



THE  
WESTMINSTER  
REVIEW.

JULY AND OCTOBER,  
1880.

~~~~~  
" Truth can never be confirm'd enough,  
Though doubts did ever sleep "

SHAKESPEARE.

Wahrheitsliebe zeigt sich darin, daß man überall das Gute zu finden und zu schätzen weiß  
GÖTTE.

~~~~~  
NEW SERIES.

VOL. LVIII.

LONDON:  
TRÜBNER & CO., LUDGATE HILL.  
MDCCLXXX.

**Ballantyne Press**  
BALLANTYNE AND MANON, EDINBURGH  
CHANDOS STREET, LONDON

# CONTENTS.

## I. *Scotch Peerage.*

1. Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Representative Peerage of Scotland and Ireland. 1874.
2. Articles and Letters on the Scotch and Irish Peerages in *The Times*, *Morning Post*, and *Pall Mall Gazette*, January, March, April, May, 1880. . . . . 1

## II. *The Place of Socrates in Greek Philosophy.*

- ZELLER. Die Philosophie der Griechen ; Zweiter Theil, Erste Abtheilung. Leipzig : 1875. . . . . 19

## III. *The Peasant-Poets of Russia.*

1. T. G. Shevchenko, Kobzar (The Wandering Minstrel). 2 vols. Prague. 1876.
2. Stikhotvorenia A. V. Koltzova (The Poems of A. V. Koltzov). Moscow. 1863.
3. Sochinenia Lomonosova (The Works of Lomonósov). St. Petersburg : 1847. . . . . 63

## IV. *Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister.*

1. Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister. Speech of Lord HOUGHTON, in the House of Lords, Tuesday, May 6, 1879, on Moving the Second Reading of the Bill for Legalizing Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister. Published for the Marriage Law Reform Association, 21, Parliament Street, Westminster.
2. Reasons for Legalizing Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister. By Lord DENMAN.
3. An Historical View of the Restrictions upon Marriage, especially in Relation to England. With the True Reasons why Marriage with the Sister of a Deceased Wife was Prohibited. By AN ANTIQUARY.
4. Hansard's Debates between the Years 1835 and 1880. . . . . 93

## V. *The Life of the Prince Consort.*

- 'The Life of His Royal Highness the Prince Consort. By THEODORE MARTIN. Vol. v. London : Smith, Elder, & Co. 1880. . . . . 109

ART.	PAGE
<b>VI. Game Laws and Game Preserving.</b>	
1. A Bill for the better Protection of Occupiers of Land against Injury to their Crops from Hares and Rabbits. (Parliamentary Paper.)	
2. The Game Laws. A Speech of Mr. P. A. TAYLOR, in the House of Commons, March 2, 1880. (The Anti-Game Law League).	
3. The Anti-Game Law Circular. 1872-3. (The Anti-Game Law League).	131
<b>VII. State Papers—Foreign Series.</b>	
1. Calendar of State Papers—Foreign Series—Preserved in Her Majesty's Public Record Office—Edward VI. and Mary, 1547-1558. Edited by W. B. TURNBULL. 2 vols.	
2. Calendar of State Papers—Foreign Series—Elizabeth, 1558-1565. Edited by the Rev. J. STEVENSON. 7 vols.	
3. Calendar of State Papers—Foreign Series—Elizabeth, 1566-1574. Edited by ALLAN JAMES CROSBY. 3 vols. Longmans, Trübner, & Co.	156
<i>A New View of the Indian Exchange Difficulty.</i>	173
<i>India and our Colonial Empire</i>	193
<b>Contemporary Literature.</b>	
Theology . . . . .	217
Philosophy . . . . .	230
Politics, Sociology, Voyages, and Travels . . . . .	236
Science . . . . .	259
History and Biography . . . . .	275
Belles Lettres . . . . .	289
Miscellanea . . . . .	303

THE  
WESTMINSTER  
AND  
FOREIGN QUARTERLY  
REVIEW.

---

JULY 1, 1880.

---

ART. I.—SCOTCH PEERAGE.

1. *Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Representative Peerage of Scotland and Ireland. 1874.*
2. *Articles and Letters on the Scotch and Irish Peerages in The Times, Morning Post, and Pall Mall Gazette, January, March, April, May, 1880.*

IN the July number of 1878 of this Review we took occasion to consider the existing condition of the House of Lords. The time we chose for so doing, was, as concerned the House of Lords, one of profound, we may almost say of slumberous, repose. From the reign of Charles I. to the reign of Queen Victoria, from the days when the chiefs of the Roundheads closed the doors of the House of Peers to the days when they were opened to life peers in the shape of law lords, the House of Lords had never enjoyed a rest so peaceful and placid. Generation after generation had seen attacks, more or less violent, levelled against it; generation after generation had seen these attacks guarded against with the most vigilant precaution, and generally repelled with considerable success. But after many apprehensions, many struggles, and some wounds, the House of Lords, in 1878, seemed at last to have entered a haven of rest; and it was professedly for this reason that we selected a moment which many people would deem the most unfavourable to write upon the subject.

It is, however, in our opinion, not the moment of intense  
[Vol. CXIV. No. CCXXV.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LVIII. No. I. B

political excitement that is best adapted for the consideration of matters of momentous importance. It should not be necessary to wait for ocular demonstration of an evil before we commence to make provision for its consequences. Yet this is, to too great an extent, the habit of our public men, both political and literary. They incline to consider only the actual atoms—the waifs and strays—which the flood of necessity casts at their feet. To use a homely metaphor, they alter the shoe only where they feel it pinches, but they rarely take measures to prevent it from pinching at all; and when the moment for action arrives there is an impatience, a feverish eagerness, for the instant realization of a project which seems to imply that in its fulfilment the personal honour of the projector is at stake rather than the intelligent advancement of the cause which he advocates. Nor need we search far to find an explanation. In politics the statesman bids for the support of the great constituency of the kingdom, and his success in the field in which he labours, depends, to a great extent, upon how far his public pledges have been redeemed, upon what fruit his designs have borne, within the narrow space of at the most the septennial existence of a single parliament. His reputation depends upon his success, and success is most cheaply achieved in parliament, as elsewhere, by shewing what has been accomplished. Hence, unlooked-for events follow each other with startling rapidity. The public, half dazzled, half alarmed, half pleased, half disgusted, await the issue of the day on the tiptoe of expectation, never quite certain whether to condemn or to applaud, and the whole action of government is reduced to something little better than a series of *coups de théâtre*.

As for political literature, which should correct much that is hasty in political declamation, it has, especially of late years, sunk to the level of a mere supplement to political controversy. Most political articles in our leading reviews are nothing else than what may be termed speeches on paper. The speaker of to-day is the writer of to-morrow, only he prefers to storm our minds through the eyes instead of through the ears; and when platforms fail, and audiences dwindle, seizes the pen as the readiest weapon to substitute for the tongue. Without desiring to underrate such articles, we think that literature loses half its value when it is employed as a mere engine of party polemics, when it ceases to be what it should be, the calm critical faculty, the touchstone upon which to test the hasty and passionate arguments of those engaged in the van of the battle. The attainment of truth, always a difficult matter, is rendered doubly so when sufficient time is not given to find it, and when the search for it is not conducted with a coolness rarely found together with

partizanship. "Probitas laudatur et-alget," said Juvenal, satirizing the antagonism which in his day existed between the precept and practice of a Roman citizen. The Englishman is hardly less inconsistent than the Roman. He praises truth, and, to do him justice, we believe that he really aspires to establish it, but he is in such a hurry to do so, that he gives himself no time to find out what it is.

To turn then to our subject. The condition of a Scotch peer as exhibited to the public is certainly lamentable. We are informed that he is a gentleman of education, and usually of some means; that he has probably influence in the county in which his property lies; that he can count innumerable ancestors whose names are inscribed on every page of Scotch history; that his forefathers, to use the words of the Lord Belhaven, of the time of the Union, "had conquered provinces, overrun counties, reduced and subjected towns and fortified places, and exacted tribute through the greatest part of England;" and more than all this we are half left to infer that the descendants of these warrior-peers, from sheer motives of philanthropy, abandoned, for the welfare of the people, those parliamentary rights which they held most dear, and which their posterity now claim again from the hands of their grateful fellow-countrymen. In this inference lies the very pith and marrow of their claim, that they *sacrificed* their privileges for the sake of a great public object, and now that, as they affirm, the sacrifice is no longer necessary, these rights which, after all, are only in abeyance, should be restored to them. The position which we mean presently to take up is that the peers of Scotland never sacrificed their privileges at all, but—to use the plainest expression possible—sold them, or rather bartered them for an equivalent, the fruits of which equivalent their descendants enjoy to the present day.

We, however, readily admit that there is much in the position of a Scotch peer to cause him profound dissatisfaction. His political power, or if not his own, at all events that of some of his brethren, is decidedly very limited, nor is he even fortunate in his comforters. He bewails his grievance. He publishes it in the *Times*. He begs at least for the bread of consolation, and lo! he is offered the stone of ridicule. The *Times*, in an article published in April last, was so struck by the picturesqueness of an election of Scotch peers that it almost forgot, in a historical reverie, the grievance complained of by its unfortunate correspondents. All the beauty—minus all the dirt—of an ancient function presented itself to its vision like a picture. For the prosaic morning-dress of the nineteenth century, the *Times*, saw in its mind's eye, the noble electors of the Scotch representatives "dressed in ermine, or brocade, or inlaid armour,



gathered to deliberate on an armed raid across the border ;" it saw the portraits of a hundred Scotch kings gazing down upon the spectacle from the walls of Holyrood, taking a part as if were in the solemn conclave. With the best wishes for the Scotch peerage we should at all events recommend its members, while attempting to recover the privileges of their ancestors, not to imitate them in this respect, or the whole question might be brought to an issue at once too short and too easy. Even the *Times*, rapt as it is in the contemplation of the picturesque scene it has conjured up, is fain before the conclusion of the article to admit of a certain practical alteration in the condition of affairs, and it compares the time-honoured ceremony, which is septennially, or even oftener, approached with feelings of reverence by a certain portion of the British peerage, to nothing better than the procession of the *Mardi* ox, or a dance of Cologne mummers. In another article on the Irish peerage, the *Times* commits the same offence. The political nature of the grievance is entirely lost sight of in a rhapsody over the beauty of Irish titles, and the Irish peer is congratulated upon the circumstance, that when he is introduced into a room his host is doubtful whether he is not about to receive one of the ornamentally-named heroes of a tale by Miss Burney or Richardson. In this, if in nothing else, we would cordially extend our sympathy to the Scotch peers. That claims, which they seriously believe are just, should be put aside as unworthy of consideration is painful enough, without parcelling them out as a band of Rip van Winkles to mingle in a jumble of *Mardi* oxes, Cologne mummers, and lifeless phantoms raised from the tomb of old romance.

But though we can readily recognise at the outset that the situation in which the Scotch peer is placed is, in many respects, a hard and disagreeable one, we cannot go the length of saying it is unjust. There can be no injustice so long as the stipulations made in the Act of Union with reference to the Scotch peerage are strictly adhered to. One, indeed, is inclined to question whether the lapse of time has not rather ameliorated than prejudiced the position of a Scotch peer. At the present moment more than half of the whole electoral body sits in the House of Lords with hereditary titles ; of the other half, sixteen must also necessarily occupy seats in the Upper Chamber, so that the residue of Scotch peers left in the cold, as the saying is, now, to what it was in the reign of Queen Anne, is reduced from 188 to 24, without even taking into account those females and minors, who would not under any circumstances have a vote at Holyrood.\* It is these unfortunate outcasts from the Scotch

---

\* It may be as well to state here, once for all, the numbers of the Scotch

peerage who meet with what little sympathy we have to bestow. Having no seats of their own by right, and having in many cases no hope of acquiring them by election, they appear isolated from all participation in political life. This is a substantial hardship, and a hardship which if it can be removed is a grievance.

Up to a certain point, therefore, we feel that in the contemplation of a reform of the Scotch peerage we stand on common ground with the Scotch peer. We admit that the erection of the Scotch representative peerage created an anomaly, and that it was a deviation from an old and well-tried principle which was of a very hazardous nature. It introduced into the House of Lords a new principle almost revolutionary, to protect the dignity of peers who, a few years afterwards, made the creation of Queen Anne's twelve peers—an Act which did not strike at the fundamental basis of the peerage at all—an Article in Oxford's impeachment. But at the time it was established it was an expedient, and a very useful one. To admit the whole Scotch peerage into the House of Lords would, at the period of the Union, have been impossible. On the one hand, the English peers, as subsequent experience showed, would have gone to any lengths—even to unconstitutional lengths—to frustrate such a design; on the other, without a concession to the Scotch nobility the idea of Union must inevitably have perished.

Our ancestors snatched at the only solution of a difficulty which, it appeared, would wreck the most important question ever submitted to the wisdom of two great nations. The Scotch representative peerage was established. It was a concession to jealousy; it prevented the immediate and inevitable catastrophe which this jealousy seemed about to produce; it was a bad thing substituted for a worse thing; the mere choice of the lesser evil. In regard, therefore, to the representative peerage system, we have no more affection for the system itself than has the discontented Scotch peer. But we can go further with him than a mere dislike of the system. We can sym-

peers, distinguishing those who have also a title to a seat of their own in the House of Lords: 154 peers are to be found upon the Roll of the Union. Since then ten peers have been added to the roll. On the other hand, some peerages have become extinct, or fallen into abeyance, while others have merged with other titles. The following may be taken as representing pretty accurately the present state of the constituency of the Scotch peerage, including females and minors: Of those peers of Scotland who are *only* peers of Scotland, having no individual right to sit in the House of Lords, there are two marquises, seventeen earls, two viscounts, nineteen barons—in all, forty. Of the Scotch peers who vote at the election of Scotch representative peers, and who are also peers of Parliament, there are eight dukes, two marquises, twenty-six earls, three viscounts, eight barons, in all forty-seven.

pathize with him in his desire to increase his political power. It is natural that Scotch peers should beat against the barriers which exclude certain of their number from an equitable portion of it. It is just that the nation should listen to their petition, and annihilate those barriers where it is in any way practicable so to do; but a relaxation of the bonds which curtail the liberties of the Scotch peer must be made in the direction which, while it gives as much freedom as is possible to the peer, may, at the same time, be of the greatest possible benefit to the public. The Scotch peer has a claim upon the nation, in common with all English citizens, for political freedom, but he has no separate claim to indicate to the nation the manner in which that relief shall be offered. Yet this is precisely the claim which he makes, and is the point upon which we can no longer support him. He ceases any longer to sue for political enfranchisement, he demands the restoration of a right. He submits his case to arbitration, but refuses to accept any award but one. As proof of this we take Lord Elphinstone's answer to the question put to him in a Select Committee, appointed by the House of Lords in 1874, to consider the Scotch and Irish peerages. Would the Scotch peers, he was asked, accept seats in the House of Commons if the offer was made to them? His answer was that "they look upon the House of Lords, and the House of Lords alone, as their right!" Nothing can express more clearly the pretensions they put forward on the subject, and nobody can more strongly reject their assumptions than ourselves.

The whole question in regard to the Scotch peerage may be reduced into the following limits.

In the first place, the condition under which the Scotch representative peerage exists may be regarded as the result of a bargain, contracted without fraud or compulsion, and solemnly ratified by the Parliaments of both nations; and in regard to Scotland, so far is it from the fact, as has been inferred, that the Scotch nobility found the clauses in it distasteful, the truth is the peers of Scotland were more instrumental in passing the Act of Union than the Commissioners of the Scotch burghs and counties. In regard to Scotland, therefore, the peers of Scotland must be considered to have entered both jointly for the nation, and separately for themselves, into the bargain which stripped them of a portion of political power more apparent than real.

The bargain being effected, there remain now only three ways of dealing with it. Either the parties to it may claim that its provisions are not properly interpreted, in which case they both admit that they are bound by its covenants, or they may set up an equitable claim under the old lines; or, thirdly, they may

agree to absolve each other from the old contract altogether, and conclude a new bargain more convenient to both parties; but in our opinion no release which could now be made would restore to the Scotch peers that *locus standi* which they enjoyed at the time of the Union as peers of Parliament. That right was utterly extinguished by the concessions which their ancestors made at the Union, and can no more be restored to them than the equivalent which their ancestors have been enjoying since the Union, in lieu of these concessions, can be restored to the British public. They must either stand by their bargain, and wait as they are, till it pleases the wisdom of successive Prime Ministers to absorb them gradually into the peerage of the United Kingdom, or they must sue as private individuals for the acquisition of rights enjoyed generally by the public, but of which they themselves are destitute.

• No compact, at whatever time concluded, has been attended with greater advantages to the weaker party than has the Act of Union to the Scotch peers. At the time of the Union the condition of Scotland was utterly pitiable. For a century previous to it she had undergone an almost unparalleled series of disasters. She lost her independence. She suffered from a condition of things which made her almost absolutely dependent upon a King who lived in a foreign capital, and a Council which she had no share in electing. Like England she had been racked with internal strife, and half-consumed by religious fanaticism. The Restoration brought an interval to England which, though one of almost unceasing political activity, granted peace to the people generally. To Scotland the Restoration brought nothing but the Duke of York, the boot, and the thumbscrew. The Government was honeycombed with intrigue; the nobility was impoverished and debased; the people oppressed and poor; while there were disseminated among them opinions such as were held by Fletcher of Saltoun, and which might ultimately have led to a *Jacquerie* and the utter destruction of the nobility. It is a curious circumstance to consider in these modern times, that while the Scotch peers are now begging to be admitted to the House of Lords because of the undue preponderance of Scotch popular representatives in the House of Commons, Fletcher of Saltoun, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, was proposing an increase of the popular representation to balance the constant creation of new peers. At the end of the seventeenth, and the beginning of the eighteenth century, the history of the Scotch nobility is a matter not pleasant to dwell upon. Those among them who took part in public life were singularly destitute of nearly all which brings credit to the life of a statesman. They were disloyal to every dynasty under

which they served. They discarded the Stuarts for William of Orange, and him again they discarded to plot for the Jacobite cause. The self-interest which is apparent in the characters of nearly all the public men in both England and Scotland was not redeemed in Scotland, as it was in England, by a few brilliant exceptions. Scotland cannot boast either of an Algernon Sidney or a Russell; it cannot boast of a single man of rank who preferred his cause to himself.\*

The light which fell upon the rest of Great Britain, on the accession of William III., did nothing but aggravate the distress of Scotland—and deepen the gloom which her position, at once dependent on and yet foreign to England, threw over her. It is quite unnecessary to describe the heavy disadvantage under which her trade laboured. She was excluded from the English colonies with the same rigour which was exercised against the French or Dutch. Yet these very colonies her soldiers were employed to defend. Her sailors were pressed into the English naval service as natives; yet were excluded from the merchant service as foreigners. She had scarcely more independence than under Cromwell, and none of the advantages which she derived from his protection. The attempt at the Darien Settlement, undertaken by that most unfortunate Company of Scotland trading to Africa and the Indies, was her last protest against the monopoly which England had established over the seas. The expedition utterly and wholly collapsed, leaving behind, on that fatal spot, not a trace of its occupation but a few bones offered up as sacrifices to the putrid qualities of the climate, and transmitting to ourselves a narration of the wretched squabbles of an ill-organized expedition, of dreams of gold turned to realities of dust, and one or two interesting descriptions of a country sprinkled with mahogany, and cocoa, and noble forest trees, among which the monkeys jumped and scrambled. The events which were contemporaneous and subsequent to the Darien enterprise, the attack on the "Worcester," the mobs in Edinburgh, and, finally, the Act for securing the Kingdom of Scotland, brought matters to an issue in which Union or Civil War was inevitable.

We have stated so much of Scotch history merely to show what the Scotch peerage had to look to if no Union had taken place; and if the peers had determined to make their entire incorporation into the House of Lords a main condition of Union. We will now, for a moment, turn to the political privileges which the Scotch peerage actually enjoyed in Scotland, and see how far, if

---

\* It is hardly possible to compare Montrose, Hamilton, Argyll, or Dundee, with these two distinguished English statesmen. It seems to us that these celebrated Scotch noblemen died martyrs to a cause, while Sidney and Russell lost their lives the confessors of a great principle.

these were again accorded, a Scotch peer would be placed in the position of an English lord of Parliament.

It will be readily granted that, previous to the Parliament convened by William III., there was very little parity between the parliamentary powers of a Scotch and an English peer. Not only did the Peers and Commoners of the Scotch Estates sit and vote in a single chamber, but the country was, in fact, governed by that famous Committee called the Lords of the Articles. The situation of the lords who had places in this committee was purely of an elective character, and of a type of election much more odious than any system of representation. The peers did not even select each other, but were selected by the bishops. Whatever may have been the Constitutional theories as to the privileges of the Scotch Parliament, they were, as a matter of fact, non-existent during the dynasty of the Stewarts. The Revolution brought to Scotland fresh expectations of political freedom. The Committee of the Articles ceased to exist, and in its place was erected an Assembly superior in every respect to that miserable body, but still essentially different to the English Houses of Parliament. As Mr. Burton points out, its features, like many other Scotch institutions, mark the modelling of a French parentage. The distinctive badges of the social state of which it was composed, the gorgeousness of the nobles, the simple unpretentiousness of the popular representatives, the publicity of the display which seemed to court the invidious attention of the people, were all a counterpart of the commencement of those dark days of France when noble and commoner trooped together into the Halls of the General Assembly. In Scotland, as in France, both Estates still met and deliberated in the same chamber, and though the Lords of the Articles existed no longer, the House still continued to be governed by committees appointed from time to time by itself, and composed of equal proportions of the representatives of each Estate. By these committees the work of the nation was carried on, and the very fact that William III. assented to this arrangement seems to imply that though all members of Parliament were eligible for service on a committee, each member had no inherent right in himself to pronounce upon any measure which might be brought before the Estates. So great was the power of the Crown in the selection of these committees that in 1698 the Government succeeded in keeping such powerful noblemen as Lord Tullibardine, Lord Belhaven, and Lord Tweeddale from the committees of Parliament for the management of business. It can scarcely be said, therefore, that at the time of the Union the peers of Scotland possessed parliamentary powers at all equivalent to those held by the peers of England. They were within the favoured pale from inside which those who

were called to deliberate were summoned, but they had never established for themselves that prescriptive right of parliamentary self-assertion which has inviolably attached to the English peerage since the days of Charles I. and Lord Bristol.

A consideration of the political privileges of the Scotch peers at the time of the Union leads us to the conclusion that were their rights, as they call them, simply restored to them, a Scotch peer would still be something entirely apart from an English lord of Parliament, and present an anomaly even more striking than he does at present,

But, says Lord Elphinstone, in the Report of the Committee from which we have already quoted, "It must not be supposed that these Articles met with the unanimous support of the Scottish nation."

It is true they did not, though what this has to do with the matter we cannot perceive. The treaty was signed, sealed, and delivered, so to speak, and whatever the deliberations in the Scotch parliament may have been—whatever the shiftings, the changes, and the opposition, the final act must always be held as the act of all; and previous disagreement can do no more to invalidate the moral force of a treaty than the irresolution of an individual before signing a contract can be held to shake that contract when once concluded. But, as a matter of fact, the peers of Scotland were a great deal too wise to attempt to frustrate the Union. Whatever opposition was directed against it did not proceed from the peers, and of the three classes of which the estates of Scotland were composed, the peers, the commissioners of the counties, and the representatives of the burghs, the largest adhesion to the measure was found among the Scotch nobility.

In advancing the cause of the Union the Scotch peers well knew what was the nature of the change to which they were dooming themselves and their successors. The notion that parliamentary exclusion was insulting to their Order was a grievance reserved for a later day. That it brought with it privileges of a sort which to a modern ear sound strangely equivocal, they were not above discerning. The immunity from debt which the Scotch peer had only for the Parliament, the English peer enjoyed for life. This valuable exemption was now extended to all the peers of Scotland, and many of these peers—who are described as being, at that period, so miserably poor and disreputable that, at the end of each session of parliament, the Canongate jail of Edinburgh became crowded with them—must have felt the extension of the privilege as a real relief. But as far as the injustice now complained of was felt, we think more importance was attached to it at Westminster, in 1707 than in

Edinburgh. Lord Rochester, declaiming against lords who were at once "peers and no peers," met with respectful attention, while Belhaven was received with shouts of laughter when he depicted in the Scotch Parliament the humiliation which would overtake the Scotch peer in the English House of Lords.

The decision of the Scotch peers, as we have suggested, may not have been entirely apart from self-interest; on the other hand, it may have been arrived at from motives of a higher duty to the State. They may have preferred to exchange discord for peace, to put an end to centuries of national animosity; to secure an honourable independence for their country, such an independence as we, for our part, fully believe would have been maintained in no other way. They may have preferred to dissipate, by a sacrifice possibly, the clouds of war which hung over the two countries, and threatened every moment to burst over them in a deluge of blood. They may have chosen to do this from the most philanthropic motives, and still we think that the exchange they made was not in any way to their disadvantage, nor to that of their successors. What the history of Scotland would have been had not this Union been effected—what the descendants of these nobles would have been had this sacrifice not been made—it is very difficult to predict; but this may safely be asserted, that it would have been very different to what it has been; that at the very most it would have been but the history of insignificance, that those peers, even had they continued to exist, would have been but the shadows of what they are now when two-thirds of their number sit and vote in the most ancient, the most splendid, and the most renowned assembly in Europe.

If, then, we assume that a contract such as we contend to have been created, in truth existed, between the Scotch peerage and the people of the United Kingdom, at the time of the Union, all that remains to be asked is, whether the stipulations of that treaty have been strictly performed, or whether, if literally performed, the Scotch peers might yet receive some equitable relief upon its terms.

The Scotch peers, then, aver that the terms of the treaty have not been strictly fulfilled. They hark back to the discussions of the Lords Commissioners for England and Scotland previous to the Union, to show the grounds upon which the Articles contained in it, as applicable to their peerage, were based. They show, and with perfect truth, that the number of representative peers to sit in the House of Lords was fixed upon the number of representative commoners who were to sit in the House of Commons. They declare, also with truth, that the numbers of representative commoners for Scotland have been considerably increased without



any corresponding augmentation in the representative lords; and hence they infer, with much plausibility, that the principle upon which was based the status of the Scotch representative peerage has been disturbed, and the contract itself been infringed and invalidated. This charge is of a serious nature, and deserves to be fully considered.

The Lords Commissioners engaged in drawing up the Union, after a certain amount of wrangling, determined to name forty-five as the quota of commoners to be sent by Scotland to the Parliament of the United Kingdom; and "there being an absolute necessity that the number of peers to be admitted into the House of Lords of the United Kingdom, for that part of the United Kingdom now called Scotland, be regulated in proportion to the number to be admitted into the House of Commons, do propose that sixteen peers be the quota of Scotland in the House of Peers of the Parliament of the United Kingdom after the intended Union." Thus runs the minute in the Report of the Proceedings of the Lords Commissioners. The point at issue is how, if sixteen peers was the proportion for forty-five commoners, can it remain the proportion to sixty.

We think that too much stress is laid on this inconsistency. The words quoted have been taken to demonstrate the *principle* upon which the quota of lords to be returned to Parliament was settled. They have been taken as showing the intention of the framers of the Union. Now we very much doubt whether these words can bear any such interpretation, or indeed whether there was any principle worthy of the name employed to settle the exact extent to which the Scotch peers should be represented in the Lords. The number was evidently fixed rather arbitrarily to meet various contingencies, mostly of a public nature, than to settle what the precise claims of the peers at that moment might be, and much less to lay down a hard and fast rule for the future. It is quite certain that the number of peers to be admitted to the House of Lords was considered as much in relation to the size of that body as it then existed, as it was to the popular representation which was to represent the Scotch Commons. Yet the principle, if it is one at all, would seem to take no notice of this obvious fact. The English peers, we may be sure, had no more idea of being overwhelmed than the Scotch commoners had of being over-lorded. The events which followed the creation of the Duke of Brandon peerage are very clear proof of this circumstance.

Besides, when we come to consider the sense of the words on their own merits, we find in them nothing which could lead one to suppose that any body of intelligent men could possibly intend to canonize them by conversion into a principle. A principle

should contain something vital and essential to a purpose. There is nothing of this to be discovered in the somewhat vague reasoning employed to fix the number of Scotch peers. As we have already suggested, circumstances might have rendered its practicability absolutely inadmissible to the English peers. Had the English House of Lords, in 1707, been smaller, it would have probably never entertained the proposal of so great an influx of foreigners. It so happened that the number of peers, fixed upon a popular basis, was not inconsistent with the views their lordships held concerning their own dignity, and hence the settlement was agreed to though the principle was not. To fix the representation of one constituency upon the numbers and strength of another, or to enlarge the representation of the lords without any regard to the internal conditions of the constituency of the Scotch peerage, merely because trade, interests, and population have increased in the popular one, seems to be a very extraordinary and unreasonable proceeding, and not at all unlike giving two members to Calne or to Richmond because a third is given to Glasgow and Sheffield. There is nothing indeed in these words to show us the intention of the framers of the Union in regard to the status of Scotch peers. If any particular inference at all is to be drawn from the deliberations anterior to the Act of Union, it is that the chief motive of action was public convenience; and an opinion that in the *then* existing state of the people, and the then existing state of the peerage, the adjustment of numbers of sixteen to forty-five was proper; so far, therefore, from discovering in the Act of Union any hard and fast rule, we should rather incline to the opinion that the framers of the Act intended that the readjustment of the representation of the peerage should rest upon what happened to be of the most public use.

The third point which we wish to consider is, whether the Scotch peers have any equitable claim to a fresh interpretation of the Act of Union. To a certain extent this question has already been answered. We have tried to show that the intentions, at all events, of those who framed the Act of Union have not been misconstrued or executed in a manner more rigorously severe than was contemplated. But there is every reason to say that the condition of the Scotch peer is infinitely better than was that of his ancestor after the completion of the Union. If it is only that he is so much nearer that blessed consummation of absorption into the House of Lords, so much nearer to the gates of that paradise whose bars he impatiently longs to force, but which in a few years if he is only patient, must open to admit him of their own accord; so much nearer that Seat of Justice before which it is his privilege to be tried, and from which he wishes to exercise the

privilege of trying his fellows—in all these things he is a happier man than his forefathers. But is it consistent that he who regards with such veneration the acts of his predecessors that he is prepared to rest his case now upon a treaty a hundred and seventy years old—is it consistent that he should hurry on that natural period of completion which they in their wisdom have fixed? In deviating from the great lines upon which the hereditary system is founded it is quite clear that those who framed the Union intended that the deviation should be merely temporary; and that in time the old system should absorb the new; but they took means to preclude this process from proceeding at a pace which they deemed injurious to the peerage or to the country. The measure may not have been the best which could have been devised, but it has at all events not been attended with any great evils. Why should the Scotch peer now desire to change it when it has very nearly worked itself out, and when a few years will see it expire from natural causes?

There are, however, other reasons which should put the Scotch peerage in a better position now than it was in a hundred years ago. That it does not enjoy the advantages of this position is due to the apathy or prejudice of the peers themselves. The constituency of the Scotch peerage ought to be nearly two-thirds smaller than what it was in 1707, and yet retain the same number of representatives. Instead of sixteen peers representing one hundred and thirty-eight, sixteen peers should now represent at the very most twenty-four peers, as the entire constituency, with the hereditary Scotch peers deducted from it, amounts but to forty. Were this the case, the Scotch peers of to-day would be infinitely better represented than their forefathers of last century. We admit that it appears almost a paradox that the smaller a constituency the larger should be its proportional representation, but it is one which the Scotch peers, had they been like other men, would have clutched at eagerly as effecting a considerable addition to their political power, while they would have occupied a position in which they were not at all likely to be attacked. But the system which exists at present is neither reasonable nor useful. Every Scotch peer who is made a peer of the United Kingdom remains, to all intents and purposes, a Scotch peer still for the purpose of electing a representative. Though possessing the prize for which he has so long pined, he still tenaciously clings to the performance of a duty which we are told, in the daily papers, is degrading to peers, and continues to take part in a function which the *Times* has declared is like nothing else but the procession of the *Mardi Ox*. When a Scotch peer becomes a peer of Parliament the privileges which have appertained to him for the sole reason that he is a peer who is not a peer of Parliament, should become

extinguished. Whatever the framers of the Act of Union contemplated, they decidedly never contemplated anything half so anomalous, half so opposed to the spirit of the English Constitution, as the representation in the Upper House of a lord of Parliament in his own person, and also in that of another selected by him. Common-sense is repelled at the anomaly of giving a more extensive voting power to the Dukes of Buccleuch and Argyll—both members of the oppressed Scotch peerage—than to the Duke of Bedford or any other peer who is merely an English lord of Parliament. The grievance is an old one. The House of Lords has from time to time tried to check the abuse. For a hundred years after the Union occasional orders were transmitted to the Lord Clerk Registrar to put an end to it, but in vain; and it still flourishes, to the detriment, as we consider, of the liberties of those Scotch peers who have no seats in the House of Lords, and also to the injury of those peers who have the misfortune to be mere peers of England, of Great Britain, or of the United Kingdom, and who have not the good luck to append to their own titles the title of a Scotch peer.

Having said so much, we cannot therefore agree with Lord Elphinstone, in the Report from which we have so liberally quoted, when he asserts, "That although those peers of Scotland who have obtained hereditary seats in the House of Lords do vote at the election of representative peers for Scotland, yet they cannot be considered as being in any way represented by those peers, as they have their own representative seats." It might just as well be said that because a commoner happens to be a member of the House of Commons he is not represented by the candidate for whose election he voted and whom he successfully assisted in returning to Parliament. To be both representative and represented is not only no anomaly, but is inevitable where the form of government is representative; but it is a very great anomaly in a chamber where the right to a seat is of a personal and not of a representative character. It is an attempt to import into the House of Lords that very system which the Scotch peers desire to abolish. They all desire to be peers of Parliament, but instead of reducing the effects of the representative system, which is opposed to their aims, to a minimum, they extend it to its very utmost limits. If nothing else were done in regard to the House of Lords and the Scotch peerage, we should be extremely glad to see Scotch peers who are also lords of Parliament prevented from voting at the election of representative peers at Holyrood. In the present state of circumstances a combination among the Scotch peers, who are also parliamentary peers, might return the whole sixteen representatives of the Scotch peerage as their

nominees to Parliament to the entire exclusion of those of their body who had no seats in the House of Lords. The absurdity of the system could hardly be more strongly demonstrated.

But after all that has been said and written on the subject of the Scotch peerage, one view of it is a great deal too much thrown into the shade. How would a change in it affect the public interest? It is not for us to try the issue by balancing against each other the scattered fragments of historical evidence, by constructing a motley case composed of half-forgotten claims and half-reported conversations, grains and scraps exhumed from ancient records, by applying in fact an investigation worthy of the ponderous machinery employed by a Scotch peer when he desires to be placed on the electoral roll. History is useful to guide us, but not to rule us. Above everything it is useful as the region from which the most valuable inferences may be drawn, but its advantages cease when it is regarded as a mere agglomeration of settled truths and principles, to be followed with the same blind submission which we pay to the leading cases of a legal compendium. We must ask ourselves, What has the Scotch peerage done to deserve a favour? What, from its past history, we may expect it to do if it acquires these new privileges? Has its influence been wholesome? Is its extension likely to add to the strength of the Upper House? Is it likely to promote peace with the Lower House? Unless these questions can be answered in the affirmative it had better remain, as it is.

We do not wish to enter upon these matters at length here. They were fully discussed in the Number of the WESTMINSTER to which we have before alluded. One of the proposals which we made in 1878 was, that the Scotch peerage, together with the Irish peerage, should be incorporated into the Upper House. The suggestion was not made alone nor at haphazard. It was made as a portion of a much larger scheme, and in obedience to a principle which, if logically pursued, would have the effect not only of admitting Scotch peers into the House of Lords but also of expelling bishops from it. We have but little sympathy with the Scotch peers as a body, or any very great respect for their grievances; particularly for the excessively sentimental one which they occasionally put forward, that even when admitted to a seat in the House of Lords their names are to be found on the roll Parliament, not under the old title which their ancestors may have perhaps earned under William the Lion or Robert Bruce for sacking cities and devastating provinces, but under the name of some peaceful village famous neither in peace nor war. There is nothing about the Scotch peerage that demands the gratitude owed to obligation. The sympathy of the Scotch peerage has never

been bestowed upon classes which, like their own, are struggling for that fair share of independence which they claim as their right. Their history has been the history of political obstruction. They have done nothing themselves, and they have done their best to prevent others doing anything either. From the time of the first Reform Bill to the present day there is not a single Bill which proposed to grant liberties either from political or religious thralldom which they have not done their best to defeat. The Jewish Disabilities Bills of 1833 and 1839 did not find the support of a single Scotch peer. The Bill of 1834 for Admission of Dissenters to Universities, as far as we can discover from the division lists, only found one in its favour, while twelve opposed it. The Irish Tithes Bill, again, displays the disparity of none in favour, eight against. The Corn Law Bill four in favour, ten against. The Irish Church Bill of 1868 two in favour, nine against. We might with ease, were it at all necessary, multiply the number of instances in which the Scotch peers opposed the removal of restraints which weighed either upon the public generally, upon sects, or upon classes. Few bodies of men in this country have displayed so long, so persistent, so striking an hostility to the advancement of political liberty, or to the concessions made to the needs of the people. It is difficult, therefore, now that the note of distress is heard from those who never attended to it in others, to give more than a cold attention, or to mete out more than the barest justice.

When we proposed, therefore, two years ago, that the Scotch peerage should be amalgamated with that of England, the proposal was made from no love of the Scotch peerage. It was not because we thought that the country would gain more, but would suffer less if such a measure was passed; that by incorporation, at all events, the Liberal element which does really exist in the Scotch peerage would be represented; and that if the numbers of those who were out of sympathy with the feelings of the age were increased, at all events the public would have the benefit of the services of others whose political intelligences were more upon a level with the times, and that in spite of the numerical increase of the first, their proportionate strength on a division would be diminished by the introduction to Parliament of an element which we now exclude.

These reasons still have their weight, but we are averse to any considerable change in the composition of the House of Lords, or to the means of recruiting it, until the matter is taken up as a whole, and until we can deal with the question in a rational way, with the view of attaining certain ends.

If there is to be an Upper Chamber let it be, by all means, one which is not only wise but strong—not as at present, just so

strong as to excite the combative jealousy of the Commons, just so weak as to make defeat a certainty. Compliance is good or bad as it proceeds from wisdom or weakness. We never watch a difference of opinion between Lords and Commons, and the usually discreet retreat of the former, without thinking of Falstaff's words to the Chief Justice, "For the box of the ear that the prince gave you, he gave it like a rude prince, and you took it like a sensible lord." But neither for Upper Chambers nor Lord Justices are boxes on the ear too frequently administered salutary to themselves or edifying to the people. The perplexed public may be excused for doubting whether the lord is not quite as impotent as he is sensible.

If, then, we want a strong second Chamber without any increase of a revolutionary character, we must take means to discover in what the strength of the House of Lords consists; and when we have made this discovery, and when we have satisfied ourselves that the material we have to work upon is sound and hopeful, so that if it were strengthened we should be the better and not the worse, we should take means to nurse and develop that strength by every means in our power. The House of Lords deserves all the respectful care which the nation can devote to it. It has been a very great assembly; it has exercised very mighty powers; and, on the whole, has exercised them with a sagacity and uprightness which we believe, in a body at once so powerful and oligarchic, is quite unequalled in the history of the world. Its associations cement us to a history of which we are all deservedly proud, and the contemplation of which should be a great moral power to elevate the minds of the people. That the House of Lords now, when it is old and somewhat crippled, when it has grown ricketty in the service of the State, should not receive the pious care of the nation, seems an unworthy return for so long and so distinguished a career. The only science which defies rules is the science of politics. In the restoration of a ruin what architect, if he was called in to rebuild it, would put on a roof before he had strengthened the columns, or would cover walls with decorations which might crumble under their weight. Yet this is what we do with the House of Lords. We add to parts of it without asking ourselves whether the framework of the House will bear the additional burthen; we shall overload its strength by placing upon it things inoffensive, even commendable perhaps in themselves, but nevertheless unscientific additions to an ancient structure. If we attempt to sustain it in a manner so careless, its life may be prolonged but its destiny is certain. Some fine day, probably when least expected, its strength will be sapped and it will fall, and great will be the fall of it.

ART. II.—THE PLACE OF SOCRATES IN GREEK  
PHILOSOPHY.

Zeller. *Die Philosophie der Griechen; Zweiter Theil, Erste Abtheilung.* Leipzig. 1875.

A PART from legendary reputations there is no name in the world's history more famous than that of Socrates, and in the history of philosophy there is none so famous. The only thinker that approaches him in celebrity is his own disciple Plato. Every one who has heard of Greece or Athens has heard of him. Every one who has heard of him knows that he was supremely good and great. Each successive generation has confirmed the reputed Delphic Oracle that no man was wiser than Socrates. He, with one or two others, alone realized the ideal of a Stoic sage. Christians deem it no irreverence to compare him with the Founder of their religion. If a few dissentient voices have broken the general unanimity, they have, whether consciously or not, been inspired by the Socratic principle that we should let no opinion pass unquestioned and unproved. Furthermore, it so happens that this wonderful figure is known even to the multitude by sight as well as by name. Busts, cameos, and engravings have made all familiar with the Silenus-like physiognomy, the thick lips, upturned nose, and prominent eyes that impressed themselves so strangely on the imagination of a race who are accused of having cared for nothing but physical beauty, because they rightly regarded it as the natural accompaniment of moral loveliness. Those who wish to discover what manner of mind lay hid beneath this uninviting exterior may easily satisfy their curiosity, for Socrates is personally better known than any other character of antiquity. Dr. Johnson himself is not a more familiar figure to the student of literature. Alone among classical worthies his table-talk has been preserved for us, and the art of memoir-writing seems to have been expressly created for his behoof. We can follow him into all sorts of company and test his behaviour in every variety of circumstances. He conversed with all classes and on all subjects of human interest, with artisans, artists, generals, statesmen, professors and professional beauties. We meet him in the armourer's workshop, in the sculptor's studio, in the boudoirs of the *demi-monde*, in the banqueting-halls of flower-crowned and wine-flushed Athenian youth, combining the self-mastery of an Antisthenes with the plastic grace of an Aristippus; or, in graver moments, cheering his comrades during the disastrous retreat from Delium; upholding the sanctity of law as President of the Assembly against a delirious populace; confronting, with invincible irony, the oligar-



chic terrorists who held life and death in their hands; pleading not for himself, but for reason and justice before a stupid and bigoted tribunal; and, in the last sad scene of all, exchanging Attic courtesies with the unwilling instrument of his death.

Such a character would, in any case, be remarkable; it becomes of extraordinary, or rather of unique, interest when we consider that Socrates could be and do so much, not in spite of being a philosopher, but because he was a philosopher, the chief though not the sole originator of a vast intellectual revolution; one who, as a teacher constituted the supremacy of reason, and as an individual made reason his sole guide in life. He at once discovered new principles, popularized them for the benefit of others, and exemplified them in his own conduct; but he did not accomplish each of these results separately; they were only different aspects of the same systematizing process which was identical with philosophy itself. Yet the very success of Socrates in harmonizing life and thought makes it the more difficult for us to construct a complete picture of his personality. Different observers have selected from the complex combination that which best suited their own mental predisposition, pushing out of sight the other elements that with him served to correct and complete it. The very popularity that has attached itself to his name is a proof of this; for the multitude can seldom appreciate more than one excellence at a time, nor is that usually of the highest order. Hegel complains that Socrates has been made the patron-saint of moral twaddle. We are fifty years further removed than Hegel from the golden age of platitude; the twaddle of our own time is half cynical, half æsthetic, and wholly unmoral; yet there are no signs of diminution in the popular favour with which he has always been regarded. The man of the world, the wit, the *viveur*, the enthusiastic admirer of youthful beauty, the scornful critic of democracy is welcome to many who have no taste for ethical discourses and fine-spun arguments.

Nor is it only the personality of Socrates that has been so variously conceived; his philosophy, so far as it can be separated from his life, has equally given occasion to conflicting interpretations, and it has even been denied that he had, properly speaking, any philosophy at all. These divergent presentations of his teaching, if teaching it can be called, begin with the two disciples to whom our knowledge of it is almost entirely due. There is, curiously enough, much the same inner discrepancy between Xenophon's "Memorabilia" and those Platonic dialogues where Socrates is the principal spokesman, as that which distinguishes the Synoptic from the Johannine Gospels. The one gives us a report certainly authentic, but probably incomplete, the other a court is, beyond all doubt, a highly idealized portraiture, but

seems to contain some traits directly copied from the original, which may well have escaped a less philosophic observer than Plato. Aristotle also furnishes us with some scanty notices which are of use in deciding between the two rival versions, although we cannot be sure that he had access to any better sources of information than are open to ourselves. By variously combining and reasoning from these data modern critics have produced a third Socrates, who is often little more than the embodiment of their own favourite opinions.

In England the most generally accepted method seems to be that followed by Mr. Grote. This consists in taking the Platonic *Apologia* as a sufficiently faithful report of the defence actually made by Socrates on his trial, and piecing it on to the details supplied by Xenophon, or at least to as many of them as can be made to fit without too obvious an accommodation of their meaning. If, however, we ask on what grounds a greater historical credibility is attributed to the *Apologia* than to the *Republic* or the *Phædo* none can be offered except the seemingly transparent truthfulness of the narrative itself, an argument that will not weigh much with those who remember how brilliant was Plato's talent for fiction, and how unscrupulously it could be employed for purposes of edification. The *Phædo* puts an autobiographical statement into the mouth of Socrates which we only know to be imaginary because it involves the acceptance of a theory unknown to the real Socrates. Why, then, may not Plato have thought proper to introduce equally fictitious details into the speech delivered by his master before the dicastery, if, indeed, the speech, as we have it, be not a fancy composition from beginning to end?

Before we can come to a decision on this point it will be necessary briefly to recapitulate the statements in question. Socrates is defending himself against a capital charge. He fears that a prejudice respecting him may exist in the minds of the jury, and tries to explain how it arose without any fault of his, as follows:—A certain friend of his had asked the oracle at Delphi whether there was any man wiser than Socrates? The answer was that no man was wiser. Not being conscious of possessing any wisdom, great or small, he felt considerably surprised on hearing of this declaration, and thought to convince the god of falsehood by finding out some one wiser than himself. He first went to an eminent politician, who however proved, on examination, to be utterly ignorant, with the further disadvantage that it was impossible to convince him of his ignorance. On applying the same test to others a precisely similar result was obtained. It was only the handicraftsmen who could give a satisfactory account of themselves, and their knowledge of one trade made them fancy that they understood everything else

equally well. Thus the meaning of the oracle was shown to be that God alone is truly wise, and that of all men he is wisest who, like Socrates, perceives that human wisdom is worth little or nothing. Ever since then Socrates has made it his business to vindicate the divine veracity by seeking out and exposing every pretender to knowledge whom he can find, a line of conduct that has made him extremely unpopular in Athens, while it has also won him a great reputation for wisdom, as people supposed that the matters on which he convicted others of ignorance were perfectly clear to himself.

The first difficulty that strikes one in connection with this extraordinary story arises out of the oracle on which it all hinges. Had such a declaration been really made by the Pythia, would not Xenophon have eagerly quoted it as a proof of the high favour in which his hero stood with the gods? And how could Socrates have acquired so great a reputation before entering on the cross-examining career which alone made him conscious of any superiority over other men and had alone won the admiration of his fellow-citizens? Our doubts are still further strengthened when we find that the historical Socrates did not by any means profess the sweeping scepticism attributed to him by Plato. So far from believing that ignorance was the common and necessary lot of all mankind, himself included, he held that action should, so far as possible, be entirely guided by knowledge; that the man who did not always know what he was about resembled a slave; that the various virtues were only different forms of knowledge, that he himself possessed this knowledge and was perfectly competent to share it with his friends. We do indeed find him very ready to convince ignorant and presumptuous persons of their deficiencies, but only that he may lead them, if well-disposed, into the path of right understanding. He also thought that there were certain secrets which would remain for ever inaccessible to the human intellect, facts connected with the structure of the universe which the gods had reserved for their own exclusive cognizance. This, however, was according to him a kind of knowledge that even if it could be obtained would not be particularly worth having, and the search after which would leave us no leisure for more useful acquisitions. Nor does the Platonic Socrates seem to have been at the trouble of arguing against natural science. The subjects of his elenchus are the professors of such arts as politics, rhetoric, and poetry. Further, we have something stronger than a simple inference from the facts recorded by Xenophon; we have his express testimony to the fact that Socrates did not limit himself to confuting people who fancied they knew everything; here we must either have a direct reference to the *Apologia*, or to a theory identical

with that which it embodies. Some stress has been laid on a phrase quoted by Xenophon himself as having been used by Hippias, which, at first sight, seems to support Plato's view. The Elian Sophist charges Socrates with practising a continual irony, refuting others and not submitting to be questioned himself; an accusation which, we may observe in passing, is not borne out by the discussion that subsequently takes place between them. Here, however, we must remember that Socrates used to convey instruction under the form of a series of leading questions, the answers to which showed that his interlocutor understood and assented to the doctrine propounded. Such a method might easily give rise to the misconception that he refused to disclose his own particular opinions and contented himself with eliciting those held by others. Finally it is to be noted that the idea of fulfilling a religious mission, of exposing human ignorance *in majorem Dei gloriam*, on which Mr. Grote lays such stress, has no place in Xenophon's conception of his master, although, had such an idea been really present, one can hardly imagine how it could have been passed over by a writer with whom piety amounted to superstition. It is, on the other hand, an idea which would naturally occur to a great religious reformer who proposed to base his reconstruction of society on faith in a supernatural order, and the desire to realize it here below.

So far we have contrasted the *Apologia* with the *Memorabilia*. We have now to consider in what relation it stands to Plato's other writings. The constructive dogmatic Socrates, who is a principal spokesman in some of them, differs widely from the sceptical Socrates of the famous *Defence*, and the difference has been urged as an argument for the historical authenticity of the latter. Plato, it is implied, would not have departed so far from his usual conception of the sage had he not been desirous of reproducing the actual words spoken on so solemn an occasion. There are, however, several dialogues that seem to have been composed for the express purpose of illustrating the negative method supposed to have been described by Socrates to his judges, investigations the sole result of which is to upset the theories of other thinkers, or to show that ordinary men act without being able to assign a reason for their conduct. Even the *Republic* is professedly tentative in its procedure, and only follows out a train of thought that has presented itself almost by accident to the company. Unlike Charles Lamb's Scotchman, the leading spokesman does not bring, but find, and you are invited to cry halves to whatever turns up in his company.

Plato had, in truth, a conception of science that no knowledge then attained, perhaps one may add, no knowledge ever attainable, could completely satisfy. Even the rigour of mathematical demonstration did not content him, for mathematical truth itself

rested on unproved assumptions, as we also, by the way, have lately discovered. Perhaps the Hegelian system would have fulfilled his requirements; perhaps not even that. Moreover, that the new order which he contemplated might be established, it was necessary to begin by making a clean sweep of all existing opinions. With the urbanity of an Athenian, the piety of a disciple, and the instinct of a great dramatic artist, he preferred to assume that this indispensable task had already been done by another. And of all preceding thinkers, who was so well qualified for the undertaking as Socrates? Who else had wielded the weapons of negative dialectic with such consummate dexterity? Who had assumed such a critical attitude towards the beliefs of his contemporaries? Who had been so anxious to find a point of attachment for every new truth in the minds of his interlocutors? Who therefore could, with such plausibility, be put forward in the guise of one who laid claim to no wisdom on his own account? The son of Phænaretê seemed made to be the Baptist of a Greek Messiah; but Plato, in treating him as such, has drawn a discreet veil over the whole positive side of his predecessor's teaching, and to discover what this was we must place ourselves under the guidance of Xenophon's more faithful report.

Not that Xenophon is to be taken as a perfectly accurate exponent of the Socratic philosophy. His work, it must be remembered, was primarily intended to vindicate Socrates from a charge of impiety and immoral teaching, not to expound a system which he was perhaps incompetent to appreciate or understand. We are bound to accept everything that he relates; we are bound to include nothing that he does not relate; but we may fairly readjust the proportions of his sketch. It is here that a judicious use of Plato will furnish us with the most valuable assistance. He grasped Socratism in all its parts and developed it in all directions, so that by following back the lines of his system to their origin we shall be put on the proper track and shall know where to look for the suggestions that were destined to be so magnificently worked out.\*

---

\* It may possibly be asked, Why, if Plato gave only an ideal picture of Socrates, we are to accept his versions of the Sophistic teaching as literally exact? The answer is that he was compelled, by the nature of the case, to create an imaginary Socrates, while he could have no conceivable object in ascribing views which he did not himself hold to well-known historical personages. Assuming an unlimited right of making fictitious statements for the public good, his principles would surely not have permitted him wantonly to calumniate his innocent contemporaries by foisting on them odious theories for which they were not responsible. Had nobody held such opinions as those attributed to Thrasymachus in the *Republic* there would have been no object in attacking them, and if anybody held them why not Thrasymachus as well as another? With regard to the veracity of the *Apologia* Mr. Grote, in his work on Plato,

Before entering on our task of reconstruction we must turn aside to consider with what success the same enterprise has been attempted by modern German criticism, especially by its chief contemporary representative, the last and most distinguished historian of Greek philosophy. The result at which Zeller, following Schleiermacher, arrives is that the great achievement of Socrates was to put forward an adequate idea of knowledge, in other words, to show what true science ought to be, and what, as yet, it had never been, with the addition of a demand that all action should be based on such a scientific knowledge as its only sure foundation. To know a thing was to know its essence, its concept, the assemblage of qualities which together constitute its definition, and make it to be what it is. Former thinkers had also sought for knowledge, but not *as* knowledge, not with a clear notion of what it was that they really wanted. Socrates, on the other hand, required that men should always be prepared to give a strict account of the end which they had in view, and of the means by which they hoped to gain it. Further, it had been customary to single out for exclusive attention that quality of an object by which the observer happened to be most strongly impressed, passing over all the others; the consequence of which was that the philosophers had taken a one-sided view of facts with the result of falling into hopeless disagreement among themselves; the Sophists had turned these contradictory points of view against one another, and thus effected their mutual destruction; while the dissolution of objective certainty had led to a corresponding dissolution of moral truth. Socrates accepts the Sophistic scepticism so far as it applies to the existing state of science, but does not push it to the same fatal conclusion; he grants that current beliefs should be thoroughly sifted and, if necessary, discarded, but only that more solid convictions may be substituted for them. Here a place is found for his method of self-examination, and for the self-conscious ignorance attributed to him by Plato. Comparing his notions on particular subjects with his idea of what knowledge in general ought to be, he finds that they do not satisfy it; he knows that he knows nothing. He then has recourse to other men who declare that they possess the knowledge of which he is in search, but their pretended certainty vanishes under the application of his dialectic test. This is the famous Socratic irony. Finally, he attempts to come at real knowledge, that is to say, the construction of definitions, by employing that inductive method with the invention of which he

---

quotes a passage from Aristeides the rhetor stating that all the companions of Socrates agreed about the Delphic oracle, and the Socratic disclaimer of knowledge. This, however, proves too much, for it shows that Aristeides quite overlooked the absence of any reference to either point in Xenophon, and therefore cannot be trusted to give an accurate report of the other authorities.

is credited by Aristotle. This method consists in bringing together a number of simple and familiar examples from common experience, generalizing from them, and correcting the generalizations by comparison with negative instances. The reasons that led Socrates to restrict his inquiries to human interests are rather lightly passed over by Zeller; he seems at a loss how to reconcile the alleged reform of scientific method with the complete abandonment of those physical investigations which, we are told, had suffered so severely from being cultivated on a different system.

There seem to be three principal points aimed at in the very ingenious theory which we have just endeavoured to summarize as adequately as space would permit. Zeller apparently wishes to bring Socrates into line with the great tradition of early Greek thought, to distinguish him markedly from the Sophists, and to trace back to his initiative the intellectual method of Plato and Aristotle. We cannot admit that the threefold attempt has succeeded. It seems to us that a picture into which so much Platonic colouring has been introduced would for that reason alone, and without any further objection, be open to very grave suspicion. But even accepting the historical accuracy of everything that Plato has said, or of as much as may be required, our critic's inferences are not justified by his authorities. Neither the Xenophontic nor the Platonic Socrates seeks knowledge for its own sake, nor does either of them offer a satisfactory definition of knowledge, or indeed any definition at all. Aristotle was the first to explain what science meant, and he did so, not by developing the Socratic notion but by incorporating it with the other methods independently struck out by physical philosophy. What would science be without the study of causation, and was not this ostentatiously neglected by the founder of conceptualism? Again, Plato, in the *Theætétus* makes his Socrates criticise various theories of knowledge, but does not even hint that the critic had himself a better theory than any of them in reserve. The author of the *Phædo* and the *Republic* was less interested in reforming the methods of scientific investigation than in directing research towards that which he believed to be alone worth knowing, the eternal ideas that underlie phenomena. The historical Socrates had no suspicion of transcendental realities; but he thought that a knowledge of physics was unattainable, and would be worthless if attained. By knowledge he meant art rather than science, and his method of defining was intended not for the latter but for the former. Those, he said, who can clearly express what they want to do are best secured against failure, and best able to communicate their skill to others. He made out that the various virtues were different kinds of knowledge, not from any extraordinary opinion of its

preciousness, but because he thought that knowledge was the variable element in volition and that everything else was constant. Zeller dwells strongly on the Socratic identification of cognition with conduct, but how could any one who fell at the first step into such a confusion of ideas be fitted either to explain what science meant or to come forward as the reformer of its methods? Nor is it correct to say that Socrates approached an object from every point of view, and took note of all its characteristic qualities. On the contrary, one would be inclined to charge him with the opposite tendency, with fixing his gaze too exclusively on some one quality which to him, as a teacher, was the most interesting. His identification of virtue with knowledge is an excellent instance of this habit. So also is his identification of beauty with serviceableness, and his general disposition to judge of everything by a rather narrow standard of utility. On the other hand Greek, physical speculation would have gained nothing by a minute attention to definitions, and most probably would have been mischievously hampered by it. Aristotle at any rate prefers the method of Democritus to the method of Plato, and Aristotle himself is much nearer the truth when he follows on the Ionian or Sicilian track than when he attempts to define what in the then existing state of knowledge could not be satisfactorily defined. To talk about the various elements—earth, air, fire, and water—as things with which everybody was already familiar, may have been a crude unscientific procedure; to analyze them into different combinations of the hot and the cold, the light and the heavy, the dry and the moist, was not only erroneous but fatally misleading; it was arresting inquiry and doing precisely what the Sophists had been accused of doing, that is substituting the conceit for the reality of wisdom. It was no doubt necessary that mathematical terms should be defined; but where are we told that geometers had to learn this truth from Socrates? The sciences of quantity, which could hardly have advanced a step without the help of exact conceptions, were successfully cultivated before he was born, and his influence was used to discourage rather than to promote their accurate study. With regard to the comprehensive all-sided examination of objects, on which Zeller lays so much stress, and which he seems to regard as something peculiar to the conceptual method, it had unquestionably been neglected by Parmenides and Heraclitus; but had not the deficiency been already made good by their immediate successors? What else is the philosophy of Empedocles, the Atomists, and Anaxagoras than an attempt—we must add, a by no means unsuccessful attempt—to recombine the opposing aspects of Nature that had been too exclusively insisted on at Ephesus and Elea? Again, to say that the Sophists had destroyed physical speculation by setting these partial aspects of truth against one another is, in



our opinion, equally erroneous. First of all, Zeller here falls into the old mistake, long ago corrected by Grote, of treating the class in question as if they all held similar views. We have shown on a former occasion,\* if, indeed, it required to be shown, that the Sophists were divided into two principal schools, of which one was devoted to the cultivation of physics. Protagoras and Gorgias were the only sceptics, and it was not by setting one theory against another, but by working out a single theory to its last consequences, that their scepticism was reached; with no more effect, be it observed, than was exercised by Pyrrho on the science of his day. For the two great thinkers, with the aid of whose conclusions it was attempted to discredit objective reality, were already left far behind at the close of the fifth century, and neither their reasonings, nor reasonings based on theirs, could exercise much influence on a generation that had Anaxagoras on Nature and the cyclopædia of Democritus in its hands. There was, however, one critic who really did what the Sophists are charged with doing; who derided and denounced physical science on the ground that its professors were hopelessly at issue with one another; and this critic was no other than Socrates himself. He maintained, on purely popular and superficial grounds, the same sceptical attitude to which Protagoras gave at least the semblance of a psychological justification. And he wished that attention should be concentrated on the very subjects that Protagoras undertook to teach—namely, ethics, politics, and dialectics. Once more, to say that Socrates was conscious of not coming up to his own standard of true knowledge is quite inconsistent with Xenophon's account, where he is represented as quite ready to answer every question put to him, and to offer a definition of everything that he considered worth defining. His scepticism, if it ever existed, was as artificial and short-lived as the scepticism of Descartes.

The truth is that no man who philosophized at all was ever more free from tormenting doubts and self-questionings; no man was ever more thoroughly satisfied with himself than Socrates. Let us add that, from a Hellenic point of view, no man had ever more reason for self-satisfaction. None, he observed in his last days, had ever lived a better or a happier life. Naturally possessed of a splendid constitution, he had so strengthened it by habitual moderation and constant training that up to the hour of his death, at the age of seventy, he enjoyed perfect bodily and mental health. Neither hardship nor exposure, neither abstinence nor indulgence in what to other men would have been excess, could make any impression on that adamant frame. We know not how much truth there may be in the story that, at

---

\* WESTMINSTER REVIEW for April, 1880. Art. "The Greek Humanists."

one time, he was remarkable for the violence of his passions; at any rate when our principal informants knew him he was conspicuous for the ease with which he resisted temptation, and for the imperturbable sweetness of his temper. His wants, being systematically reduced to a minimum, were easily satisfied, and his cheerfulness never failed. He enjoyed Athenian society so much that nothing but military duty could draw him away from it. For Socrates was a veteran who had served through three arduous campaigns, and could give lectures on the duties of a general, which so high an authority as Xenophon thought worth reporting. He seems to have been on excellent terms with his fellow-citizens, never having been engaged in a lawsuit, either as plaintiff or defendant, until the fatal prosecution which brought his career to a close. He could, on that occasion, refuse to prepare a defence, proudly observing that his whole life had been a preparation, that no man had ever seen him commit an unjust or impious deed. The anguished cries of doubt uttered by Italian and Sicilian thinkers could have no meaning for one who, on principle, abstained from ontological speculations; the uncertainty of human destiny that hung like a thunder-cloud over Pindar and the tragic poets had melted away under the sunshine of arguments that demonstrated, to his satisfaction, the reality and beneficence of a supernatural Providence. For he believed that the gods would afford guidance in doubtful conjunctures to all who approached their oracles in a reverent spirit; while, over and above the Divine counsels accessible to all men, he was personally attended, by an oracular voice, a mysterious monitor, which told him what to avoid though not what to do, a circumstance well worthy of note, for it shows that he did not, like Plato, attribute every kind of right action to divine inspiration. It may be said that all this only proves Socrates to have been, in his own estimation, a good and happy, but not necessarily, a wise man. With him, however, the last of these conditions was inseparable from the other two. He was prepared to demonstrate, step by step, that his conduct was regulated by fixed and ascertainable principles, and was of the kind best adapted to secure happiness both for himself and for others. That there were deficiencies in his ethical theory may readily be admitted. The idea of universal beneficence seems never to have dawned on his horizon; and chastity was to him what sobriety is to us mainly a self-regarding virtue. We do not find that he ever recommended conjugal fidelity to husbands; he regarded prostitution very much as it is still, unhappily, regarded by men of the world among ourselves; and in opposing the darker vices of his countrymen it was rather the excess than the perversion of appetite that he condemned. These, however, are points which do not interfere with our general contention that Socrates adopted the ethical

standard of his time, that he adopted it on rational grounds, that having adopted he acted up to it, and that in so reasoning and acting he satisfied his own ideal of absolute wisdom. Even as regards physical phenomena Socrates, so far from professing complete ignorance, held a very positive theory which he was quite ready to share with his friends. He taught what is called the doctrine of final causes, and, so far as our knowledge goes, he was either the first to teach it, or, at any rate, the first to prove the existence of divine agencies by its means. The old poets had occasionally attributed the origin of man and other animals to supernatural intelligence, but apparently without being led to their conviction by any evidence of design displayed in the structure of organized creatures. Socrates, on the other hand, went through the various external organs of the human body with great minuteness, and showed, to his own satisfaction, that they evinced the workings of a wise and beneficent Artist. We shall have more to say further on about this whole argument; here we only wish to observe that intrinsically it does not differ very much from the speculations which its author derided as the fruit of an impertinent curiosity; and that no one who now employed it would be called an Agnostic or a sceptic for a single moment.

Must we, then, conclude that Socrates was, after all, nothing but a sort of glorified Greek Paley, whose principal achievement was to present the popular ideas of his time on morals and politics under the form of a rather grovelling utilitarianism, and whose "evidences of natural and revealed religion" bore much the same relation to Greek mythology as the corresponding lucubrations of the worthy archdeacon bore to Christian theology? Even were this the whole truth it should be remembered that there was an interval of twenty-three centuries between the two teachers, which ought to be taken due account of in estimating their relative importance. Socrates, with his closely-reasoned, vividly-illustrated ethical expositions, had gained a tactical advantage over the vague declamations of Gnomie poetry and the isolated aphorisms of the Seven Sages comparable to that possessed by Xenophon and his Ten Thousand in dealing with the unwieldy masses of Persian infantry and the undisciplined mountaineers of Carduchia; while his idea of a uniformly beneficent Creator marked a still greater advance on the jealous divinities of Herodotus. On the other hand, as against Hume and Bentham, Paley's pseudo-scientific paraphernalia could effect no more than the muskets and cannon of an Asiatic army against the English conquerors of India. Yet had Socrates done no more than contributed to philosophy the idea just alluded to his place in the evolution of thought, though honourable, would not have been what it is justly held to be—unique.

So far we have been occupied in disputing the views of others;

it is now time that our own view should be stated. We maintain then, that Socrates first brought out the idea, not of knowledge, but of mind in its full significance; that he first studied the whole circle of human interests as affected by mind; that in creating dialectics he gave this study its proper method, and simultaneously gave his method the only subject-matter on which it could be profitably exercised; finally, that by these immortal achievements philosophy was constituted, and received a threefold verification—first, from the life of its founder; secondly, from the success with which his spirit was communicated to a band of followers; thirdly, from the whole subsequent history of thought. Before substantiating these assertions, point by point, it will be expedient to glance at the external influences that may be supposed to have moulded the great intellect and the great character now under consideration.

Socrates was, before all things, an Athenian. To understand him we must first understand what the Athenian character was in itself and independently of disturbing circumstances. Our estimate of that character is too apt to be biased by the totally exceptional position occupied by Athens during the fifth century B.C. The possession of empire developed qualities in her children which they had not exhibited at an earlier period, and ceased to exhibit when empire had been lost. Among these must be reckoned military genius, an adventurous and romantic spirit, and a high capacity for political and artistic production—qualities displayed, it is true, by every Greek race, but by some for a longer, and by others for a shorter period. Now the tradition of greatness does not seem to have gone very far back with Athens. Her legendary history, what we have of it, is singularly unexciting. The same rather monotonous though edifying story of shelter accorded to persecuted fugitives, of successful resistance to foreign invasions and of devoted self-sacrifice to the State meets us again and again. The Attic drama itself shows how much more stirring was the legendary lore of other tribes. One need only look at the few remaining pieces that treat of patriotic subjects to appreciate the difference; and an English reader may easily convince himself of it by comparing Mr. Swinburne's *Erechtheus* with the same author's *Atalanta*. There is a want of vivid individuality perceptible all through. Even Theseus, the great national hero, strikes one as a rather tame sort of personage compared with Perseus Heracles and Jason. No Athenian figures prominently in the *Iliad*; and on the only two occasions when Pindar was employed to commemorate an Athenian victory at the Panhellenic games he seems unable to associate it with any legendary glories in the past. The circumstances that for a long time made Attic history so barren of incident are the same to which its subsequent importance is due.

The relation in which Attica stood to the rest of Greece was somewhat similar to the relation in which Tuscany, long afterwards, stood to the rest of Italy. It was the region least disturbed by foreign immigration, and therefore became the seat of a slower but steadier mental development. It was among those to whom war, revolution, colonization and commerce brought the most many-sided experience that intellectual activity was most speedily ripened. Literature, art, and science were cultivated with extraordinary success by the Greek cities of Asia Minor, and even in some parts of the old country before Athens had a single man of genius except Solon to boast of. But along with the enjoyment of undisturbed tranquillity, habits of self-government, orderliness and reasonable reflection were establishing themselves, which finally enabled her to inherit all that her predecessors in the race had accomplished; and to add what alone they still wanted, the crowning consecration of self-conscious mind. There had, simultaneously, been growing up an intensely patriotic sentiment, due, in part, to the long-continued independence of Attica; in part, also, we may suppose, to the union, at a very early period, of her different townships into a single city. The same causes had, however, also favoured a certain love of comfort, a jovial pleasure-seeking disposition often degenerating into coarse sensuality, a thriftiness, and an inclination to grasp at any source of profit, coupled with extreme credulity where hopes of profit were excited, together forming an element of prose-comedy that mingles strangely with the tragic grandeur of Athens in her imperial age, and emerges into greater prominence after her fall, until it becomes the predominant characteristic of her later days. It is, we may observe, the contrast between these two aspects of Athenian life that gives the plays of Aristophanes their unparalleled comic effect, and it is their very awkward conjunction that makes Euripides so unequal and disappointing a poet. We find, then, that the original Athenian character is marked by reasonable reflection, by patriotism, and by a tendency towards self-seeking materialism. Let us take note of these three qualities, for we shall meet with them again in the philosophy of Socrates.

Empire, when it came to Athens, came almost unsought. The Persian invasions had made her a great naval power; the free choice of her allies placed her at the head of a great maritime confederacy. The sudden command of vast resources and the tension accumulated during ages of repose, stimulated all her faculties into preternatural activity. Her spirit was steeled almost to the Dorian temper, and entered into victorious rivalry with the Dorian Muse. Not only did her fleet sweep the sea, but her army, for once, defeated Theban Hoplites in the field. The grand choral harmonies of Sicilian song, the Sicyonian re-

citals of epic adventure were rolled back into a framework for the spectacle of individual souls meeting one another in argument, expostulation, entreaty and defiance; a nobler Doric edifice rose to confront the Æginetan temple of Athênê; the strained energy of Æginetan combatants was relaxed into attitudes of reposing power, and the eternal smile on their faces was deepened into the stillness of unfathomable thought. Only the true fire of a warrior race was wanting and the illimitable aspirations that nothing earthly can content. To the violet-crowned city Athênê was a giver of wealth and wisdom rather than of prowess; her empire rested on the contributions of unwilling allies and on a technical proficiency which others were sure to equal in time; so that the Corinthian orators could say with justice that Athenian skill was more easily acquired than Dorian valour. At once receptive and communicative, Athens absorbed all that Greece could teach her and then returned it in a more elaborate form, but without the freshness of its earliest inspiration. Yet there was one field that still afforded scope for creative originality. Habits of analysis, though fatal to spontaneous production, were favourable, or rather were necessary, to the growth of a new philosophy. After the exhaustion of every limited idealism, there remained that highest idealization which is the reduction of all past experience to a method available for the guidance of all future action. To accomplish this last enterprise it was necessary that a single individual should gather up in himself the spirit diffused through a whole people, bestowing on it by that very concentration the capability of an infinitely wider extension when its provisional representative should have passed away from the scene.

Socrates represents the popular Athenian character much as Richardson, in a different sphere, represents the English middle-class character, represents it, that is to say, elevated into transcendent genius. Except this elevation there was nothing anomalous about him. If he was exclusively critical, rationalizing, unadventurous, prosaic, in a word, as the German historians say, something of a Philistine, so we may suspect were the mass of his countrymen. His illustrations were taken from such plebeian employments as cattle-breeding, cobbling, weaving, and sailing. These were his "touches of things common" that at last "rose to touch the spheres." He both practised and inculcated virtues, the value of which is especially evident in humble life—frugality and endurance. But he also represents the Dêmos in its sovereign capacity as legislator and judge. Without aspiring to be an orator or statesman, he reserves the ultimate power of arbitration and election. He submits candidates for office to a severe scrutiny, and demands from all men an even stricter

account of their lives than retiring magistrates had to give of their conduct, when in power, to the people. He applies the judicial method of cross-examination to the detection of error, and the parliamentary method of joint deliberation\* to the discovery of truth. He follows out the democratic principles of free speech and self-government by submitting every question that arises to public discussion, and insisting on no conclusion that does not command the willing assent of his audience. Finally, his conversation, popular in form, was popular also in this respect, that everybody who chose to listen might have the benefit of it gratuitously. Here we have a great change from the scornful dogmatism of Heraclitus, and the virtually oligarchic exclusiveness of the teachers who demanded high fees for their instruction.

To be free and to rule over freemen were, with Socrates, as with every Athenian, the goals of ambition, only his freedom meant absolute immunity from the control of passion or habit; government meant superior knowledge, and government of freemen meant the power of producing intellectual conviction. In his eyes the possessor of any art was, so far, a ruler, and the only true ruler, being obeyed under severe penalties by all who stood in need of his skill. But the royal art which he himself exercised without expressly laying claim to it, was that which assigns its proper sphere to every other art, and provides each individual with the employment that his peculiar faculties demand. This is Athenian liberty and Athenian imperialism carried into education, but so idealized and purified that they can hardly be recognised at first sight.

The philosophy of Socrates is more obviously related to the practical and religious tendencies of his countrymen. Neither he nor they had any sympathy with the cosmological speculations that seemed to be unconnected with human interests, and to trench on matters beyond the reach of human knowledge. The old Attic sentiment was averse from adventures of any kind, whether political or intellectual. Yet the new spirit of inquiry awakened by Ionian thought could not fail to react powerfully on the most intelligent man among the most intelligent people of Hellas. Above all, one paramount idea which went beyond the confines of the old philosophy had been evolved by the differentiation of knowledge from its object, and had been presented, although under a materializing form, by Anaxagoras to the Athenian public. Socrates took up this idea, which expressed what was highest and most distinctive in the national character, and applied it to the development of ethical speculation. We have seen, in a former Article,\* how an attempt was made

to base moral truth on the results of natural philosophy was combated by the Humanistic school. It could not be doubtful which side Socrates would take in this controversy. That he paid any attention to the teaching of Protagoras and Gorgias is indeed highly problematic, for their names are never mentioned by Xenophon, and the Platonic dialogues in which they figure are evidently fictitious. Nevertheless, he had to a certain extent arrived at the same conclusion with them, although by a different path. He was opposed on religious grounds to the theories that an acute psychological analysis had led them to reject. Accordingly, the idea of Nature is almost entirely absent from his conversation, and, like Protagoras, he is guided solely by regard for human interests. To the objection that positive laws were always changing, he victoriously replied that it was because they were undergoing an incessant adaptation to varying needs. Like Protagoras, again, he was a habitual student of old Greek literature, and sedulously sought out the practical lessons in which it abounded. To him, as to the early poets and sages, *Sôphrosynê*, or self-knowledge and self-command taken together, was the first and most necessary of all virtues. Unlike them, however, he does not simply accept it from tradition, but gives it a philosophical foundation—the newly-established distinction between mind and body; a distinction not to be confounded with the old Psychism, although Plato, for his reforming purposes, shortly afterwards linked the two together. The disembodied spirit of mythology was a mere shadow or memory, equally destitute of solidity and of understanding; with Socrates, mind meant the personal consciousness that retains its continuous identity through every change, and as against every passing impulse. Like the Humanists, he made it the seat of knowledge—more than the Humanists, he gave it the control of appetite. In other words, he adds the idea of will to that of intellect; but instead of treating them as distinct faculties or functions, he absolutely identifies them. Mind having come to be first recognised as a knowing power, carried over its association with knowledge into the volitional sphere, and the two were first disentangled by Aristotle, though very imperfectly even by him. Yet no thinker helped so much to make the confusion apparent as the one to whom it was due. Socrates deliberately insisted that those who knew the good must necessarily be good themselves. He taught that every virtue was a science; courage, for example, was a knowledge of the things that should or should not be feared; temperance, a knowledge of what should or should not be desired, and so forth. Such an account of virtue would, perhaps, be sufficient if all men did what, in their opinion, they ought to do; and, however strange it may seem, Socrates assumed that



this actually was the case. The paradox, even if accepted at the moment by his youthful friends, was sure to be rejected, on examination, by cooler heads, and its rejection would prove that the whole doctrine was essentially unsound. Various causes prevented Socrates from perceiving what seemed so clear to duller intelligences than his. First of all he did not separate duty from personal interest. A true Athenian, he recommended temperance and righteousness very largely, on account of the material advantages they secured. That the agreeable and the honourable, the expedient and the just, frequently came into collision, was at that time a rhetorical commonplace, and it might be supposed that, if they were shown to coincide, no motive to misconduct but ignorance could exist. Then, again, being accustomed to compare conduct of every kind with the practice of such arts as flute-playing, he had come to take knowledge in a rather extended sense, just as we do when we say, indifferently, that a man knows geometry and that he knows how to draw. Aristotle himself did not see more clearly than Socrates that moral habits are only to be acquired by incessant practice, only the earlier thinker would have observed that knowledge of every kind is gained by the same laborious repetition of particular actions. To the obvious objection that, in this case, morality cannot, like theoretical truth, be imparted by the teacher to his pupils, but must be won by the learner for himself, he would probably have replied, that all truth is really evolved by the mind from itself, and that he for that very reason disclaimed the name of a teacher, and limited himself to the seemingly humbler task of awakening dormant capacities in others.

An additional influence, not the less potent because unacknowledged, was the same craving for a principle of unity that had impelled early Greek thought to seek for the sole substance or cause of physical phenomena in some single material element, whether water, air, or fire; and just as these various principles were finally decomposed into the multitudinous atoms of Leucippus, so also, but much more speedily, did the general principle of knowledge tend to decompose itself into innumerable cognitions of the partial ends or utilities which action was directed to achieve. Again, the need of a comprehensive generalization made itself felt, and all-good was summed up under the head of happiness. The same difficulties recurred under another form. To define happiness proved not less difficult than to define use or practical knowledge. Three points of view offered themselves, and all three had been more or less anticipated by Socrates. Happiness might mean pleasure of every kind, or the exclusive cultivation of man's higher nature, or voluntary subordination to a larger whole. The founder of Athenian philosophy used to present each of these, in turn, as an end, without recognising the

possibility of a conflict between them ; and it certainly would be a mistake to represent them as constantly opposed. Yet a truly scientific principle must either prove their identity, or make its choice among them, or discover something better. Plato seems to have taken up the three methods, one after the other, without coming to any very satisfactory conclusion. Aristotle identified the first two, but failed, or rather did not attempt to harmonize them with the third. Succeeding schools tried various combinations, laying more or less stress on different principles at different periods, till the will of an Omnipotent Creator was substituted for every human standard. With the decline of dogmatic theology we have seen them all come to life again, and the old battle is still being fought out under our eyes. Speaking broadly, it may be said that the method which we have placed first on the list is more particularly represented in England, the second in France, and the last in Germany. Yet they refuse to be separated by any rigid line of demarcation, and each tends either to combine with or to pass into one or both of the rival theories. Modern utilitarianism, as constituted by John Stuart Mill, although avowedly based on the paramount value of pleasure, in admitting qualitative differences among enjoyments, and in subordinating individual to social good, introduce principles of action that are not, properly speaking, Hedonistic. Neither is the idea of the whole by any means free from ambiguity. We have party, church, nation, order, progress, race, humanity, and the sum total of sensitive beings, all putting in their claims to figure as that entity. Where the pursuit of any single end gives rise to conflicting pretensions, a wise man will check them by reference to the other accredited standards, and will cherish a not unreasonable expectation that the evolution of life is tending to bring them all into ultimate agreement.

Returning to Socrates, we must further note that his identification of virtue with science, though it does not express the whole truth, expresses a considerable part of it, especially if we remember that to him conduct meant not three-fourths but the whole of life. Only those who believe in the existence of intuitive and infallible moral perceptions can consistently maintain that nothing is easier than to know our duty, and nothing harder than to do it. Even then the intuitions must extend beyond general principles, and also inform us how and where to apply them. That no such inward illumination exists is sufficiently shown by experience ; so much so that the mischief done by foolish people with good intentions has become proverbial. Modern casuists have indeed drawn a distinction between the intention and the act, making us responsible for the purity of the former, not for the consequences of the latter. Though based on the Socratic division between mind and body, this distinction would not have commended itself to Socrates. His object was not to save souls from sin, but to

save individuals, families, and states from the ruin that ignorance of fact entails.

If we enlarge our point of view so as to cover the moral influence of knowledge on society taken collectively, its relative importance will be vastly increased. When Auguste Comte assigns the supreme direction of progress to advancing science, and when Buckle, following Fichte, makes the totality of human action depend on the totality of human knowledge, they are virtually attributing to intellectual education an even more decisive part than it played in the Socratic ethics. Even those who reject the theory, when pushed to such an extreme, will admit that the same quantity of self-devotion must produce a far greater effect when it is guided by deeper insight into the conditions of existence.

The same principle may be extended in a different direction if we substitute for knowledge, in its narrower significance, the more general conception of associated feeling. We shall then see that belief, habit, emotion, and instinct are only different stages of the same process—the process by which experience is organized and made subservient to vital activity. The simplest reflex and the highest intellectual conviction are alike based on sensori-motor mechanism, and so far differ only through the relative complexity and instability of the nervous connections involved. Knowledge is life in the making, and when it fails to control practice fails only by coming into conflict with passion—that is to say, with the consolidated results of an earlier experience. Physiology offers another analogy to the Socratic method that must not be overlooked. Socrates recommended the formation of definite conceptions because, among other advantages, they facilitated the diffusion of useful knowledge. So, also, the organized associations of feelings are not only serviceable to individuals, but may be transmitted to offspring with a regularity proportioned to their definiteness. How naturally these deductions follow from the doctrine under consideration is evident from their having been, to a certain extent, already drawn by Plato. His plan for the systematic education of feeling under scientific supervision answers to the first; his plan for breeding an improved race of citizens by placing marriage under State control answers to the second. Yet it is doubtful whether Plato's predecessor would have sanctioned any scheme tending to substitute an external compulsion, whether felt or not, for freedom and individual initiative, and a blind instinct for the self-consciousness that can give an account of its procedure at every step. He would bring us back from social physics and physiology to psychology, and from psychology to dialectic philosophy.

To Socrates himself the strongest reason for believing in the identity of conviction and practice was, perhaps, that he had made it a living reality. With him to know the right and to do it were

the same. In this sense we have already said that his life was the first verification of his philosophy. And just as the results of ethical teaching can only be ideally separated from their application to his conduct, so also these results themselves cannot be kept apart from the method by which they were reached; nor is the process by which he reached them for himself distinguishable from the process by which he communicated them to his friends. In touching on this point we touch on that which is greatest and most distinctively original in the Socratic system, or rather in the Socratic impulse to systematization of every kind. What it was will be made clearer by reverting to the central conception of mind. With Protagoras mind meant an ever-changing stream of feeling; with Gorgias it was a principle of hopeless isolation, an interchange of thoughts between one consciousness and another, by means of signs, being an illusion. Socrates, on the contrary, attributed to it a steadfast control over passion, and a unifying function in society through its essentially synthetic activity, its need of co-operation and responsive assurance. He saw that the reason which overcomes animal desire tends to draw men together just as sensuality tends to drive them into hostile collision. If he recommended temperance on account of the increased egoistic pleasure that it secures, he recommended it also as making the individual a more efficient instrument for serving the community. If he inculcated obedience to the established laws it was no doubt partly on grounds of enlightened self-interest, but also because union and harmony among citizens were thereby secured. And if he insisted on the necessity of forming definite conceptions it was with the same twofold reference to personal and public advantage. Along with the diffusive social character of mind he recognised its essential spontaneity. In a commonwealth where all citizens were free and equal there must also be freedom and equality of reason. Having worked out a theory of life for himself he desired that all other men should so far as possible pass through the same bracing discipline. Here we have the secret of his famous erotetic method. He did not, like the Sophists, give continuous lectures, nor profess, like some of them, to answer every question that might be put to him. On the contrary, he put a series of questions to all who came in his way, generally in the form of an alternative, one side of which seemed self-evidently true and the other self-evidently false, arranged so as to lead the respondent on, step by step, to the conclusion which it was desired that he should accept. Socrates did not invent this method. It had long been practised in the Athenian law-courts as a means for extracting from the opposite party admissions that could not be otherwise obtained, whence it had passed into the tragic drama, and into the discussion of philosophical problems. Nowhere else was the analytical power of

Greek thought so brilliantly displayed; for before a contested proposition could be subjected to this mode of treatment it had to be carefully discriminated from confusing adjuncts, considered under all the various meanings that it might possibly be made to bear, subdivided, if it was complex, into two or more distinct assertions, and linked by a minute chain of demonstration to the admission by which its validity was established or overthrown.

Socrates, then, did not create the cross-examining elenchus, but he introduced into it two very important modifications. So far as we can make out, it had hitherto been only used (again, after the example of the law-courts) for the purpose of detecting errors or intentional deceit. He made it an instrument for introducing his own convictions into the minds of others, but so that his interlocutors seemed to be discovering them for themselves, and were certainly learning how in their turn to practice the same didactic interrogation on a future occasion. Of course Socrates also employed the erotetic method as a means of confutation, and, in his hands, it powerfully illustrated what we have called in a former Paper the negative moment of Greek thought.\* To prepare the ground for new truth it was necessary to clear away the misconceptions that were likely to interfere with its acceptance; or, if Socrates himself had nothing to impart, he could at any rate purge away the false conceit of knowledge from unformed minds, and hold them back from attempting difficult tasks until they were properly qualified for the undertaking. For example, a certain Glauco, a brother of Plato, had attempted to address the public assembly, when not yet twenty years of age, and naturally quite unfitted for the task. At Athens, where every citizen had a voice in his country's affairs, obstruction, whether intentional or not, was very summarily dealt with. Speakers who had nothing to say that was worth hearing were forcibly removed from the bema by the police, and this fate had already more than once befallen the youthful orator, much to the annoyance of his friends, who could not prevail on him to refrain from repeating the experiment, when Socrates took the matter in hand. One or two adroit compliments on his ambition drew Glauco into a conversation with the veteran dialectician on the aims and duties of a statesman. It was agreed that his first object should be to benefit the country, and that a good way of achieving this end would be to increase its wealth; which again could be done either by augmenting the receipts or by diminishing the expenditure. Could Glauco tell what was the present revenue of Athens, and whence it was derived? No; he had not studied that question.

---

\* See WESTMINSTER REVIEW for January, 1880. Art. "Early Greek Thought."

—Well then, perhaps, he had some useful retrenchments to propose.—No ; he had not studied that either. But the State might, he thought, be enriched at the expense of its enemies.—A good idea, if we can be sure of beating them first ! Only to avoid the risk of attacking somebody who is stronger than ourselves, we must know what are the enemy's military resources as compared with our own. To begin with the latter : Can Glauco tell how many ships and soldiers Athens has at her disposal ?—No, he does not at this moment remember.—Then, perhaps, he has it all written down somewhere ?—He must confess not. So the conversation goes on until Socrates has convicted his ambitious young friend of possessing no accurate information whatever about political questions. Xenophon has recorded another dialogue in which a young man, named Euthydêmus, who was also in training for a statesman, and who, as he supposed, had learned a great deal more out of books than Socrates could teach him, is brought to see how little he knows about ethical science. He is asked, Can a man be a good citizen without being just ? No, he cannot.—Can Euthydêmus tell what acts are just ? Yes, certainly, and also what are unjust.—Under which head does he put such actions as lying, deceiving, harming, enslaving ? Under the head of injustice.—But suppose a hostile people are treated in the various manners specified, is that unjust ? No, but it was understood that only one's friends were meant.—Well, if a general encourages his own army by false statements, or a father deceives his child into taking medicine, or your friend seems likely to commit suicide, and you purloin a deadly weapon from him, is that unjust ? No, we must add "for the purpose of harming" to our definition. Socrates, however, does not stop here, but goes on cross-examining until the unhappy student is reduced to a state of hopeless bewilderment and shame. He is then brought to perceive the necessity of self-knowledge, which is explained to mean knowledge of one's own powers. As a further exercise Euthydêmus is put through his facings on the subject of good and evil. Health, wealth, strength, wisdom, and beauty are mentioned as unquestionable goods. Socrates shows, in the style long afterwards imitated by Juvenal, that they are only means towards an end, and may be productive of harm no less than good.—Happiness at any rate is an unquestionable good. Yes, unless we make it consist of questionable goods like those just enumerated.

It is in this last conversation that the historical Socrates most nearly resembles the Socrates of Plato's *Apologia*. Instead, however, of leaving Euthydêmus to the consciousness of his ignorance, as the latter would have done, he proceeds, in Xenophon's account, to direct the young man's studies according to the

simplest and clearest principles ; and we have another conversation where religious truths are instilled by the same catechetical process. Here the erotetic method is evidently a mere didactic artifice, and Socrates could easily have written out his lesson under the form of a regular demonstration. But there is little doubt that in other cases he used it as a means for giving increased precision to his own ideas, and also for testing their validity, that, in a word, the habit of oral communication gave him a familiarity with logical processes which could not otherwise have been acquired. The same cross-examination that acted as a spur on the mind of the respondent, reacted as a bridle on the mind of the interrogator, obliging him to make sure beforehand of every assertion that he put forward, to study the mutual bearings of his beliefs, to analyze them into their component elements, and to examine the relation in which they collectively stood to the opinions generally accepted. It has already been stated that Socrates introduced two modifications into the erotetic method ; we now see in what direction they tended. He made it a vehicle for positive instruction, and he also made it an instrument for self-discipline, a help to fulfilling the Delphic precept, "Know thyself." The second application was even more important than the first. With us literary training—that is, the practice of continuous reading and composition—is so widely diffused, that conversation has become rather a hindrance than a help to the cultivation of argumentative ability. The reverse was true when Socrates lived. Long familiarity with debate was unfavourable to the art of writing ; and the speeches in Thucydides show how difficult it was still found to present close reasoning under the form of an uninterrupted exposition. The traditions of conversational thrust and parry survived in rhetorical prose ; and the crossed swords of tongue-fence were represented by the bristling *chevaux de frise* of a laboured antithetical arrangement where every clause received new strength and point from contrast with its opposing neighbour.

By combining the various considerations here suggested we shall arrive at a clearer understanding of the sceptical attitude commonly attributed to Socrates. There is, first of all, the negative and critical function exercised by him in common with many other constructive thinkers, and intimately associated with a fundamental law of Greek thought. Then there is the Attic courtesy and democratic spirit leading him to avoid any assumption of superiority over those whose opinions he is examining. And, lastly, there is the profound feeling that truth is a common possession, which no individual can appropriate as his peculiar privilege, because it can only be discovered, tested, and preserved by the united efforts of all.

Thus, then, the Socratic dialogue has a double aspect. It is, like all philosophy, a perpetual carrying of life into ideas, and ideas into life. Life is raised to a higher level by thought; thought, when brought into contact with life, gains movement and growth, assimilative and reproductive power. If action is to be harmonized we must regulate it by universal principles; if our principles are to be efficacious they must be adopted; if they are to be adopted we must demonstrate to the satisfaction of our contemporaries. Language, consisting as it does almost entirely of abstract terms, furnishes the materials out of which alone such an ideal union can be framed. But men do not always use the same words, least of all, if they are abstract words, in the same sense, and therefore a preliminary agreement must be arrived at in this respect; a fact which Socrates was the first to recognise. Aristotle tells us that he introduced the custom of constructing general definitions into philosophy. The need of accurate verbal explanations is more felt in the discussion of ethical problems than anywhere else, if we take ethics in the only sense that Socrates would have accepted, as covering the whole field of mental activity. It is true that definitions are also employed in the mathematical and physical sciences, but there they are accompanied by illustrations borrowed from sensible experience, and would be unintelligible without them. Hence it has been possible for those branches of knowledge to make enormous progress, while the elementary notions on which they rest have not yet been satisfactorily analyzed. The case is entirely altered when mental dispositions have to be taken into account. Here abstract terms play much the same part as sensible intuitions elsewhere in steadying our conceptions, but without possessing the same invariable value, the experiences from which those conceptions are derived being exceedingly complex and, what is more, exceedingly liable to disturbance from unforeseen circumstances. Thus, by neglecting a series of minute changes the same name may come to denote groups of phenomena not agreeing in the qualities which alone it originally connoted. More than one example of such a gradual metamorphosis has already presented itself in the course of our investigation, and others will occur in the sequel. Where distinctions of right and wrong are involved it is of enormous practical importance that a definite meaning should be attached to words, and that they should not be allowed, at least without express agreement, to depart from the recognised acceptation: for such words, connoting as they do the approval or disapproval of mankind, exercise a powerful influence on conduct, so that their misapplication may lead to disastrous consequences. Where government by written law prevails the importance of defining ethical terms imme-



diately becomes obvious, for, otherwise, personal rule would be restored under the disguise of judicial interpretation. Roman jurisprudence was the first attempt on a great scale to introduce a rigorous system of definitions into legislation. We have seen, in a former Article,\* how it tended to put the conclusions of Greek naturalistic philosophy into practical shape. We now see how, on the formal side, its determinations are connected with the principles of Socrates. And we shall not under-value this obligation if we bear in mind that the accurate wording of legal enactments is not less important than the essential justice of their contents. Similarly, the development of Catholic theology required that its fundamental conceptions should be progressively defined. This alone preserved the intellectual character of Catholicism in ages of ignorance and superstition, and helped to keep alive the reason by which superstition was eventually overthrown. Mommsen has called theology the bastard child of Religion and Science. It is something that in the absence of the robust parent its features should be recalled and its tradition maintained even by an illegitimate offspring.

So far we have spoken as if the Socratic definitions were merely verbal; they were, however, a great deal more, and their author did not accurately discriminate between what at that stage of thought could not well be kept apart—explanations of words, practical reforms, and scientific generalizations. For example, in defining a ruler to be one who knew more than other men, he was departing from the common usages of language and showing not what was, but what ought to be true. And in defining virtue as wisdom, he was putting forward a new theory of his own instead of formulating the received connotation of a term. Still, after making every deduction, we cannot fail to perceive what an immense service was rendered to exact thought by introducing definitions of every kind into that department of inquiry where they were chiefly needed. We may observe also that a general law of Greek intelligence was here realizing itself in a new direction. The need of accurate determination had always been felt, but hitherto it had worked under the more elementary forms of time, space, and causality, or to employ the higher generalization of modern psychology, under the form of contiguous association. The earlier cosmologies were all processes of circumscription; they were attempts to fix the limits of the universe, and, accordingly, that element which was supposed to surround the others was also conceived as their producing cause, or else (in the theory of Heracleitus) as typifying the rationale of their continuous transformation. For this reason

Parmenides, when he identified existence with extension, found himself obliged to declare that extension was necessarily limited. Of all the physical thinkers Anaxagoras, who immediately precedes Socrates, approaches on the objective side most nearly to his standpoint. For the governing Nous brings order out of chaos by segregating the confused elements, by separating the unlike and drawing the like together, which is precisely what definition does for our conceptions. Meanwhile Greek literature had been performing the same task in a more restricted province, first fixing events according to their geographical and historical positions, then assigning to each its proper cause, then, as Thucydides does, isolating the most important groups of events from their external connections, and analyzing the causes of complex changes into different classes of antecedents. The final revolution effected by Socrates was to substitute arrangement by difference and resemblance for arrangement by contiguity in coexistence and succession. To say that by so doing he created science is inexact, for science requires to consider Nature under every aspect, including those which he systematically neglected; but we may say that he introduced the method which is most particularly applicable to mental phenomena, the method of ideal analysis, classification, and reasoning. For he observed that Socrates did not limit himself to searching for the One in the Many, he also, and perhaps more habitually, sought for the Many in the One. He would take hold of a conception and analyze it into its various notes, laying them, as it were, piecemeal before his interlocutor for separate acceptance or rejection. If, for example, they could not agree about the relative merits of two citizens, Socrates would decompose the character of a good citizen into its component parts and bring the comparison down to them. A good citizen, he would say, increases the national resources by his administration of the finances, defeats the enemy abroad, wins allies by his diplomacy, appeases dissension by his eloquence at home. When the shy and gifted Charmides shrank from addressing a public audience on public questions, Socrates strove to overcome his nervousness by mercilessly subdividing the august Ecclesia into its constituent classes. "Is it the fullers that you are afraid of?" he asked, "or the leather-cutters, or the masons, or the smiths, or the husbandmen, or the traders, or the lowest class of hucksters?"\* Here the analytical power of Greek thought is manifested with still more searching effect than when it was applied to space and motion by Zeno.

\* Xenophon, Mem. iii. 7. We may incidentally notice that this passage is well worthy the attention of those who look on the Athenian Dêmos as an idle and aristocratic body, supported by slave labour.

Nor did Socrates only consider the whole conception in relation to its parts, he also grouped conceptions together according to their genera and founded logical classification. To appreciate the bearing of this idea on human interests it will be enough to study the disposition of a code. We shall then see how much more easy it becomes to bring individual cases under a general rule, and to retain the whole body of rules in our memory, when we can pass step by step from the most universal to the most particular categories. Now it was by jurists versed in the Stoic philosophy that Roman law was codified, and it was by Stoicism that the traditions of Socratic philosophy were most faithfully preserved.

Logical division is, however, a process going deeper than any fixed and formal distribution of topics, nor yet is it equivalent to the arrangement of genera and species, according to their natural affinities as in the admirable systems of Jussieu and Cuvier. It is something much more flexible and subtle, a carrying down into the minutest detail of that psychological law which requires, as a condition of perfect consciousness, that feelings, conceptions, judgments, and, generally speaking, all mental modes should be apprehended together with their contradictory opposites. Heracleitus had a dim perception of this truth when he taught the identity of antithetical couples, and it is more or less vividly illustrated by all Greek classic literature after him; but Socrates seems to have been the first who transformed it from a law of existence into a law of cognition; with him knowledge and ignorance, reason and passion, freedom and slavery, virtue and vice, right and wrong (*πολλῶν ὀνομάτων μορφῇ μία*) were apprehended in inseparable connection, and were employed for mutual elucidation, not only in broad masses, but also through their last subdivisions, like the delicate adjustments of light and shade on a Venetian canvas. This method of classification by graduated descent and symmetrical contrast, like the whole dialectic system of which it forms a branch, is only suited to the mental phenomena for which it was originally devised; and Hegel committed a fatal error when he applied it to explain the order of external coexistence and succession. We have already touched on the essentially subjective character of the Socratic definition, and we shall presently have to make a similar restriction in dealing with Socratic induction. With regard to the question last considered, our limits will not permit us, nor, indeed, does it fall within the scope of our present study, to pursue a vein of reflection which was never fully worked out either by the Athenian philosophers or by their modern successors, at least not in its only legitimate direction.

After definition and division comes reasoning. We arrange

objects in classes, that by knowing one or some we may know all. Aristotle attributes to Socrates the first systematic employment of induction as well as of general definitions. Nevertheless, his method was not solely inductive, nor did it bear more than a distant resemblance to the induction of modern science. His principles were not gathered from the particular classes of phenomena which they determined, or were intended to determine, but from others of an analogous character which had already been reduced to order. Observing that all handicrafts were practised according to well-defined, intelligible rules, leading, so far as they went, to satisfactory results, he required that life in its entirety should be similarly systematized. This was not so much reasoning as a demand for the more extended application of reasoning. It was a truly philosophic postulate, for philosophy is not science, but precedes and underlies it. Belief and action tend to divide themselves into two provinces, of which the one is more or less organized, the other more or less chaotic. We philosophize when we try to bring the one into order, and also when we test the foundations on which the order of the other reposes, fighting both against incoherent mysticism and against traditional routine. Such is the purpose that the most distinguished thinkers of modern times—Francis Bacon, Spinoza, Hume, Kant, Auguste Comte, and Herbert Spencer, however widely they might otherwise differ—have, according to their respective lights, all set themselves to achieve. No doubt there is this vast difference between Socrates and his most recent successors that physical science is the great type of certainty, to the level of which they would raise all speculation, while with him it was the type of a delusion and an impossibility. The analogy of artistic production when applied to Nature led him off on a completely false track, the ascription to conscious design of that which is in truth a result of mechanical causation. But now that the relations between the known and the unknown have been completely transformed, there is no excuse for repeating the fallacies which imposed on his vigorous understanding; and the genuine spirit of Socrates is best represented by those who, starting like him from the data of experience, are led to adopt a diametrically opposite conclusion. We may add, that the Socratic method of analogical reasoning gave a retrospective justification to early Greek thought, of which Socrates was not himself aware. Its daring generalizations were really an inference from the known to the unknown. To interpret all physical processes in terms of matter and motion is only assuming that the changes to which our senses cannot penetrate are homogeneous with the changes which we can feel and see. When Socrates argued that because the human body is animated

by a consciousness, therefore that the material universe must be similarly animated, Democritus might have answered that the world presents no appearance of being organized like an animal. When he argued that because statues and pictures are known to be the work of intelligence, the living models from which they are copied must be similarly due to design, Aristodêmus should have answered, that the former are seen to be manufactured, while the others are seen to grow. It might also have been observed, that if our own intelligence requires to be accounted for by a cause like itself, so also does the creative cause, and so on through an infinite regress of antecedents. Teleology has been destroyed by the Darwinian theory; but before the "Origin of Species" appeared, the slightest scrutiny might have shown that it was a precarious foundation for religious belief. If many thoughtful men are now turning away from theism, "natural theology" may be thanked for the desertion. "I believe in God," says the German baron in "Thorndale," "until your philosophers demonstrate His existence." "And then?" asks a friend. "And then— I do not believe the demonstration."

Whatever may have been the errors into which Socrates fell he did not commit the fatal mistake of compromising his ethical doctrine by associating it indissolubly with his metaphysical opinions. Religion, with him, instead of being the source and sanction of all duty, simply brought in an additional duty—that of gratitude to the gods for their goodness. We shall presently see where he sought for the ultimate foundation of morality, after completing our survey of the dialectic method with which it was so closely connected. The induction of Socrates, when it went beyond that kind of analogical reasoning that we have just been considering, was mainly abstraction, the process by which he obtained those general conceptions or definitions which played so great a part in his philosophy. It was thus that on comparing the different virtues, as commonly distinguished, he found that they all agreed in requiring knowledge, which he accordingly concluded to be the essence of virtue. So other moralists have been led to conclude that right actions resemble one another in their felicific quality, and in that alone. Similarly, political economists find, or formerly found (for we do not wish to be positive on the matter), that a common characteristic of all industrial employments is the desire to secure the maximum of profit with the minimum of trouble. Another comparison shows that value depends on the relation between supply and demand. *Æsthetic* enjoyments of every kind resemble one another by including an element of ideal emotion. It is a common characteristic of all cognitions that they are constructed by association

out of elementary feelings. All societies are marked by a more or less developed division of labour. These are given as typical generalizations that have been reached by the Socratic method. They are all taken from the philosophic sciences—that is, the sciences dealing with phenomena that are partly determined by mind, and the systematic treatment of which is so similar that they are frequently studied in combination by a single thinker, and invariably so by the greatest thinkers of any. But were we to examine the history of the physical sciences, we should find that this method of wide comparison and rapid abstraction cannot, as Francis Bacon imagined, be successfully applied to them. The facts with which they deal are not transparent, not directly penetrable by thought; hence they must be treated deductively. Instead of a front attack, we must, so to speak, take them in the rear. Bacon never made a more unfortunate observation than when he said that the syllogism falls far short of the subtlety of Nature. Nature is even simpler than the syllogism, for she accomplishes her results by advancing from equation to equation. That which really does fall far short of her subtlety is precisely the Baconian induction with its superficial comparison of instances. No amount of observation could detect any resemblance between the bursting of a thunderstorm and the attraction of a loadstone, or between the burning of charcoal and the rusting of a nail.

But while philosophers cannot prescribe a method to physical science, they may to a certain extent bring it under their cognizance by disengaging its fundamental conceptions and assumptions, and showing that they are functions of mind; by arranging the special sciences in systematic order for purposes of study; and by investigating the law of their historical evolution. Furthermore, since psychology is the central science of philosophy, and since it is closely connected with physiology, which in turn reposes on the inorganic sciences, a certain knowledge of the objective world is indispensable to any knowledge of ourselves. Lastly, since the subjective sphere not only rests, once for all, on the objective, but is also in a continual state of action and reaction with it, no philosophy can be complete which does not take into account the constitution of things as they exist, independently of ourselves, in order to ascertain how far they are unalterable, and how far they may be modified to our advantage. We see, then, that Socrates, in restricting philosophy to human interests, was guided by a just tact; that in creating the method of dialectic abstraction, he created an instrument adequate to this investigation, but to this alone; and, finally, that human interests, understood in the largest sense, embrace a number of

subsidiary studies which either did not exist when he taught, or which the inevitable superstitions of his age would not allow him to pursue.

It remains to consider another aspect of the dialectic method first developed on a great scale by Plato, and first fully defined by Aristotle, but already playing a certain part in the Socratic teaching. This is the testing of common assumptions by pushing them to their logical conclusion, and rejecting those that lead to consequences inconsistent with themselves. So understood, dialectic means the complete elimination of inconsistency, and has ever since remained the most powerful weapon of philosophical criticism. To take an instance near at hand, it is constantly employed by thinkers so radically different as Mr. Herbert Spencer and Professor T. H. Green ; while it has been generalized into an objective law of Nature and history, with dazzling, though only momentary success, by Hegel and his school.

Consistency is, indeed, the one word which, better than any other, expresses the whole character of Socrates, and the whole of philosophy as well. Here the supreme conception of mind reappears under its most rigorous, but, at the same time, its most beneficent aspect. It is the temperance that no allurements can surprise ; the fortitude that no terror can break through ; the justice that eliminates all personal considerations, egoistic and altruistic alike ; the truthfulness that, with exactest harmony, fits words to meanings, meanings to thoughts, and thoughts to things ; the logic that will tolerate no self-contradiction ; the conviction that seeks for no acceptance unwon by reason ; the liberalism that works for equality by raising all men to a level with the highest ; the love that never changes, or doubts, or falters, because it has been originally won by the qualities to which alone an unalterable fidelity is due. It was the intellectual passion for consistency that made Socrates so great, and that fused his life into a flawless whole ; but it was an unconscious motive power, and therefore he attributed to mere knowledge what knowledge alone could not supply. A clear perception of right cannot by itself secure the obedience of our will. High principles are not of any value, except to those in whom a discrepancy between practice and profession produces the sharpest anguish of which their nature is capable ; a feeling like, though immeasurably stronger than that which women of exquisite sensibility experience when they see a candle set crooked or a table-cover awry. How moral laws have come to be established, and why they prescribe or prohibit certain classes of actions, are questions which still divide the schools, though with an increasing consensus of authority on the utilitarian side : their ultimate sanction—that which, whatever they are, makes obedience to them truly moral—can hardly be

sought elsewhere than in the same consciousness of logical stringency that determines, or should determine, our abstract beliefs.

Be this as it may, we venture to hope that a principle has been here suggested deep and strong enough to reunite the two halves into which historians have hitherto divided the Socratic system, or, rather, the beginning of that universal systematization called philosophy, which is not yet, and perhaps never will be, completed; a principle which is outwardly revealed in the character of the philosopher himself. With such an one, ethics and dialectics become almost undistinguishable through the similarity of their processes and the intermixture of their aims. Integrity of conviction enters, both as a means and as an element, into perfect integrity of conduct, nor can it be maintained where any other element of rectitude is wanting. Clearness, consecutiveness, and coherence are the morality of belief; while temperance, justice, and beneficence, taken in their widest sense and taken together, constitute the supreme logic of life.

It has already been observed that the thoughts of Socrates were thrown into shape for and by communication, that they only became definite when brought into vivifying contact with another intelligence. Such was especially the case with his method of ethical dialectic. Instead of tendering his advice in the form of a lecture, as other moralists have at all times been so fond of doing, he sought out some pre-existing sentiment or opinion, inconsistent with the conduct of which he disapproved, and then gradually worked round from point to point, until theory and practice were exhibited in immediate contrast. Here his reasoning, which is sometimes spoken of as exclusively inductive, was strictly syllogistic, being the application of a general law to a particular instance. With the growing emancipation of reason, we may observe a return to the Socratic method of moralization. Instead of rewards and punishments, which encourage selfish calculation, or examples, which stimulate a mischievous jealousy when they do not create a spirit of servile imitation, the judicious trainer will find his motive power in the pupil's incipient tendency to form moral judgments, which, when reflected on the individual's own actions, become what we call a conscience. It was mentioned on a former occasion, that the celebrated golden rule of justice was already enunciated by Greek moralists in the fourth century B.C.\* Possibly it may have been first formulated by Socrates. In all cases it occurs in the writings of his disciples, and happily expresses the drift of his entire philosophy. The generalizing *êthos* was, indeed, so natural to a noble Greek, that instances of it occur long before

---

\* WESTMINSTER REVIEW for April, 1880. Art. "The Greek Humanists."



philosophy began. We find it in the famous question of Achilles: "Did not this whole war begin on account of a woman? Are the Atreidæ the only men who love their wives?" and in the now not less famous apostrophe to Lycaon, reminding him that an early death is the lot of far worthier men than he—utterances which come on us with the awful effect of lightning flashes, that illuminate the whole horizon of existence while they paralyze or destroy an individual victim.

The power that Socrates possessed of rousing other minds to independent activity and apostolic transmission of spiritual gifts was, as we have said, the second verification of his doctrine. Even those who, like Antisthenes and Aristippus, derived their positive theories rather from the Sophists than from him, preferred to be regarded as his followers; and Plato, from whom his ideas received their most splendid development, has acknowledged the debt by making that venerated figure the centre of his own immortal Dialogues. A third verification is given by the subjective, practical, dialectic tendency of all subsequent philosophy properly so called. On this point we will content ourselves with mentioning one instance out of many, the recent declaration of Mr. Herbert Spencer that his whole system was constructed for the sake of its ethical conclusion.

Apart, however, from abstract speculation, the ideal method seems to have exercised an immediate and powerful influence on Art, an influence which was anticipated by Socrates himself. In two conversations reported by Xenophon, he impresses on Parrhasius, the painter, and Cleito, the sculptor, the importance of so animating the faces and figures which they represented as to make them express human feelings, energies, and dispositions, particularly those of the most interesting and elevating type. And such, in fact, was the direction followed by imitative art after Pheidias, though not without degenerating into a sensationalism which Socrates would have severely condemned. Another and still more remarkable proof of the influence exercised on plastic representation by ideal philosophy was, perhaps, not foreseen by its founder. We allude to the substitution of abstract and generic for historical subjects by Greek sculpture in its later stages, and not by sculpture only, but by dramatic poetry as well. For early art, whether it addressed itself to the eye or to the imagination, and whether its subjects were taken from history or from fiction, had always been historical in this sense, that it exhibited the performance of particular actions by particular persons in a given place and at a given time; the mode of presentment most natural to those whose ideas are mainly determined by contiguous association. The schools that came after Socrates let fall the limitations of concrete reality, and

found the unifying principle of their works in association by resemblance, making their figures the personification of a single attribute or group of attributes, and bringing together forms distinguished by the community of their characteristics or the convergence of their functions. Thus Aphroditê no longer figured as the lover of Arês or Anchises, but as the personification of female beauty; while her statues were grouped together with images of the still more transparent abstractions, Love, Longing, and Desire. Similarly Apollo became a personification of musical enthusiasm, and Dionysus of Bacchic inspiration. So also dramatic art, once completely historical, even with Aristophanes, now chose for its subjects such constantly-recurring types as the ardent lover, the stern father, the artful slave, the boastful soldier, and the fawning parasite.

Nor was this all. Thought, after having, as it would seem, wandered away from reality in search of empty abstractions, by the help of those very abstractions regained possession of concrete existence, and acquired a far fuller intelligence of its complex manifestations. For each individual character is an assemblage of qualities, and can only be understood when those qualities, after having been separately studied, are finally recombined. Thus, biography is a very late production of literature, and although biographies are the favourite reading of those who most despise philosophy, they could never have been written without its help. Moreover, before characters can be described they must exist. Now, it is partly philosophy that calls character into existence by sedulous inculcation of self-knowledge and self-culture, by consolidating a man's individuality into something independent of circumstances, so that it comes to form not a figure in a bas-relief but what sculptors call a figure in the round. Such was Socrates himself, and such were the figures that he taught Xenophon and Plato to recognise and portray. Character-drawing begins with them, and the *Memorabilia* in particular is the earliest attempt at a biographical analysis that we possess. From this to Plutarch's *Lives* there was still a long journey to be accomplished, but the interval between them is less considerable than that which divides Xenophon from his immediate predecessor Thucydides. And when we remember how intimately the substance of Christian teaching is connected with the literary form of its first record, we shall still better appreciate the all-penetrating influence of Hellenic thought, vying, as it does, with the forces of Nature in subtlety and universal diffusion.

Besides transforming art and literature, the dialectic method helped to revolutionize social life, and the impulse communicated in this direction is still very far from being exhausted. We allude

to its influence on female education. The intellectual blossoming of Athens was aided, in its first development, by a complete separation of the sexes. There were very few of his friends to whom an Athenian gentleman talked so little as to his wife. Colonel Mure aptly compares her position to that of an English housekeeper, with considerably less liberty than is enjoyed by the latter. Yet the union of tender admiration with the need for intelligent sympathy and the desire to awaken interest in noble pursuits existed at Athens in full force and created a field for its exercise. Wilhelm von Humboldt has observed that at this time chivalrous love was kept alive by customs which, to us, are intensely repellent. That so valuable a sentiment should be preserved and diverted into a more legitimate channel was an object of the highest importance. The naturalistic method of ethics did much, but it could not do all, for more was required than a return to primitive simplicity. Here the method of mind stepped in and supplied the deficiency. Reciprocity was the soul of dialectic as practised by Socrates, and the dialectic of love demands a reciprocity of passion that can only exist between the sexes. But in a society where the free intercourse of modern Europe was not permitted, the modern sentiment could not be reached at a single bound; and those who sought for the conversation of intelligent women had to seek for it among a class of which Aspasia was the highest representative. Such women played a great part in later Athenian society; they attended philosophical lectures, furnished heroines to the New Comedy, and on the whole gave a healthier tone to literature. Their successors, the Delias and Cynthias of Roman elegiac poetry, called forth strains of exalted affection that need nothing but a worthier object to place them on a level with the noblest expressions of tenderness that have since been heard. Here at least, to understand is to forgive, and we shall be less scandalized than certain critics, we shall even refuse to admit that Socrates fell below the dignity of a moralist when we hear that he once visited a celebrated beauty of this class, Theodotê by name; that he engaged her in a playful conversation; and that he taught her to put more mind into her profession; to attract by something deeper than personal charms; to show at least an appearance of interest in the welfare of her lovers; and to stimulate their ardour by a studied reserve, granting no favour that had not been repeatedly and passionately sought after.

Xenophon gives the same interest a more edifying direction when he enlivens the dry details of his "Cyropædia" with touching episodes of conjugal affection, or presents lessons in domestic economy under the form of conversation between a newly-married couple. Plato in some respects transcends, in

others falls short of his less-gifted contemporary. For his doctrine of love as an educating process—a true doctrine, all sneers and perversions notwithstanding—though readily applicable to the relation of the sexes, is not applied to them by him; and his project of a common training for men and women, though suggestive of a great advance on the existing system if rightly carried out, was, from his point of view, a retrograde step towards savage or even animal life, an attempt to throw half the burdens incident to a military organization of society on those who had become absolutely incapable of bearing them.

Fortunately the dialectic method proved stronger than its own creators, and once set going introduced feelings and experiences of which they had never dreamed within the horizon of philosophic consciousness. It was found that if women had much to learn, much also might be learned from them. Their wishes could not be taken into account without giving a greatly increased prominence in the guidance of conduct to such sentiments as fidelity, purity, and pity, and to that extent the religion which they helped to establish has, at least in principle, left no room for any further progress. On the other hand, it was only by reason that the more exclusively feminine impulses could be freed from their primitive narrowness and elevated into truly human emotions. Love, when left to itself, causes more pain than pleasure, for the words of the old idyl still remain true that associate it with jealousy as cruel as the grave; pity, without prevision, creates more suffering than it relieves, and blind fidelity is instinctively opposed even to the most beneficent changes. We are still suffering from the excessive preponderance which Catholicism gave to the ideas of women; but we need not listen to those who tell us that the varied experiences of humanity cannot be organized into a rational, consistent self-supporting whole.

A survey of the Socratic philosophy would be incomplete without some comment on an element in the life of Socrates, which at first sight seems to lie altogether outside philosophy. There is no fact in his history more certain than that he believed himself to be constantly accompanied by a Dæmonium, a divine voice often restraining him, even in trifling matters, but never prompting to positive action. That it was neither conscience in our sense of the word, nor a supposed familiar spirit, is now generally admitted. Even those who believe in the supernatural origin and authority of our moral feelings do not credit them with a power of divining the accidentally good or evil consequences which may attend on our most trivial and indifferent actions: while, on the other hand, those feelings have a positive, no less than a negative function, which is exhibited whenever the

performance of good deeds becomes a duty. That the *Dæmonium* was not a personal attendant is proved by the invariable use of an indefinite neuter adjective to designate it. How the phenomenon itself should be explained is a question for professional pathologists. We have here to account for the interpretation put upon it by Socrates, and this, in our judgment, follows quite naturally from his characteristic mode of thought. That the gods should signify their pleasure by visible signs and public oracles was an experience familiar to every Greek. Socrates conceiving God as a mind diffused through the whole universe would look for traces of the Divine presence in his own mind, and would readily interpret any inward suggestion not otherwise to be accounted for as a manifestation of this all-pervading power. Why it should invariably appear under the form of a restraint is less obvious. The only explanation seems to be that as a matter of fact such mysterious feelings, whether the product of unconscious experience or not, do habitually operate as deterrents rather than as incentives.

This *Dæmonium*, whatever it may have been, formed one of the ostensible grounds on which its possessor was prosecuted and condemned to death for impiety. We might have spared ourselves the trouble of going over the circumstances connected with that tragical event had not various attempts been made in some well-known works to extenuate the significance of a singularly atrocious crime. The case stands thus. In the year 399 B.C. Socrates, who was then over seventy, and had never in his life been brought before a law-court, was indicted on the threefold charge of introducing new divinities, of denying those already recognised by the State, and of corrupting young men. His principal accuser was one Melétus, a poet, supported by Lycon, a rhetorician, and by a much more powerful backer, Anytus, a leading citizen in the restored democracy. The charge was tried before a large popular tribunal, numbering some five hundred members. Socrates regarded the whole affair with profound indifference. When urged to prepare a defence, he replied with justice, that he had been preparing it his whole life long. He could not, indeed, have easily foreseen what line the prosecutors would take. Our own information on this point is meagre enough, being principally derived from allusions made by Xenophon, who was not himself present at the trial. There seems, however, no unfairness in concluding that the charge of irreligion neither was nor could be substantiated. The evidence of Xenophon is quite sufficient to establish the unimpeachable orthodoxy of his friend. If it really was an offence at Athens to believe in gods unrecognised by the State, Socrates was not guilty of that offence, for his *Dæmonium* was not a new divinity, but a revelation from

the established divinities, such as individual believers have at all times been permitted to receive even by the most jealous religious communities. The imputation of infidelity commonly and indiscriminately brought against all philosophers was a particularly unhappy one to fling at the great opponent of physical science, who besides was noted for the punctual discharge of his religious duties. That the first two counts of the indictment should be so frivolous raises a strong prejudice against the third. The charges of corruption seem to have come under two heads—alleged encouragement of disrespect to parents, and of disaffection against democratic institutions. In support of the former, some innocent expressions let fall by Socrates seem to have been taken up and cruelly perverted. By way of stimulating his young friends to improve their minds, he had observed that relations were only of value when they could help one another, and that to do so they must be properly educated. This was twisted into an assertion that ignorant parents might properly be placed under restraint by their better-informed children. That such an inference could not have been sanctioned by Socrates himself is obvious from his insisting on the respect due even to so intolerable a mother as Xanthippe. The political opinions of the defendant presented a more vulnerable point for attack. He thought the custom of choosing magistrates by lot absurd, and did not conceal his contempt for it. There is, however, no reason for believing that such purely theoretical criticisms were forbidden by law or usage at Athens. At any rate, much more revolutionary sentiments were tolerated on the stage. That Socrates would be no party to a violent subversion of the Constitution, and would regard it with high disapproval, was abundantly clear both from his life and from the whole tenour of his teaching. In opposition to Hippias, he defined justice as obedience to the law of the land. The chances of the lot had, on one memorable occasion, called him to preside over the deliberations of the Sovereign Assembly. A proposition was made, contrary to law, that the generals who were accused of having abandoned the crews of their sunken ships at Arginusæ should be tried in a single batch. In spite of tremendous popular clamour, Socrates refused to put the question to the vote on the single day for which his office lasted. The just and resolute man, who would not yield to the unrighteous demands of a crowd, had shortly afterwards to face the threats of a frowning tyrant. When the Thirty were installed in power, he publicly, and at the risk of his life, expressed disapproval of their sanguinary proceedings. The oligarchy, wishing to involve as many respectable citizens as possible in complicity with their crimes, sent for five persons, of whom Socrates was one, and ordered

them to bring a certain Leo from Samos, that he might be put to death; the others obeyed, but Socrates refused to accompany them on their disgraceful errand. Nevertheless, it told heavily against the philosopher that Alcibiades, the most mischievous of demagogues, and Critias, the most savage of aristocrats, passed for having been educated by him. It was remembered, also, that he was in the habit of quoting a passage from Homer, where Odysseus is described as appealing to the reason of the chiefs, while he brings inferior men to their senses with rough words and rougher chastisement. In reality, Socrates did not mean that the poor should be treated with brutality by the rich, for he would have been the first to suffer had such license been permitted, but he meant that where reason failed harsher methods of coercion must be applied. Precisely because expressions of opinion let fall in private conversation are so liable to be misunderstood, or purposely perverted, to adduce them in support of a capital charge where no overt act can be alleged, is the most dangerous form of encroachment on individual liberty.

Modern critics, beginning with Hegel, have discovered reasons for considering Socrates a dangerous character, which apparently did not occur to Melétus and his associates. We are told that the whole system of applying dialectics to morality had an unsettling tendency, for if men were once taught that the sacredness of duty rested on their individual conviction, they might refuse to be convinced and act accordingly. And it is further alleged that Socrates first introduced this principle of subjectivity into morals. The persecuting spirit is so insatiable that in default of acts it attacks opinions, and in default of specific opinions it fastens on general tendencies. We know that Joseph de Maistre was suspected by his ignorant neighbours of being a Revolutionist because most of his time was spent in study; and but the other day a French preacher was sent into exile by his ecclesiastical superiors for daring to support Catholic morality on rational grounds. Fortunately Greek society was not subject to the rules of the Dominican Order. Never anywhere in Greece, certainly not at Athens, did there exist that solid all-comprehensive, unquestionable fabric of traditional obligation assumed by Hegel; and Zeller is conceding far too much when he defends Socrates, on the sole ground that the recognised standards of right had fallen into universal contempt during the Peloponnesian war, while admitting that he might fairly have been silenced at an earlier period, if indeed his teaching could have been conceived as possible before it actually began. For from the first, both in literature and in life, Greek thought is distinguished by an ardent desire to get to the bottom of every question, and to discover arguments of universal applicability for every decision.

Even in the youth of Pericles knotty ethical problems were eagerly discussed without any interference on the part of the public authorities. Experience had to prove how far-reaching was the effect of ideas before a systematic attempt could be made to control them.

In what terms Socrates replied to his accusers cannot be stated with absolute certainty. Reasons have been already given for believing that the speech put into his mouth by Plato is not entirely historical; and here we may mention as a further reason that the specific charges mentioned by Xenophon are not even alluded to in it. Thus much, however, is clear, that the defence was of a thoroughly dignified character, and that while the allegations of the prosecution were successfully rebutted, the defendant stood entire on his innocence, and refused to make any of the customary but illegal appeals to the compassion of the court. We are assured that he was condemned solely on this ground, and by a very small majority. Melétus had demanded the penalty of death, but by Attic law Socrates had the right of proposing some milder sentence as an alternative. According to Plato he began by stating that the justest return for his entire devotion to the public good would be maintenance at the public expence during the remainder of his life, an honour usually granted to victors at the Olympic games. In default of this he proposed a fine of thirty minæ, to be raised by contributions among his friends. According to another account\* he refused, on the ground of his innocence, to name any alternative penalty. On a second division Socrates was condemned to death by a much larger majority than that which had found him guilty, eighty of those who had voted for his acquittal now voting for his execution.

Such was the transaction which some moderns, Grote among the number, holding Socrates to be one of the best and wisest of men, have endeavoured to excuse. Their argument is that the illustrious victim was jointly responsible for his own fate, and that he was really condemned not for his teaching, but for contempt of court. To us it seems that this is a distinction without a difference. What has been so finely said of space and time may be said also of the Socratic life and the Socratic doctrine; each of them was contained entire in every point of the other. Such as he appeared to the Dicastery such also he appeared everywhere, always, and to all men, offering them the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. If conduct like his was not permissible in a court of law, then it was not permissible at all; if justice could not be administered without reticences,

---

\* In the *Apologia* attributed to Xenophon.



evasions, and disguises, where was sincerity ever to be practised? If reason was not to be the paramount arbiter in questions of public interest, what issues could ever be entrusted to her decision? Admit every extenuating circumstance that the utmost ingenuity can devise, and from every point of view one fact will come out clearly, that Socrates was impeached as a philosopher, that he defended himself like a philosopher, and that he was condemned to death because he was a philosopher. Those who attempt to remove this stain from the character of the Athenian people will find that, like the blood-stain on Bluebeard's key, when it is rubbed out on one side it reappears on the other. To punish Socrates for his teaching, or for the way in which he defended his teaching, was equally persecution and persecution of the worst description, that which attacks not the results of free thought but free thought itself. We cannot then agree with Grote when he says that the condemnation of Socrates "ought to count as one of the least gloomy items in an essentially gloomy catalogue." On the contrary, it is the gloomiest of any because it reveals a depth of hatred for pure reason in vulgar minds that might otherwise have remained unsuspected. There is some excuse for other persecutors, for Caiaphas and St. Dominic and Calvin; for the Inquisition, and for the authors of the dragonnades; for the judges of Giordano Bruno and the judges of Vanini; they were striving to exterminate particular opinions, which they believed to be both false and pernicious; there is no such excuse for the Athenian dicasts, least of all for those eighty who, having pronounced Socrates innocent, sentenced him to death because he reasserted his innocence; if, indeed, innocence be not too weak a word to describe his life-long battle against that very irreligion and corruption which were laid to his charge. Here in this one cause the great central issue between two abstract principles, the principle of authority and the principle of reason, was cleared from all adventitious circumstances, and disputed on its own intrinsic merits with the usual weapons of argument on the one side and brute force on the other. On that issue Socrates was finally condemned, and on it his judges must be condemned by us.

Neither can we admit Grote's further contention that in no Greek city but Athens would Socrates have been permitted to carry on his cross-examining activity for so long a period. On the contrary, we agree with Colonel Mure that in no other State would he ever have been molested. Xenophanes and Parmenides, Heracleitus and Democritus, had given utterance to far bolder opinions than his, opinions radically destructive of Greek religion, apparently without running the slightest personal risk; while Athens had more than once before shown the same spirit of

fanatical intolerance, though without proceeding to such a fatal extreme, thanks, probably, to the timely escape of her intended victims. M. Ernest Renan has quite recently contrasted the freedom of thought accorded by Roman despotism with the narrowness of old Greek Republicanism, quoting what he calls the Athenian Inquisition as a sample of the latter. The word Inquisition is not too strong, only the lecturer should not have led his audience to believe that Greek Republicanism was in this respect fairly represented by its most brilliant type, for had such been the case very little free thought would have been left for Rome to tolerate.

During the month's respite that was accidentally allowed him, Socrates had one more opportunity of displaying that steadfast obedience to the law which had been one of his great guiding principles through life. The means of escaping from prison were offered to him, but he refused to avail himself of them, that the implicit contract of loyalty to which, as he conceived, his citizenship had bound him, might be preserved unbroken. Nor was death unwelcome to him, although it is not true that he courted it, any desire to figure as a martyr being quite alien from the noble simplicity of his character. But he had reached an age when the daily growth in wisdom which for him alone made life worth living, seemed likely to be exchanged for a gradual and melancholy decline. That this past progress was a good in itself he never doubted, whether it was to be continued in other worlds, or succeeded by the happiness of an eternal sleep. And we may be sure that he would have held his own highest good to be equally desirable for the whole human race, even with the clear prevision that its collective aspirations and efforts cannot be prolonged for ever.

Two philosophers only can be named who, in modern times, have rivalled or approached the moral dignity of Socrates. Like him, Spinoza realized his own ideal of a good and happy life. Like him, Giordano Bruno, without a hope of future recompense, chose death rather than be unfaithful to the highest truth, and death, too, under its most terrible form, not painless extinction by hemlock, but the agonizing dissolution that was intended to serve as a foretaste of everlasting fire. Yet with neither can the parallel be extended further; for Spinoza, wisely perhaps, refused to face the storms that a public profession and propagation of his doctrine would have raised; and the wayward career of Giordano Bruno was not in keeping with its heroic end. The complex and distracting conditions in which their lot was cast did not permit them to attain that statuesque completeness which marked the classic age of Greek life and thought. Those times developed a wilder energy, a more stubborn endurance, a sweeter purity

than any that the ancient world had known. But until the scattered elements are recombined in a still loftier harmony, our sleepless thirst for perfection can be satisfied at one spring alone. Pericles must remain the ideal of statesmanship, Pheidias of artistic production, and Socrates of philosophic power.

Before the ideas which we have passed in review could go forth on their world-conquering mission, it was necessary, not only that Socrates should die, but that his philosophy should die also, by being absorbed into the more splendid generalizations of Plato's system. That system has, for some time past, been made an object of close study in our most famous seats of learning, and a certain acquaintance with it has almost become part of a liberal education in England. No better source of inspiration combined with discipline, could be found; but we shall understand and appreciate Plato still better by first extricating the nucleus round which his speculations have gathered in successive deposits, and this we can only do with the help of Xenophon, whose little work also well deserves attention for the sake of its own chaste and candid beauty. The relation in which it stands to the Platonic writings may be symbolized by an example familiar to the experience of every traveller. As sometimes, in visiting a Gothic cathedral, we are led through the wonders of the more modern edifice—under soaring arches, over tessellated pavements, and between long rows of clustered columns, past frescoed walls, storied windows, carven pulpits and sepulchral monuments with all their endless wealth of mythologic imagery—down into the oldest portion of any, the bare stern crypt, severe with the simplicity of early art, resting on pillars taken from an ancient temple, and enclosing the tomb of some martyred saint, to whose glorified spirit an office of perpetual intercession before the mercy-seat is assigned, and in whose honour all that external magnificence has been piled up; so, also, we pass through the manifold and marvellous constructions of Plato's imagination to that austere memorial where Xenophon has enshrined with pious care under the great primary divisions of old Hellenic virtue, an authentic record of one standing foremost among those who, having worked out their own deliverance from the powers of darkness, would not be saved alone, but published the secret of redemption though death were the penalty of its disclosure, and who, by their transmitted influence even more than by their eternal example, are still contributing to the progressive development of all that is most rational, most consistent, most social, and therefore most truly human in ourselves.

## ART. III.—THE PEASANT-POETS OF RUSSIA.

1. *T. G. Shevchenko, Kobzar (The Wandering Minstrel)*. 2 vols. Prague. 1876.
2. *Stikhotvorenia A. V. Koltzova (The Poems of A. V. Koltzov)*. Moscow. 1863.
3. *Sochinenia Lomonosova (The Works of Lomonósov)*. St. Petersburg. 1847.

OUR readers are probably so prepared to find both political and moral eccentricities in Russia, that they will not think the heading of this article especially curious. We shall, at all events, be able to show them that in a country where the condition of the serfs seemed so hostile to any culture, or the nobler aspirations of human nature, men have been found not unworthy to be ranked among national poets. Apart from their works, the biographies of some of these writers are interesting as throwing light upon the social condition of the times in which they lived. A new illustration will be given from a country still but little known, but now every day more studied that neither slavery nor physical suffering can stifle the impulses of genius.

We have every reason to believe that wandering minstrels abounded in Slavonic countries of old time: the race is even now not quite extinct, as Hilferding, and other collectors of legendary poems, have shown us. The *savans*, who attended the Literary Congress of Kiev, were able to listen to the strains of one of the last of the kobzars of Southern Russia—Ostap Veresai, and an interesting account of Riabanin, a singer of the age of eighty, is given by Hilferding. The portrait of the latter is prefixed to the pretty little volume on the “Heroes of Kiev” (*Kniga o Kievskikh Bogatirakh*), which was published at St. Petersburg in 1876. About this universal propensity for music, we find some strange stories in early writers: a somewhat absurd one has been handed down to us by the Byzantine historian, Theophylactus Simocatta,\* concerning the Khan of the Avars, who captured three Slavonians wandering about with lyres in their hands. When asked why they carried no swords, they told him that their countrymen knew nothing about war, but occupied themselves entirely with music and singing. There is a falsely bucolic and idyllic air about this tale, but idle as it probably is, it is

\* “Historiarum” vi. 2-15. The passage is cited in Bielowski’s “*Monumenta Poloniæ Historica*.”

none the less true that the early Slavs were a peaceful agricultural race, who passed their lives easily, unless goaded into retaliation by the attacks of their warlike neighbours.

In previous articles in this REVIEW, attention has been called to the popular poetry of the Slavonic races; but on the present occasion we have nothing to do with oral literature. We intend to confine ourselves to those poets who have won distinction among the recognised authors of their country, having been born in the lower ranks of society, and with no one could we begin more appropriately than with Lomonosov, the fisherman poet of Kholmogori, and the father of modern Russian literature.

Michael Vasilievich Lomonosov\* was born in the year 1711, in the village of Denisovka, which, in later times, has had its name changed in honour of the poet, situated on an island not far from Kholmogori, in the Government of Archangel. His father, a fisherman, took the boy as soon as he was ten years of age to assist him in the labours of his calling. Lomonosov learned to read and write from the clerk of the church, and, we are told, with astonishing rapidity. His eagerness for knowledge was unbounded, and it can easily be imagined that in such a remote part of the world it was not likely to be satisfied. His teacher on one occasion informed him, that to become a thoroughly learned man it was necessary to know Latin, and that could only be studied in Petersburg, Kiev, or Moscow. In the house of a peasant, named Dondin, he found the Arithmetic of Magnitzki, the old Slavonian Grammar of Smotritzki, and the Psalms translated into verse by Simeon Polotzki.† These books he studied so completely that he learned them by heart; but, finding that there was no chance of his stock of knowledge being enlarged under the arctic skies of his native place, he resolved to betake himself to Moscow in the best way he could. An opportunity for this expedition did not occur till he was seventeen years of age. One winter morning, during a severe frost, when a train of waggons laden with fish was about to depart for Moscow, the young student seized his opportunity, and, following the convoy, appeared with it in the old capital, where he seems to have arrived at night. Feeling lonely in a strange city, he remained with the fishermen, and a piece of good fortune befel him. Early in the morning a clerk came into the fish-market, who, having been previously acquainted with Lomonosov and recognising him, took him to his hut. The worthy man afterwards entreated a

---

\* The name is a singular one, and belongs to a class of which many countries furnish instances. It signifies "broken-nose."

† Simeon Polotzki (1628-1680) was tutor to the Tzar Feodor, son of Alexis. His works at one time enjoyed great popularity in Russia, and had a certain educational value.

monk, who was his friend, to bestir himself to get Lomonósov admitted into the Zaikonospasski Schóol. The attempt was successful, and the object of the young peasant attained. There his progress was very rapid, especially in Latin, and in the year 1734 he was sent from Moscow, together with other promising students, to St. Petersburg. Here his proficiency, especially in science, was remarked by all, and he was one of the young Russians chosen to complete his education in foreign countries. This system had been established by Peter the Great; or even as early as the beginning of the seventeenth century a predecessor of the great reformer, Boris Godunov, had shown sufficient breadth of mind to realize the fact that Russia must be educated *ab extero*. He accordingly sent some young nobles to be trained at Oxford. Lomonósov commenced the study of metallurgy at Marburg, in Germany, the expenses of his residence being defrayed by the Russian Government. But he was not content with his work under the professors only: he now began to write poetry, imitating the German authors, of whose productions he is said to have especially admired those of Günther.\* His "Ode on the Taking of Khotin from the 'Turks'" was composed in 1739, and attracted a great deal of attention at St. Petersburg. It is modelled on those of Boileau and Jean Baptiste Rousseau. Lomonósov recommends the unfortunate infidels to kiss the feet of the Empress who has subjugated them; but, after all, he has said nothing more extravagant than the first of these two French poets in his "Ode sur la Prise de Namur:"—

" Accourez, Nassau, Bavière,  
De ces nuis l'unique espoir ;  
A couvert d'une rivière,  
Venez, vous pouvez tout voir.  
Considérez ces approches :  
Voyez grimper sur ces roches  
Ces athlètes belliqueux ;  
Et dans les eaux, dans la flamme ;  
Louis, à tout donnant l'âme,  
Marcher, courir avec eux."

During his residence in Germany Lomonósov married a native of the country, and found it very difficult to maintain his increasing family on the scanty allowance granted to him by the St. Petersburg Academy, which, moreover, was very irregularly sent. He, in consequence, became embarrassed in his circumstances, and showed so little moral courage that he made up his mind

---

\* Born in Silesia, in 1695, died at Jena, in 1723, one of the best German poets of this very prosaic time. Lomonosov, no doubt, borrowed some hints from his "Ode on the Peace between the German Emperor and the Porte in 1718."

to leave the country, and by going to Lübeck or Holland, hoped to return to St. Petersburg. He does not appear to have had any intention of deserting his wife, but simply sought the means of supporting her. On the way, he spent the night at an inn near Düsseldorf. Here he met with a Prussian officer, who was on a recruiting errand. Mr. Carlyle has told us of the fondness of German sovereigns for regiments of giants. Noticing the tall stature and ample proportions of Lomonósov, the military official invited him to dine with him, and freely plied him with liquor. The poet became intoxicated, and fell into a deep sleep. On waking, he found himself in Prussian uniform, and was told that the night before he had consented to enter the Prussian service. All remonstrances were in vain, and Lomonósov, finding that he was to be sent to the fortress of Wesel, hit upon a means of escape, and succeeded in reaching Amsterdam, travelling as a poor Saxon student. Thence he went to the Hague to the Russian ambassador, Count Golovkin, who furnished him with some money for his journey to St. Petersburg. For two years he dared not write to his wife, not being able to send money for the maintenance of his family. On his arrival in Russia, he heard of the death of his father, the old fisherman. He now rapidly rose to distinction, and was made professor of chemistry in the University of St. Petersburg. Meanwhile his wife, who had been left behind at Marburg, as previously mentioned, was greatly disquieted at learning nothing about her husband during so long a period, and entreated Count Golovkin to forward a letter to him. When Lomonósov received it he was stung with remorse, and immediately sent her 100 roubles, with which she at once made her way to Russia. The poet, to say the least of it, appears to have been apathetic. His career was now one long course of success, which culminated in his being made Director of the University, and in 1784 Secretary of State. The latter title must have been valuable to him at a time when the position of a literary man in Russia was in many respects unsatisfactory. We get glimpses of the low tone from the way in which Trediakovski, the Court Poet, was treated by the Minister Volinski. But are other and more civilized nations of Europe free from these vulgarities? Is it not true that a little before this time, when Voltaire called upon Congreve, and felicitated him upon his sparkling comedies, the Englishman entreated him to think of him as a gentleman, and not a play-writer? Is there not, perhaps, ground for the statement of the Scottish biographer, that even so late as our own century, Sir Walter Scott concealed his authorship of the "Waverley Novels" for fear of losing caste among the Roxburghshire country gentlemen?

Lomonósov had long been occupying himself with the physical

sciences, in which, it must be confessed, he shewed himself a much greater proficient than in poetry. He died in 1765, and was buried in the cemetery of the Monastery of St. Alexander Nevski, at St. Petersburg, where the bodies of so many eminent Russian authors rest. His funeral was attended by a large assembly of the most influential persons in the country, and a monument was erected to his memory by Count Vorontzov.

It is, indeed, singular that at such a period of her history a literary man in Russia could have fought his way from so lowly a position to such an eminence. Of our own writers, Bunyan is the only one who can be compared with him in humble origin. As, on the one hand, the Russian lacked the genius of the inspired tinker, so, on the other, he was immeasurably superior to him in culture, being probably one of the most learned men of his day in any country. He busied himself very much with physical science, especially chemistry, and wrote extensively on most of its branches. He did a great deal to improve the rhythm of Russian verse, teaching correctness of expression, and settling the limits between modern Russia and ecclesiastical Slavonic, which, till his time, had been but ill-defined. The school upon which he formed himself as a poet was, unfortunately, a bad one. We must remember that these were the days of falsely-conceived classicism, and the French taste, upon which all the literature of Europe was moulded. He wrote his "Peter the Great," an epic in two books—for this is all that he compiled—upon such a model as the "Henriade;" and his two plays, "Demiphon" and "Tamira and Selim," are rhyming plays, in the French style; for the Russians had yet to find out that their language was capable of a noble and sonorous blank verse. In the same way, the early German and Polish writers of plays hampered themselves with lumbering Alexandrines.

In all these productions of Lomonósov we see learning, accuracy, and refinement, but no genius. The odes addressed to the Empresses Anne and Elizabeth are full of turgid flattery, as might be expected; but the numbers are elegant and the language smooth. At the same time, in England, Cibber was saluting the hero of Dettingen with far worse. It would be an injustice to translate any of these poems when these two qualifications—perhaps the only ones—would be so seriously impaired. They are certainly wonderful productions when we consider that they were written by the son of an Archangel fisherman. Of course, since didactic poetry was so much *à la mode*, Lomonósov must, of necessity, figure in this line also, and, accordingly, we have a versified "Essay on the Use of Glass." Some of the religious poetry, however, is better, and is still read with pleasure



by his countrymen. But although the actual works of Lomonósov left to us be but trivial in value, his good influences upon the literature of his country must not be depreciated. He belongs to the glorious band of patriots which includes such men as Dositei Obradovich, Raich, and Primus Truber—men whose object is to elevate and give dignity to their nation—great workers in the popular education of their countrymen. The Russian poet Nekrasov, whose premature loss his native country has recently deplored, has expressed this sentiment exquisitely in the noble little poem entitled “The Scholar,” from which we give some extracts in a prose version :—

“Barefooted, dirty,  
And scantily clothed. . . .  
Never mind, what does it matter ? •  
This has been the journey of many celebrated men.

“I see in your bag a little book,  
Ah! you are going to study.  
I understand : father on his darling son  
Has spent his last two copecks.

“I know : the old wife of the parish-clerk  
Has given a chetvertachok\*  
Which the merchant's wife, as she passed through the village,  
Offered her to buy tea with.

“Or may be you are a serf  
Just set free—well!  
That's nothing new.  
Don't be afraid : you'll succeed—

“You will soon be told, at school,  
How the peasant of Archangel,  
By God's will and his own,  
Became wise and great!

“There are kind people in the world—  
Some one is taking you to Moscow ;  
You will be a member of the University!  
The dream is being fulfilled.

“There is an open career *there*,  
So learn, work, and fear nothing.  
Ah! it is for this that I love thee dearly,  
O Russia, my native land!

---

\* The fourth part of a copeck.

“That nature is not without its gifts;  
That country is not lost  
Which produces from the people  
Such celebrated scholars.  
“Such good and noble men,  
Who are strong in a loving soul—  
Amidst those who are stupid, cold-hearted  
And besotted with self-love!”

In the study of the life of the next peasant-author whom we introduce to our readers, many curious facts will present themselves. In the case of Slepoushkin there was a generous enthusiasm shown, but it did more credit to the hearts of his admirers than their heads. At any rate we cannot say, in this instance, to quote the words of Gray—

“Chill penury repressed his noble rage,  
And froze the genial current of the soul.”

We must all remember how, at the close of the last century and beginning of the present, there was a great mania in England for bringing forward “self-taught” genius, the impetus to which was given by the success of Burns. Hence the temporary popularity of Kirke White, Anne Yearsley, the milkwoman of Bath, the Bloomfields, Joseph Blackett, and others, some of whom wrote fair enough verses, yet none could be properly included under the denomination of poets.

The grandfather of Slepoushkin, Semen Skoudarni, was a peasant of the Government of Yaroslav. In his youth he was taken to Moscow, married there, and afterwards became blind, in consequence of which his son Nikiphor, the father of the poet, was called Slepoushkin, the son of the blind man. Nikiphor was actively engaged in trade, and left some property at his death, but it was wasted by the guardians of his son Feodore, the poet, who became an orphan at the age of nine years. Feodore was born in 1783, and in his early youth was distinguished by his talent for drawing and his ready wit. His abilities, however, were but little noticed, and he was for some time employed in a general store, as the Americans would call it, where he remained till his sixteenth year. At the age of twenty he married a young girl belonging to the sect of Anabaptists (Perekrestchentzi), and joined that body. But owing to the sums he was obliged to pay by way of *obrok* (the now obsolete tax which, under the old régime, was due to his master from the peasant for leave to carry on any trade for his own benefit) and other taxes, his business was brought to an abrupt termination, and he was forced to leave his young wife in the country and go with his father-in-law to seek his fortune in St. Petersburg. He opened a small shop at Ribatzkaia, on the bank

of the Neva, and soon gained a reputation for honesty and industry. When he had satisfactorily established himself he sent for his wife, and conducted his business for some time with success, but about the year 1806 a bad harvest occurred, and his debtors were unable to pay him. In this way the poor poet fell into great poverty, but an event happened which showed very clearly in what estimation he was held by his neighbours. A stranger, who occasionally came to his shop, offered to lend him 700 roubles, the only condition attached to the loan being, that he was to be paid when it was in the poet's power to do so. In vain did Slepoushkin try to find out his name. "It is enough that I know you," replied the stranger, and departed. In the following year Slepoushkin was enabled to pay the debt. His stay at Ribatzkaia was advantageous to him in another way. He learned the German language from some natives of the country, resident in the place. Soon afterwards, he returned to the communion of the Orthodox Church, together with his wife, his children, his father-in-law, and about sixty other *raş-kolniks*. In the year 1819 his wife died, and soon afterwards he married again. He now began writing poetry, his first piece being entitled "The Funeral of the Peasant's Wife." His reputation as a verse-writer spread abroad, and reached the ears of P. Svinyin, a *litterateur* of the time, who edited a journal, entitled *Patriotic Memorials*. Svinyin paid the poet a visit at Ribatzkaia, in the autumn of 1822, and wrote a most enthusiastic account of him, in which, perhaps, he allowed his generous feelings of sympathy with the struggles of such a man to outrun his judgment and critical powers. Friends now began to gather round Slepoushkin. Glinka, an author of repute at the time, gave him some hints about the grammar and prosody of his compositions. We see that, at this time, Bloomfield had become known in Russia, although we are not aware of any translation of his writings in the language. This unfortunate poet, who closed a life clouded with poverty and neglect in 1823, has now fallen into oblivion, and there is probably no good reason for attempting to resuscitate his reputation: he had a musical note and some power of expressing himself, but his poems lack genius. Charles Lamb rightly contrasts the fine manly assertion of dignity by Burns, with the timidity and want of self-confidence of poor Bloomfield, who is overcome by humility.\* Svinyin

\* Thus we cannot understand Bloomfield making use of such vigorous and proud language as Burns, when he says—

"If I'm designed, you lordling's slave,  
By Nature's will designed,—  
Why was an independent wish  
E'er planted in my mind?"

says, "I made him (Slepoushkin) acquainted with Bloomfield, the English peasant poet, and advised him to draw his pictures directly from Nature." Alas! the Nature of Russia would not be everywhere such as to stimulate the poetic feeling: it was the magnificent scenery of the Caucasus which elicited some of the finest verses of Pushkin and Lermontov. The lines of Tiouchev, who died a short time ago, express the feelings of a Russian who contemplates the somewhat monotonous aspect of his country. There is a fine pathos in the verses. We have, on this occasion, attempted a metrical rendering—

" O ye landscapes unalluring,  
Where the scanty hovels stand,  
Land of labour all-enduring  
Yea, our native Russian land.

" With his looks of scornful loathing  
Ill the stranger doth divine,  
What with secret splendour's clothing  
That poor nakedness of thine.

" For himself, the King of Heaven,  
With his Cross about him cast,  
In humble guise hath trod thee,  
And hath blessed thee as he passed."\*

Not only, however, did Slepoushkin make some little figure with his poetry: he was also a very fair painter, and executed portraits of many of his relatives. In the conjunction of skill in painting, with a talent for verse, Slepoushkin resembled the Cossack, Shevcheuko, of whom we shall speak shortly, but the latter greatly excelled him in both.

Svinyin speaks in the highest terms of the domestic virtues of Slepoushkin, and the harmony and happiness of his household. The poet was next introduced to Boris Fedorov, another *littérateur* of the time, who brought him into fashionable society at the house of Madame Smirnov, sister of the Russian poet, Dmitriev. In 1826 appeared a collection of the verses of Slepoushkin, under the title of the "Recreations of a Villager." To this a preface was prefixed by Fedorov, in which the poet is compared to Hesiod! Rarely have any productions met with such a genial reception, which certainly proves that at the time there was a great disposition in Russia to reward merit in an obscure station, in spite of all that we are told of the depressing nature of the Government. The Academy of Arts decreed a gold medal

---

\* Tiouchev.

to the author, which was sent to him by Shishkov, the Minister of Public Education, with the following letter :—

“ Most respected villager, Fedor Nikiphorovich !

“ The Russian Imperial Academy, in its Session of the 23rd January, 1826, listened to the reading of your poem, ‘ The Recreations of a Villager.’ The Academy, with great pleasure, and not without astonishment at your natural gifts, commends your productions, both for their elegance and their simple and noble style and language, well suited to the description of rural scenes. Moreover, although encumbered with the cares of a family, you have found leisure to apply yourself to painting. Your conduct has been such as to elicit the praises of many, and, therefore, as an encouragement of such a commendable life and a reward of your labours, a gold medal is decreed to you, with the inscription, ‘ To the Benefactor of Russian Literature.’ In sending it to you in the name of the Academy, I will at the same time express my hope that you may be spared for many years, and earn reputation by your services and labours for the honour of your country, and for Art and Science. “ ALEXANDER SHISHKOV.”

Throughout this document Shishkov, as a nobleman, preserves his dignity by addressing Slepoushkin with the pronoun *thou*. On receiving the letter, the delighted poet caused it to be framed, and exhibited it in triumph to his friends and acquaintances. His honours were to be further augmented, for soon afterwards he was presented to the Emperor, and received as a present a coat embroidered with gold and a gold watch. It is in this costume that the portrait was taken which has been handed down to us: the poet looks simply a good-hearted, robust fellow, with no signs of genius in his face, but certainly with none of the depressed dulness usually assigned to the serf. Soon afterwards a benevolent lady, the Princess Tatiana Yousoufov, enabled him to purchase his freedom, having collected 3,000 roubles for the purpose, which were paid to his mistress, Catherine Novosiltzov. “ As is clear, the Countess knew how to value talent,” says the author of the Article in “ Old and New Russia.” Let us satisfy the justice of history by preserving the names of both, and the reader can make such comment as he pleases upon the difference of their conduct.

In 1828 appeared a second edition of his poems, with some fresh ones added, but there were few signs of improvement. Basil Popov, the author of the Article above cited, is inclined to think that the advice of his educated friends did Slepoushkin harm, as was the case with Burns, by directing him to ‘ more artificial styles of composition. It has always struck us as a wonder that the highly-polished gentlemen of the modern Athens did not crush all the originality out of the Scottish poet by their pedantic rules, and the lectures they were continually reading

him. For it is certain that by none of these jargons is the poetical flame kindled—no “Art Poétique” of Boileau, or “Essay on Criticism” by Pope. Burns himself was far nearer the truth when he wrote the never-to-be-forgotten verse—

“The Muse, nae poet ever fund her,  
Till by himsel’ he learned to wander .  
Adown some trotting burn’s meander  
An’ no think lang  
O sweet to stray an’ pensive ponder  
A heart-felt sang.”

Slepoushkin, however, did improve considerably in painting, and received instruction from some of the chief members of the Russian Academy. His next production was the “Seasons,” perhaps inspired by what he had been told of the poems of the same name by Bloomfield and Thomson. In the year 1832, the column of Alexander I. was erected, and the author celebrated the event in a triumphal poem. For this he received another medal from the Emperor. In 1834 appeared “New Recreations of a Villager,” which, if anything, showed a falling off in poetical power, and the reviews began to be less favourable. Among others, he was attacked by the bitter critic Senkovski, who for some time edited a periodical called *The Circulating Library* (Biblioteka dla Chtenia). An unfavourable opinion of his productions was also expressed by Belinski, the best of Russian critics, who has thrown such a charm over the life of Koltzov by his interesting biography. Slepoushkin now ventured upon prose, but not very successfully: his work was an attack on the Perekrestschentzi, the sect to which he had previously belonged, as we have already mentioned. He had now become excessively Orthodox. In the year 1848 he died of the cholera, and was buried in the cloister of the church at Rîbatzkaia, which he himself had decorated with paintings.

We have forborne giving our readers any extracts from this poet: such merit as he has lies chiefly in form, and this would be lost in an English version. He is certainly not a Burns, but more resembles a Bloomfield—perhaps, in some of his pieces, hardly rises above the level of Stephen Duck. We have, however, given his life at some length, as an interesting sketch of Russian manners. Be his merits what they may, we cannot but feel an interest in a man who could develop taste and culture under such very adverse circumstances. It is pleasant, also, to be able to add that his literary productions were advantageous to him, whereas, in the case of Koltzov, a man of much higher genius, of whom we are about to write, his whole life was clouded with misfortune, and he was another exemplification of the lines of Shelley—

“Most wretched men  
Are cradled into poetry by wrong,  
They learn in suffering what they teach in song.”

It is also very gratifying to find that Slepoushkin was a good, honest fellow, and was not spoiled by his success. One of his poems has had the honour of being translated into French by Prince Elim Mestscherski in his “*Poètes Russes*” (Paris, 1846). It is on the well-worn story of Ivan Soussanin having saved the life of Michael Románov, which has been shown by Kostomárov to be little more than a legend.

The success of Slepoushkin raised up some more peasant poets in Russia. Two of these, Soukhanov and Alipanov, addressed epistles to him. These writers are now forgotten, nor are we able, even if we could afford space, to furnish any details of them. Prince Mestscherski has a little fable by the first among his translations. Alipanov published a volume of the same species of compositions under the title “*Basni Krestianina Yegora Alipanova*” (Fables by the Peasant Yegor Alipanov), but they do not, as far as we have examined the book, present any interesting features, and the number of writers of fables, an exploded form of literature, is far too many in Russia.

It was in Alexis Koltzov that the real voice of the Russian people first spoke which, up to that time, had only been heard in the national songs. Lomonósov, Pushkin, and Zhukovski were in one sense artificial poets, well acquainted with the literatures of Western Europe, but in the new poet all Russia recognized a man of the people, who, like Burns, could tell their aspirations and griefs, and whose songs had been awakened under the influence of the popular lays of the country. The universality of such a man was such as Slepoushkin could never boast. It is in this sense that Koltzov is the most *national* of all the Russian poets. For the chief facts of his life we shall make use of the valuable memoir of the eminent Russian critic, Belinski, in which it must be confessed that a somewhat idealized portrait of the poet is given, but of this we shall speak more anon in a subsequent part of our article.

Alexis Vasilievich Koltzov was born at Vorónezh, in the Government of the same name, October 2nd (old style); 1809. His father traded in sheep, whose carcasses were to be boiled down for the tallow-factories. The family had been engaged in this occupation for many generations, and were fairly substantial people of the burgher class, so that the poet, perhaps, hardly comes strictly under the designation of a peasant. Still, educationally speaking, his condition was a very low one: if Russian merchants shew but little culture now, it was still more the case fifty or sixty years ago. In a very interesting article, commu-

nicated by M. de Poulet to the journal *Old and New Russia*,\* a graphic description is given of the town of Voronezh, once so active during the time of Peter the Great, but now a dull and decayed place. Béliniski speaks severely of the coarse and vulgar associations amidst which Koltzov grew up. This, however, de Poulet considers to be a somewhat exaggerated account: one of the poet's sisters, to whom he showed considerable attachment, seems to have been a woman of refinement. Koltzov received such education as his native town could afford, but it was imperfect at best, and, till the end of his days, he used a very ungrammatical style in his letters, and his orthography was exceedingly capricious. Prosaic as some of the features of his life were; poetical accessories were not wanting. He was occasionally sent to tend his father's flocks on the steppe, and thus found himself in complete communion with Nature. The accounts given by his biographers reminds us very much of some of the details of the life of the Ettrick Shepherd, and the days he spent upon the solitary Scottish hills. It is of this steppe that the Russian poet is never weary of singing, and he has consecrated to it many of his most beautiful poems. His fancies were first stimulated by reading the works of Dmitriev, a poet of the classical school, who flourished in the interval between Lomonosov, and the romantic revival under Zhukovski. Soon afterwards he was enabled to purchase the works of Lomonosov, Derzhavin, and Bogdanovich, but, even with the help of these, his writings were clumsy, and lacked the artistic construction necessary for the poet. He betook himself to the bookseller, a half-educated but very intelligent man, named Kashkin, who felt a deep interest in his studies. Kashkin gave him a book of Russian prosody, by which he was able to instruct himself in the more artificial portion of his craft. One of the most pathetic parts of the biography of Belinski is devoted to a love-episode in the life of the poet. Much, however, of the romance contained in this narrative seems to be dissipated by the sober statements of De Poulet, and it is very difficult for a foreigner to decide, where there are such opposite statements. Belinski, a man of fine and genial sympathies, has perhaps idealised the whole incident far too much. The father of the poet, although himself belonging only to the burgher class, owned some serfs, and among these was a young girl who had grown up in the house and been kindly treated by the family. She was half servant and half-humble companion of Koltzov's sisters, and indeed, as De Poulet writes, there would not be much difference between them in point of education. The young girl appears to have had very

---

\* "Drevnai Novaia Rossia," vol. x. p. 206.



considerable personal attractions, and was a beauty of the South Russian type. The poet fell in love with her, and his passion was reciprocated: his father, however, when made aware of it, determined to put an end to such an attachment, which he thought but little conducive to his son's interest. He, accordingly, took advantage of the absence of Alexis in the steppe, and sold Duniasha (such was the girl's name) and her mother to one of the landed proprietors dwelling in the district of the Don. The father of Koltzov, in most of his actions, appears as a hard money-loving man, but it is not easy to forgive him for this act of brutality. We are told by De Poulet that, on his return, the poet was so overpowered at the loss of the young woman, whom he regarded with great affection, that he fell into a violent fever and nearly lost his life. He made every effort to discover what had become of Duniasha, but only succeeded in ascertaining that she had been married to some Cossack. This sad instance of the abuse of parental authority occurred when the poet was twenty-two years of age.

The love of Koltzov for Duniasha had a great influence upon his subsequent life, and to her he consecrated one of his last poems, "The Star."\*

"Wherever I may be, always  
Till dawn, a bright star  
Is before me.  
It keenly looks into my eyes;  
Beneath it, at one time, was a parting;  
The hour of that parting seems to have passed from me—  
Only that ray never leaves me—  
It has always something weird for me!  
Sometimes it leads me to passionate strength;  
Sometimes to ecstacy and enthusiasm;  
Sometimes to saddest care.  
How I mourn for her, the lost one!"

Belinski waxes very eloquent upon the sufferings of the poet in this matter. "These details we heard from Koltzov himself, in the year 1838. To say nothing about his remembering the grief so clearly ten years after the time of its occurrence, his face grew pale, the words came out of his mouth with difficulty and slowly, and, when speaking, he looked aside and on the ground. Only once did he speak to us about it, and we resolved never to question him again on the subject; it would be only to reopen a wound of the heart, which, without this, had never been completely closed." This romance, in the words of Belinski, ended in death. Duniasha "quickly fell into a consumption,

---

\* "Stikhotvorenia Koltzova," 1863, *Zvezda*, p. 153.

and died through grief at parting and the agonies of a violent change." "But there is," adds De Poulét, "another epilogue to this romance, according to which, Duniasha was married to a soldier, lived happily, returned, after the death of the poet, to Voronezh and was domesticated with his mother and sisters as before." If this were indeed the case, we must all feel it to be a prosaic ending to a very pretty love-story—but we cannot accept it. Many of the poems of Koltzov are consecrated to this love, such, as, "If I meet not thee," "First Love," "O! sing, Nightingale," &c.

In 1835 eighteen of the poems of Koltzov were published through the agency of his friend Stankevich, the son of a landed proprietor of Voronezh, and the book soon made its way. In 1836 Koltzov had occasion to visit St. Petersburg and Moscow, with a view to the settlement of some of his father's affairs. It was on this occasion that he was introduced to the chief literary lions of the two capitals, and the *salons* of the aristocracy were thrown open to the poetical cattle-dealer (*poet-prasol*), as he was called. The memoirs of Koltzov, published by Belinski and De Poulet are full of painful details of the constant squabbles of the poet with his father, a coarse, selfish old man; and even the favourite sister, Anisia, towards whom he had shown such great affection, and to whose judgment he had deferred in many matters connected with his poems, became hostile to him on account of his opposition to her marriage. After his return from Moscow, in March, 1841, Koltzov first began to show symptoms of that disease which was destined to carry him off in the following year. The disagreeable condition of his life is made only too apparent in his letters to Belinski, and we are therefore, in many instances, more inclined to agree with the verdict of this biographer. Fortunately, the poor poet fell into the hands of a kindly and thoroughly sympathetic doctor. Life had, however, become distasteful to Koltzov: he used to say to his medical man, "If my disease is incurable, if you are only protracting life, I implore you not to do so. The sooner it is over the better, and I shall give you less trouble." It is pleasant to be able to add (as one would willingly have hoped, for the credit of human nature) that his mother, alone of his relatives, remained firm in her affection. On the advice of his medical attendant, Koltzov went to the residence of one of his connections in the country, so that he might be able to bathe regularly in the Don, and for some time his health improved. "But this improvement," remarks Belinski, "was only deferring death. For the re-establishment of his health before everything rest was necessary. Meanwhile he was every day and every night vexed, tortured, and teased like a wild beast in a cage. Sometimes he had no money to pay for his

medicine ; sometimes he had neither tea, sugar, nor candles ; and sometimes his mother could only stealthily procure him his dinner and supper ! His father required that he should live with the family, where he could not have a moment's quiet. He took up his abode in his old quarters, which were never thoroughly warmed throughout the whole winter : he was not allowed any firewood ! and he used to bring it in at night like a thief. When this was discovered they threatened to turn him out of the house. No other course was left for him but to go down below." "That is," adds De Poulet, commenting upon this passage of Belinski's, "in the chamber occupied by the family. Of the seven rooms, of which the Koltzovs made use, they gave the most quiet to Alexis, the windows of which looked out upon the court, in which the noise of the street and the rattling of the carriages could not be heard, and which had only one door, whereas the remaining rooms opened one into the other ; there was no passage through this room (both the poet and his father died in it), as Koltzov himself says in one of his letters." But at this time the marriage of his sister Anisia was drawing on, and it was a matter of great etiquette among the burgher class that this should be celebrated with considerable festivities. There was a continual noise in the house : constant merry-makings were the order of the day. All this was terrible for the suffering poet. "Once," Belinski tells us, "in an adjoining room his sister was entertaining her friends, and some practical joking was going on. A table was set in the midst, and on it a young girl was placed : she was covered with a sheet, as if a corpse, and all sang the funeral hymn of Alexis." It is impossible to conceive a more brutal and senseless joke. What sad impressions it leaves upon our minds as to the condition of Russian domestic life ! The marriage of his sister soon followed. "They are always going through my room," writes the poor poet ; "they are continually washing the floors, and all damp is injurious to me. Every day they are smoking, and this is bad for my weak lungs. For some time past my life has hung on a hair. My physician, in spite of my having paid him but little, has visited me three times a day. We are now continually having evening parties, noise, shouting, and running about ; the doors of my room are turning on their hinges till midnight. I ask them not to smoke, they smoke the more ; I ask them not to wash the floors, they do it the more."

Things improved after the marriage of the poet's sister : he saw his father but rarely, and his wants were more carefully attended to. He had begun to walk about a little, and twice visited the theatre. The last letter which his warm-hearted friend Belinski received from him was dated February 27 (old

style), 1842. And yet the poet lingered for some time after this. In August of the same year he was visited by an old acquaintance, named Askochenski, who had arrived from Kiev. The survivor thus describes the interview :

“Taking advantage of a leisure hour, I went to see Koltzov, who was then living in his father’s house in Dvorienskaia Street.

‘Does A. V. Koltzov live here!’ I asked the porter.

‘He does.’

‘Where can I find him?’

‘If you please, here; he is in his room.’

I go. A long-winding, corkscrew staircase, conducted me at last to the retreat of the poet. I gently opened the door and entered the room, where I was in the presence of so many buried hopes and passions, where there still beat a heart so full of love for humankind.

“‘Good morning, Alexis Vasilievich.’

“‘Good morning,’ replied he, in a feeble, hoarse voice. Koltzov was then in the last stage of consumption.

“‘You don’t know who I am?’

“‘No,’ he answered.

“I told him my name. Koltzov listened eagerly, having made me sit near the table. He spoke quickly, dwelling upon old times, and especially his friend Serebrianski. Seeing that this cost him a great effort, I begged him to be tranquil, and wishing to draw his attention from these painful recollections, I said, ‘Well, and how are you?’

“‘Thank God,’ said he, sinking exhausted upon his bed, ‘now I am better, but things went badly with me last year.’

“‘Live, Alexis Vasilievich,’ said I, ‘for our national literature. We are such an unfortunate people already, having lost the great representative of our . . . .’\*

“‘Cease,’ interrupted he, ‘those unmeasured praises of our journalists have already done so much to spoil me. Save me from them.’

“The most trivial opposition might be prejudicial to the poet’s health, and, therefore, I hastened to change the conversation.

“‘Are you comfortable?’

“Yes, comfortable,’ he said. ‘Yes, comfortable,’ slowly repeating the words, with a bitter smile. ‘They only see a tradesman in me, but I wish to be looked upon as a *man*. I give them realities—what business is it of theirs whether I take my inspirations from heaven or earth?’

“A hoarse cough interrupted his conversation. I begged him to be tranquil.

“‘Your honourable title,’ said I, ‘by which all Russia knows you is that of poet. She wishes to know nothing more, and is as proud of the cattle-dealer, Koltzov, as of the fisherman, Lomonosov.’

\* Probably alluding to the death of Pushkin at the beginning of the year 1837.

“ ‘ I thank you,’ he said, eagerly taking my hand ; ‘ here everything is irksome to me. There is no one to give me a fresh thought. I am in a wilderness.’ ”

And in this strain the poor poet continued the conversation. As Askochenski says further :—

• “ The chamber in which Koltzov received me was a very poor one ; the furniture consisting of a table, a bed, and two or three chairs. On the table lay a Bible and a volume of the works of Zhukovski. On the wall, in the corner, hung a small ivory crucifix, and on the sides were a portrait of Polzhaev,\* and a picture of Pushkin in his coffin.”

It is very sad to be obliged to add that, as happened in the case of Burns, Koltzov had been “ cut,” as our phrase is, by most of his friends, partly from personal quarrels and partly from the dislike they felt to his father. The poor poet had, no doubt, become a *fruit sec*, as the French wittily term it, an unfashionable person, and the summer friends, “ flies of estate and sunshine,” to use the fine language of old George Herbert, had gradually dropped off when they saw that his weak health impeded the full realization of his fine powers and the accompanying material prosperity. His sisters and their husbands visited him every day, among them Anisia, the former favourite, but her presence was now visibly disagreeable to him, and he often refused her admittance. His mother and a nurse alternately remained by the bed of the dying man. Tears used to flow down his cheeks as he showed his wasted hands. Being a man of strong religious feeling, he spent his last days in devotional exercises.

On the nineteenth of October his sister Andronov arrived earlier than the others to visit her dying brother. He lay half out of bed, and was drinking tea from a large cup, which had been presented to him by Prince Odóievski, and was greatly prized. The nurse was holding it for him to drink, because his own hand trembled so much. “ Nurse,” said Alexis, “ how tiresome of you ; you’ve poured tea again into that cup. You know how I value it, and I am so weak that I might let it fall. Pour it into the glass.” The tea was poured, and at that moment his sister left the room. In a few seconds a cry was heard from the nurse, at which the mother and sister hurried in : they found him already dead. He had expired, holding the hand of the nurse with both his hands.

On the following day, in the Temnoi Riad, † in the shop of a

\* A Russian poet to whom allusion has been made in a previous Number of this REVIEW.

† Lit. “ Dark Row.”

certain Melentiev, the following scene took place. Thither comes the father of Koltzov, and asks for brocade, fringes, muslin, &c., the ordinary appurtenances of a Russian funeral, and makes a selection. On his entrance, the proprietor was not in his shop, but shortly afterwards made his appearance. The ordinary topics of conversation among acquaintances were discussed. Koltzov, senior, had many stories to tell of a good bargain he had made the night before at an inn.

“But for whom are you buying the mourning?” interrupted the shopkeeper.

“For my son—for Alexis; he died yesterday,” replied the father, in a casual way.

Koltzov was buried in the new Mitrofanovski Cemetery, which, at that time, contained but few graves.

But a change soon came over the father. He was seen to visit the solitary spot where his celebrated son lay buried. Sometimes he would sit or stand for a long time in the churchyard, weeping bitterly. He also erected to his memory a monument, with an inscription composed by himself. The inhabitants of Vorónezh have testified to the pride they feel in the poet's fame by a statue, and have named one of their streets after him. The old man survived his son ten years, dying July 20, 1852, aged seventy-seven. In his latter days he was in far less flourishing circumstances. Many years after the death of his son he was heard to say of him, “My son, Alexis, was a clever fellow, but God did not give him a long life. Too much learning brought him to his grave.” The mother, Prascovia, after her husband's death, went to live with her married daughter, named Andronov, and died at her house, December 4, 1861. Anisia survived her brother five years. She died of consumption, April 17, 1847, leaving a young son, who soon followed his mother to the grave.

The volume of poems which Koltzov has left us is not great in extent, but its contents are precious. He has all moods; but the melancholy one is predominant. How could it be otherwise in such a mutilated and joyless life? And we must remember that the sorrows of Koltzov were real ones, and his desponding utterances are not like the expressions of *Weltschmerz*, of the poets of the Byronic school, who too often show their self-inflicted wounds to the world, as mendicants do for an alms. We cannot say of him that he is

“Sad as summer night for wantonness.”

He has thoroughly realized the melancholy condition of the Russian peasant in the old days of serfdom, when he sings—

[Vol. CXIV. No. CCXXV.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LVIII. No. I. G

*The Peasant-Poets of Russia.*

“ I sit by the table,\*  
 And think  
 How am I to live  
 Alone.

“ The young man  
 Has no young wife ;  
 The young man  
 Has no true friend.

“ Together with poverty  
 My father has given me  
 Only one talent—  
 Bodily strength.

“ And that  
 Bitter necessity  
 Has made me altogether spend  
 Upon strangers.”

But he has cheerful pictures of Nature and her influences :—

“ Art thou sleeping, peasant ?  
 Spring is stirring in the court !  
 Verily, thy companions  
 Are long since at their labours.”

And, again—

“ The beautiful dawn  
 Burns in the sky ;  
 From the great forest  
 The sun comes forth.

“ I joyfully arrange  
 The harrow and plough ;  
 I get ready the cart —  
 I scatter the seed.”

\* \* \* \* \*

“ We get ready the holy  
 Cradle for the seed ;  
 The damp Mother Earth  
 Drinks it in and feeds it.

“ The grass springs up in the field,  
 The ear grows ;  
 It will ripen and rejoice  
 In the golden ears.

---

\* Reflexions of the Peasant.

“How our sickles shine here,  
How our scythes clash!  
Sweet will be our rest  
Over the loaded sheaves.

\* \* \* \* \*

“With a silent prayer  
I plough, I sow,  
Oh! God, produce for me  
Bread, my only riches!”

We have not attempted to convey the exquisite rhythm of the original, but we take this to be a most sweet lyric. It reminds us of a beautiful little poem by Mr. Carlyle (and what fine pieces our professed prose writers occasionally give us), from which we will quote the last verse with the refrain:—

“Now steady and sure again,  
And measure of stroke and step we keep;  
Thus up and down we cast our grain:  
Sow well and you gladly reap.

“Fall gently and still, good morn,  
Lie warm in thy earthy bed,  
And stand so yellow some morn  
For beast and man must be fed.”

The following piece will show the poet in a different light, as a man of deep religious feeling. We have attempted an imitation of the original metre:—

“THE GREAT SECRET.

“The clouds bring the water,  
The water earth drinketh  
With fruits the earth labours,  
Countless stars in the heavens,  
Countless forms of life teeming!  
In her darkness and brightness  
How wondrous is nature!

“And with doubt growing older  
About the great secrets,  
Flow on unreturningly  
Ages on ages,  
And each age as it passeth  
Eternity questions  
When comes the conclusion?  
But each of them answers—  
Go, question another.



*The Peasant-Poets of Russia.*

“The brave spirit prayerful,  
 To Providence wendeth.  
 O tell me the secret,  
 Dark tale of thy workings.  
 And there comè forth, as answer,  
 Only marvels far greater,  
 In the calm, in the tempest,  
 Our weird souls that wilder.

“What end to the marvels  
 In the future of nature ?  
 Oh ! lamp, burn thou bright o'er  
 The crucified Saviour.  
 Oh ! thoughts, ye are gloomy,  
 Oh ! prayer thou art sweetest.”

In the “ House of the Forester ” he has prettily intervoven some of the superstitions of the Russian peasantry, affording such fine material for the poet :—

“ In the dark wood, by the river,  
 Stands a little house,  
 With two bright windows  
 And open gates.

“ Under the tower the gates  
 And the wicket are shut,  
 That thither should not come the hornèd  
 Demon of the wood, terrible and shaggy ;

“ That the vampire should not enter,  
 Nor the passing warrior  
 Who lives there alone,  
 Afar from human haunts.

“ Is it some poor fisherman,  
 Or bearded robber  
 Retired in it, as a hermit,  
 With his chest and treasure ?

“ In the house has lived, for a long time,  
 To guard the Tzar's property,  
 The old Forester, with his wife  
 And his third young daughter.”

We have no space to finish the translation of this pretty lyric, but it well repays perusal in the original.

Leaving this ill-starred son of genius, we now come to the celebrated Cossack poet, Taras Sherchenko, of whose works a

complete edition, cited at the commencement of our article, was published a little while ago at Prague,\* with a portrait of the poet, showing his fine manly face under his Cossack cap. It would be impossible, in the limits of the present article, to sketch the rise and progress of Little Russian literature, the interests of which have been so gallantly defended by M. Dragomanov. Perhaps we may return to it on a subsequent occasion. It will suffice to say here that a written literature did not exist among the Little Russians till the close of last century.

The life of Shevchenko is full of interesting details, and gives us a curious picture of Russian society. Besides the biographical sketch published by Maslov, there is a short account of his works by Obriist, printed in German at Czernowitz, in 1870. Moreover, Shevchenko himself wrote his auto-biography, a very interesting work, which is published at the end of the Lemberg edition.

• He was born on the 25th of March, 1814, in the village of Mornitza, near Kerelivka, in the Government of Kiev. His parents were peasants, being serfs on the estate of a certain Engelhardt. He has told us that he never felt any happiness in life after his ninth year. He appears to have been a dreamy child, full of strange impulses; thus he was always gazing at the mountains which formed the background to the view round his home, and thought they must be iron pillars which supported the sky. He, accordingly, wandered from the village to put his belief to the test, and would, perhaps, have been lost if he had not been brought back by some wandering pedlars (*choumaki*). In the year 1823 he was deprived by death of his mother, and her loss was the beginning of his troubles. His father married again, and the new wife proved a severe stepmother to the children.

Taras, with his little sister, Irene, who was his constant companion, used to go to the neighbouring Lebedinski monastery. Here he often saw an old monk, who had been an eye-witness of the terrible struggle between the Malo-Russians and the Poles in 1768. This man had many a story to tell of the period, and gave the young poet the material for his striking poem "Haidamak," of which we shall speak shortly. The father of Shevchenko sent him for instruction to a certain Hubski, but did not long survive to take care of his son, as he outlived his first wife only two years. The stripling was then sent to a drunken priest, named Buhorski, who treated him with brutal severity. "This was the first despot I ever had to deal with," says Taras, in his autobiography, "and he instilled in me for the rest of my life a loathing for every act of oppression, which one man can commit against

---

\* An earlier edition had appeared at Lemberg, in 1866.

another." He, also, narrates his adventures with two other persons of this sort by whom he was instructed, and from whom he learned something of the art of painting, for they were both partly employed in the preparation of sacred icons, an easy occupation in Russia, as these pictures must all be drawn from certain fixed models. Thus, besides a genius for song, an inclination for painting was produced in him. But his fortunes were to undergo a change. In the year 1829 his old master, Engelhardt, died, and his son and heir took the youngster as his page. This new position, although it seemed at first to cripple his love of freedom, was in the end advantageous to him. His duty was to remain in his master's ante-chamber and attend to him whenever (in the Russian style) he clapped his hands. The poor youth, to wile away his time, was accustomed to copy the pictures hanging on the wall. This practice, however, on one occasion brought him into a great deal of trouble. He accompanied his master to Vilno on the occasion of a festival in honour of the Tzar. During the absence of M. Engelhardt at this fête young Shevchenko set himself to copy the pictures which were hanging on the walls. It was the occasion of a grand ball, and, while the household slept, the young artist secretly rose, lit a candle, and began drawing. He became so engrossed in the pursuit that he did not perceive when his master returned, and was rudely awakened from his artistic studies by his ears being pulled by the angry nobleman, reminding the careless young artist that by his sitting with the candle among the papers he had not only nearly set on fire the house, but the whole city. The unfortunate Shevchenko received a beating at the time and also, on the following day, a severer castigation by his master's orders.

A better time, however, was in store for him. M. Engelhardt resolved to send him to a house-painter and decorator with the idea of employing him on his own estate. To a painter of this kind he was accordingly sent, and, luckily for himself, found a kind-hearted man, who saw how superior his apprentice was to such work, and recommended his master to put the young artist under a certain Lampi, at that time a portrait-painter of some reputation at Warsaw. Consent was given to this; but as the unfortunate young man grew nearer to manhood he seems to have realized his sad condition more thoroughly; according to Maslov he was, on several occasions, on the point of committing suicide.

In the year 1832, the master of Taras removed permanently to St. Petersburg, and the poet followed with the rest of the servants. He was now eighteen years of age, and was put (at his earnest request) at another painter's, who was but little better than a house-decorator, as the former one. His mind, however, became greatly developed in the capital. On fête-days and holi-

days he used to visit the picture-galleries, and longed to imitate the great masters whose works he saw exhibited there. He would frequently spend the whole night in the summer gardens, sitting under the pale green sky, where light continues during the whole night, in some months, as we have ourselves often seen it, and as it has been so prettily described by Pushkin in his lines on St. Petersburg—

“A proud city, a poor city ;  
An atmosphere of slavery ; a monotonous aspect,  
Under a pale green sky ;  
Weariness, cold, and granite.”

By good luck he made the acquaintance of the artist Soshenko, and by his advice began to paint portraits in water-colours. His success in this respect was so great that his master used to employ him to paint the portraits of his friends, and rewarded him with money. Soshenko not only assisted him in his work as an artist, but laboured for his moral and intellectual progress, and introduced him to the Malo-Russian novelist, Grebenka. These worthy men succeeded in purchasing the freedom of the poor artist. The celebrated Russian painter, Brioulov, agreed to execute a portrait of the poet Zhukovski, which was sold for 2,500 roubles, and for this sum his master, Engelhardt, agreed to set him at liberty.

Shevchenko now (April, 1858) became a member of the Academy of Arts, and everything seemed to promise a successful career for him. His fondness for poetry developed itself, and in 1840 appeared his “Kobzar,”\* containing a collection of lyrical pieces in the Little Russian language. In the following year were published “The Haidamuks” and “Hamalia.” These poems were received with great enthusiasm by the South Russians, and made the name of the poet deservedly celebrated among his countrymen. The Ukraine and the surrounding lands have always formed the most poetic region of Russia, and have been celebrated not only by the poets who used the national language, but also by the so-called Ukraine School of Polish Poets, including Zaleski, Malczeski, Goszczynski, Padura, Slowacki, and others. Soon afterwards the poet paid a visit to his native province, and there had the good fortune to make the acquaintance of Koulish and Kostomárov. While staying at Kiev, he became embroiled with the Government, through mixing himself up with some secret societies. Information against the poet was given by a student of the Kiev University.†

\* The Kobzar is a wandering minstrel, among the Malo-Russians, who accompanies his song with a kind of guitar, called Kobzar.

† See the sympathetic little work of Professor Partitzki, “Leading Ideas in the Writings of Tavas Shevchenko. Lemberg 1872. (In Malo-Russian).”

This, we must remember, was under the iron rule of the Emperor Nicholas. The unhappy Shevchenko was sentenced to serve as a common soldier at Orenburg, on the Asiatic frontier of the empire. During his exile of ten years, from 1847 to 1857, the condition of the poet was inexpressibly sad, as he has recorded in many of his "Dumí;" from Orenburg he was removed to Siberia, and afterwards to the fort of Novopetrovsk, on the Asiatic coast of the Caspian Sea. His fate was the more severe, because he was forbidden to amuse himself with painting. He, however, continued to secrete materials, even carrying a pencil in his shoe, and his proceedings were winked at through the good nature of the officer in command. The following story, with which we shall all sympathize, is told by the great novelist, Tourghéniev, in the interesting recollections which he has furnished to the complete edition of the poet's works:— "One general, an out-and-out martinet, having heard that Shevchenko, in spite of the prohibition, had made two or three sketches, thought it his duty to report the matter to Perovski (the commander-in-chief of the district) on one of his days of reception, but the latter, looking sternly on the over-zealous informer, said, in a marked tone, 'General, I am deaf in this ear, be so good as to repeat to me on the other side what you have said.' The General took the hint, and, going to the other ear, told him something which in no way concerned Shevchenko." The poor poet during his captivity lamented his fate in several very sad poems. In one, addressed to his friend Kozachovski, he speaks of "often bedewing his couch with tears of blood."\* But a day of deliverance was at hand. In 1855 the Emperor Nicholas died. Up to that time the only slight alleviation of Schevchenko's fate was when he was allowed to accompany, through part of Siberia, the expedition under Lieutenant Boutakov as draughtsman. Towards the end, also, of his captivity, his treatment was more gentle, and he composed some poems of considerable length.

His release was owing to the efforts of Count Feodore Tolstoi and his wife, whom Shevchenko ever afterwards reckoned among his greatest benefactors. There were some delays, however, in his being set at liberty, and he did not return to St. Petersburg till April, 1858. In the summer of 1859 he paid a visit to the Ukraine, and saw his sister Irene in his native village. But he was so poor that he was only able to give her a rouble. At that time all the rest of his family were serfs, but in 1860 they received their liberty to the number of eleven souls, owing to the efforts of a society formed to assist poor authors and their families. The

---

\* "Partitzki," p. 20.

great measure of emancipation of the present Tzar was to follow the next year. Taras had a fixed plan of settling himself in the Ukraine by the purchase of a cottage and a little piece of land within sight of the Dnieper, but he was never destined to carry it out. Towards the middle of July he again made his appearance at St. Petersburg, and a new edition of his *Kobzar* was published, which was received with great applause. At this time he had chambers in the Academy Buildings, and, occupied himself with engraving. He now resolved to marry, and, in spite of the suggestions of his friends, who reminded him that he was a man of talent and culture, to a peasant girl. His answer was characteristic: "In body and spirit I am a son and brother of our despised common people. How, then, can I unite myself with one of aristocratic blood? And what would a proud luxurious lady do in my humble cottage?" In pursuance of this plan, he successively endeavoured to gain the affections of two women in humble life, named Charita and Glukeria, but in neither case was he successful, although preparations were even made for his wedding with the latter. The girl herself broke off the proposed marriage. He now became more than ever anxious to get away from his lonely life in St. Petersburg, and agreeably to his wishes a piece of land was purchased on the right bank of the Dnieper, near Kanev.

His health now began to show signs of breaking up, owing to his long sufferings both in early youth and in his Siberian exile. But even in his last days he was busy in writing books, to assist popular education, in the Little Russian language; of these, one, a Grammar, was published during the life of the poet; the others, a work on Arithmetic, a Geography, and History were never finished. In January, 1861, Shevchenko wrote to his brother Bartholomew: "I have begun this year very badly; for two weeks I have not stirred out of the house. I feel debilitated and cough continually." A fortnight after he said: "I feel so ill that I can hardly hold the pen in my hand." On his name's-day the poet, although very weak, was cheered by telegrams from his countrymen in the Ukraine, who regarded him with enthusiastic affection. This was on the 25th of February: encouraged by their warm expressions of sympathy, the poet on that day talked cheerfully with his companions, and expressed a hope that he might get to the South, and he felt sure that his health would be restored. On the following day, February 26th, he rose from his bed at five o'clock in the morning, and went to his studio; but suddenly felt himself ill, fell down, and in about half an hour the poet was no more.

On the 28th of February the burial of Shevchenko took place. Over his coffin many sympathetic speeches were made in the

Little and Great Russian and Polish languages. The orators spoke of his noble and original talent, his services, his sad life and labours undergone in the interest of the national literature and his people. He was buried in the Smolensk Cemetery, where, every Sunday, his grave was visited by the natives of the Ukraine living in St. Petersburg. But this was only to be the poet's temporary resting-place. His admirers, knowing his love for his native country, and the wish he had expressed, in a pathetic poem, to be buried in the Ukraine—

“When I am dead  
 Bury me in a grave  
 Amidst the broad steppe,  
 In my beloved Ukraine.  
 That the wide-extending meadows  
 And the Dnieper and its banks  
 I may see and hear  
 As it rushes on roaring,”—

had resolved that his wish should be carried out. All arrangements were made, and soon afterwards the remains of the poet were conducted South. Everywhere the body was received with honour, and the coffin was carried through the city of Kiev by the students. He was finally buried in a picturesque spot on the banks of the Dnieper, in the presence of a great crowd of people. In imitation of the graves made in the old Cossack days, a vast mound of earth was piled on the grave, which was surmounted with an iron cross. The tomb of the poet is the object of especial reverence among his countrymen, and it was spoken of a little while ago by one of the Polish journals as the *Mecca* of the South Russian Revolutionists. We have, unfortunately, no space in our review for a detailed criticism of the writings of Shevchenko. He loves to describe the wild fury of the Cossacks in their old, independent days, and he gathered into his verse many of the most striking legends of the Ukraine. He tells of Hamalia, Jan Pidkova, Doroshenko, Nalivaiko, and others. “The Haidamaks”\* (from a Turkish word signifying robber) is a poem which sings of the terrible rising of the Cossacks against the Poles, in 1768, under Gonta and others. The most powerful part of it, the “bloody banquet,” records how the former, a fiend in human shape, murdered one thousand Jewish children at Human. This scoundrel was afterwards caught, and, together with one of his companions, put to death with the most inhuman tortures. There is certainly great lyrical and dramatic power in this piece, and it is written in a vigorous style, but it is

---

\* According to others this signification of the word is too depreciatory, as it rather signifies a wandering Malo-Russian under Polish rule.

repulsive from its subject. Many readers will turn from it as from the "Taras Boulba" of Gogol, because the descriptions which it contains are too revolting. Some of the shorter pieces of Schevchenko are very pathetic. He has, in a clever manner, interwoven with his poems the popular superstitions and customs of his countrymen; hence his pieces are full of national colouring, and racy of the soil. This probably explains the great charm which they have for all Southern Russians, by whom his memory is regarded with idolatry. Moreover, no poet was ever more autobiographical: he is always giving us details of his sad, but interesting life. To the Prague edition of the poet's works, previously alluded to, are prefixed the interesting recollections of Toughéniev Polinski, Kostomarov, and Mikéshin. The former has left us a graphic description of the poet's personal appearance, his broad shoulders and high forehead, and thoroughly Cossack appearance. He confirms the accuracy of the portrait prefixed to Shevchenko's works.

Before concluding our review, we must say a few words of Nikitin, born in the same town, Vorónezh, as Koltzov, whose life was also spent in poverty and disappointed hopes. The father of this poet was an incurable drunkard, and brought his family to the greatest distress. Nikitin, to support his relations, was obliged to keep an inn, which he was afterwards able to exchange for the more congenial occupation of a bookseller. The poor poet died in 1861. His poems are chiefly realistic in tone, describing the sad life of the Russian peasant. Take the following, for instance, in a literal translation:—

## GRANDFATHER.

Bald, with a white beard,  
The old grandfather sits:  
A cup of water and some bread  
Are before him.

Quite grey,\* on his forehead wrinkles,  
With a lean face;  
He has seen a great deal of sorrow  
In his time.

All is past: his strength has gone; †  
His sight is weak.  
Death has laid in the grave  
His children and grandchildren.

---

\* Lit., grey as a buzzard.

† Our readers will be reminded of Wordsworth's fine lines on Simon Lee.



With him, in the dirty hovel,  
 Only a cat lives :  
 It is old too, and sleeps the whole day,  
 Never moving from the stove.

The aged man wants but little,  
 He makes and sells peasants' shoes ;\*  
 This maintains him. His recreation  
 Is to go to the village church.

By the wall, near the gate,  
 He stands mumbling,  
 And for his sufferings thanks God—  
 He, one of God's children!

He is glad to live, though the grave is not far off,  
 In the dark corner.  
*Where didst thou spend all that strength of thine ?*  
*Poor peasant !*

In the last two lines is summed up all the cruelty of the system of serfdom, and other countries, which might be specified, more in the West of Europe, where we hear a great deal of hypocritical lamentation over the degradation of slavery and the barbarism of Russia, whereas their own peasants, for all practical purposes, are but little better off. The English Hodge, bent double with rheumatism, from exposure to all weathers, mumbling over his wretched workhouse dole, would make a very good companion to poor ragged and barbarous Ivan.

As we are drawing to the conclusion of our article, we see in a contemporary literary periodical† the announcement of the death of another of Russia's peasant poets, Ivan Sourikov, the son of a serf on one of Count Sheremetiev's estates in the Government of Yaroslav. He published a volume of poems in 1871, and appears to have been by trade a seller of old iron, perhaps (as we rather whimsically term it), a marine-store dealer. Our space is already so exhausted that we cannot say more of this interesting man, nor of many others who have made themselves of repute, although of the humblest origin : thus, for example, the eminent engraver Siriakov, whose autobiography was published a short time ago in the Review *Starinu*. The present

---

\* In the original *Lapti* M. Reclus shall explain this word for us. "Nouvelle Géographie Universelle," v. 756. "Les paysans de plusieurs villages vivent dans ces valliers pendant l'hiver occupés à la coupe des bois et à la préparation de l'écorce de tilleul, qui sert à fabriquer des nattes, des paniers, et des chaussures, appelées *lapti*, que portent tous les paysans de la grande Russie."

† *Athenæum*, May 22nd, 1880.

Emperor, by the noble act of emancipation of 22,000,000 of serfs, has justly earned the title of being one of the greatest benefactors which the human race has ever seen. This *great* measure is already bearing its fruits. On the twenty-fifth anniversary of his reign, Alexander II. received, among other gratifying proofs of the love of his subjects, a silver medal struck in his honour by a rich railway contractor, who, till the year 1861, had been a serf. It is such acts, as well as his generous deliverance of the Eastern Christians, which will surround the memory of Alexander with a halo when other regal and imperial puppets have strutted their little hour, and have gone to the limbo of obscurity. We may say to him, in the line of the poet,—

“These are Imperial arts and worthy of thee.”

That Russia may advance in Constitutional Progress, and free herself from the curses of militarism and bureaucratism, must be the hearty wish of every true Liberal, and of all those who know, practically, how much individual worth is to be found in the much-abused (because ill-understood) Russian people.

---

#### ART. IV.—MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

1. *Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister.* Speech of Lord HOUGHTON, in the House of Lords, Tuesday, May 6, 1879, on Moving the Second Reading of the Bill for Legalizing Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister. Published for the Marriage Law Reform Association, 21, Parliament Street, Westminster.
2. *Reasons for Legalizing Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister.* By Lord DENMAN.
3. *An Historical View of the Restrictions upon Marriage, especially in Relation to England. With the True Reasons why Marriage with the Sister of a Deceased Wife was Prohibited.* By AN ANTIQUARY.
4. *Hansard's Debates between the Years 1835 and 1880.*

**B**EFORE the year, 1533, the twenty-fifth year of the reign of Henry VIII., there existed no statute prohibiting marriages on the ground of the consanguinity or affinity of the parties. This matter was then regulated by the Canon Law of the Church of Rome, as part of the common law of the realm; and the validity of marriages in this respect was cognisable exclusively by the Ecclesiastical Courts, subject to the control of the Court of King's Bench. By the Canons of the Fourth

Council of Lateran the prohibition, which had previously extended to persons related in the seventh degree, according to canonical computation, was restricted to those in the fourth degree. This degree included a mother's great grandmother's great grandmother; and a granddaughter's granddaughter, in the direct line; and a brother's, an uncle's, a great uncle's, and a great-great uncle's great granddaughter, in the collateral. In the year 1533 an Act was passed settling the succession to the Crown, dissolving the marriage of the King with his brother's widow, establishing his marriage with Anne Bullen, and fixing, for the first time by statute, the degrees of consanguinity and affinity within which marriages should for the future be unlawful. This statute was afterwards repealed, and several others were passed and repealed touching the same matter, as State exigencies or the caprice of the monarch might dictate. Finally, by the 32nd Henry VIII., cap. 38, it was provided "That no reservation or prohibition, *God's Law except*, shall trouble or impeach *any marriage without the Levitical degrees.*"

On the accession of Elizabeth to the throne she appointed Parker, the chaplain of her mother, Anne Bullen, Archbishop of Canterbury; and Parker, to support the Queen's legitimacy and title, published a Table of Degrees declaring unlawful (among others) marriage with a brother's widow, or with a deceased wife's sister. This Table stands solely on the authority of the Archbishop, having force only within his own province, and on such only within that province as should choose to observe it. It has been contended that the Table was adopted and sanctioned by the Canons of 1603, but these Canons having no force themselves can give no effect to the Table, for they have never been sanctioned by Parliament; and certainly do not bind the laity. Without insisting further on this point we may observe that for about three hundred years the law of marriage in England was regulated by the statute of Henry VIII., and the Table of Degrees and the Canons. But during this long period a man was practically permitted to marry whom he would. A marriage within the prohibited degrees could only be set aside during the lifetime of both the parties, by process in the Ecclesiastical Courts; and the cases were rare indeed in which any such suits were instituted. Even if such proceedings were threatened it was easy for the parties attacked to get a friendly suit commenced and kept on foot until the husband or wife died, when the marriage could no longer be impeached. For several hundred years, therefore, little practical evil resulted from the undue restrictions imposed. The moral sense of the community was not shocked, nor the peace of families disturbed by reason of uncanonical unions having been entered into. Thousands of such marriages must,

during that period, have been contracted, whilst instances in which they were dissolved by the tribunals scarcely amounted to scores.

So matters continued until our own times, when a case arose which occasioned the passing of a new Act upon this subject. A nobleman of high rank and vast estates was the offspring of a marriage with the sister of a deceased wife, and the late Lord Lyndhurst brought in a Bill to limit to two years the time within which such unions could be impeached. After very slight discussion in the House of Lords the Bill was passed, in a form entirely different from that in which it had been introduced; and while all such marriages as had been heretofore contracted were validated, and the issue legitimized, they were for the future not to be *voidable* as before, but *absolutely null and void*. The author of the measure in vain remonstrated against this alteration, the Bishops (headed by Bishop Blomfield) insisting on the change as the indispensable condition of their consent to its passing; and so, to save himself from defeat, Lord Lyndhurst was fain to submit. Of this conduct of the Bishops no explanation has ever been given which exonerates them from a charge of the grossest inconsistency. Professing to believe that the marriage with a deceased wife's sister was unlawful and incestuous, only one course was open to them, and that was to refuse, on any grounds, or for any reasons, to assist in giving them legal sanction. Instead of pursuing this plain and intelligible course, they condoned all the sins of the past, and consented to bless the incestuous couples who had been married before the 31st August, 1835; and proceeded at once to inflict an absolute prohibition of such unions for the future. The mischief and misery caused by this conduct of the prelates of the English Church is quite incalculable; and to this hour the wrong remains unredressed. Thus transformed the Bill came down to the Commons, who refused to accept the prohibition clause in committee, but on the report it was reluctantly accepted; yet only on a distinct assurance that it should be repealed in the following session, a pledge which to this hour remains unredeemed, in spite of constant and resolute efforts on the part of the House to remedy the injustice.

In 1842 Lord Francis Egerton brought in a Bill for that purpose, and was defeated by 123 to 100.

In 1849 the Right Honorable J. Stuart Wortley brought in a Bill, and carried the second reading by 177 to 143.

In 1850 he renewed his effort, and carried the first reading by 149 to 65; the second reading by 182 to 130; and the third reading by 144 to 134.

In 1855 Mr. James Heywood carried the second reading of his Bill by 164 to 157.

In 1858 Lord Bury carried the first reading by 105 to 62; the second reading by 174 to 184; and the third reading by 100 to 70.

In 1859 the same noble lord brought in the Bill, and carried the first reading by 155 to 85; the second reading by 135 to 77; and the third reading by 137 to 89.

In 1861 Mr. Monckton Milnes' Bill was defeated on the second reading by 174 to 155.

In 1862 the Bill was defeated in Committee by 148 to 116.

In 1866 Mr. T. Chambers' Bill was lost on second reading by 174 to 155.

In 1869 Mr. Chambers renewed his attempt, and carried the second reading by 243 to 144, on April 21st; but, through the persistent opposition of Mr. Beresford Hope and others, the Bill could not be got through; and it was withdrawn on August 4th.

In 1870 the three readings of Mr. Chambers' Bill were carried without a division; and the Committee was carried by 184 to 114.

In 1871 Mr. Chambers carried the second reading by 125 to 84.

In 1872 he succeeded on the second reading by 186 to 138; but was compelled by resolute opposition to withdraw the Bill on July 2nd.

In 1873 Sir Thomas Chambers' Bill was read a second time by 126 to 87, and a third time by 98 to 54.

In 1875 Sir Thomas Chambers was defeated on the second reading of his Bill by 171 to 142.

It thus appears that out of twenty-two divisions on the Bills thus enumerated, seventeen gave majorities in favour of the measure, and five against it. Seven times the Bill has been passed in the Lower House, and on several other occasions there were decisive majorities in its favour; but the obstinate opposition offered to its progress at every stage enabled its opponents to defeat it. In truth, it has become quite impossible of late years for any private member to carry a Bill if a very few members are determined on obstructing it. Nor has any proposal ever submitted to Parliament had to face such reckless and resolute opposition as this. No tactics are thought unworthy, so long as their effect is to delay or defeat the measure. A very striking example of this was furnished at the commencement of the last session of the last Parliament. Sir Thomas Chambers gave notice of the introduction of his Bill at the earliest moment, and was so successful on the ballot for precedence that, though there were seventy-seven competitors, he obtained the seventh place. This good fortune would have enabled him to select a convenient and vacant Wednesday early in the Session for the second

reading. But what happened? No sooner was it known that the member in charge of the Bill occupied so favourable a place, than a trick was resorted to which was immediately fatal. There is a standing order of the House that no opposed business can be called on after half-past twelve o'clock at night, and with this engine Mr. Beresford Hope at once made his attack. He put down a notice of motion to oppose the introduction of the Bill—a use of the standing order which in recent years is quite unprecedented. Its effect was all that he desired. Public business went on the next evening until over half-past twelve. Sir Thomas Chambers was, therefore, precluded from bringing in his Bill. The other seventy-six members, to whose Bills no such preliminary objection had been offered, all introduced their measures, and every Wednesday, until August, was immediately taken possession of. The Wife's Sister Bill was thus, by this ungenerous use of an order of the House, if not effectually defeated, yet placed at so great a disadvantage, that there was little prospect of being able to bring on a discussion upon it. So persistent has been this tactic of delay, that for five years last past it has been impossible to submit the Bill to the judgment of Parliament. At the present moment, with more than four hundred members of the House of Commons in favour of the Bill, its chances are at the mercy of some half-dozen fanatical opponents, who for long years have, and for long years will, continue to offer a relentless and unscrupulous opposition. Those in charge of the Bill are helpless; the overwhelming majority at their back is helpless; and unless the Government will give such moderate facilities for debate, by arranging that the public business on a Government night should be suspended, and the Wife's Sister Bill brought on before the hour of half-past twelve, this Session, and twenty succeeding successions may pass, and no progress whatever be made towards settling this painful and long-agitated question. Every member of the Government, without exception, in the House of Commons, is in favour of the Bill, and nearly all of those in the Upper House. The majority is composed of members from all sides of the House, and from all shades of political sentiment; from the professors of all creeds, and the representatives of all parts of the kingdom; and yet, after thirty-eight years of debate, Parliament is mocked, and the country disappointed at the deadlock which is irremovable, even by the most resolute and untiring efforts.

But let us turn from the House of Commons to the House of Lords.

In 1841 Lord Wharncliffe's Bill was lost without a division.

In 1851 Lord St. German's Bill was lost by 50 to 16.

In 1856 his Bill was again lost by 43 to 19.

In 1858 Lord Gage's Bill was lost by 46 to 22.

[Vol. CXIV. No. CCXXV.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LVIII. No. I. H

In 1859 Lord Wodehouse's Bill was lost by 49 to 39.

In 1870 Lord Houghton's Bill was lost by 77 to 73.

In 1871 Lord Penzance's Bill was lost by 97 to 71.

In 1878 Lord Houghton's Bill was lost by 74 to 49.

In 1879 Lord Houghton's Bill was lost by 101 to 81.

Looking at these numbers, the progress which the measure has made among the Peers is very marked. It began in 1851 with 16 friends; it finished last year with 81. Its opponents in 1851 were 50; in 1879 they were 101; so that while those who oppose it have only doubled in numbers, those who support it have increased fivefold. The fluctuations from year to year are, no doubt, very great, and can easily be accounted for from accidental causes, such as the time of year at which the debate came on, or the hour at which the division was taken. It appears, therefore, that while the Commons have passed the measure seven times, and resolved in its favour seventeen times, the Lords have rejected it eight times; once, however (in 1870), only by the narrow majority of four. It is to be deeply regretted that the success of his opposition is due almost entirely to the Bench of Bishops. In every division they are found to largely turn the scale against the Bill. Chargeable as they are with the infinite mischiefs of the Act of 1835, they yet refuse to lend any aid in correcting them; they are resolute, in the face of the House of Commons and of the country, in their attitude of defiance. Verily, they justify their antecedents. For what measure of Reform and Justice have they not resisted? That slavery has been abolished—that the people have obtained Reform—that the Corn Laws were repealed—that an alien Church in Ireland was disestablished—that the Roman Catholics and the Jews have acquired the rights of citizens—so far from being due to their votes and influence, is a result achieved against all their exertions. Which of the Reformers have they not persecuted? Which of the Reforms have they not opposed? All honour to the few of their number (several, alas! departed), who have had the justice and the courage to assist in redressing the wrong done in 1835. Hearty thanks are due to the Bishops of Worcester and Ripon for their consistent support of the Wife's Sister Bill.

We have thus traced the legislative history of this painful controversy. It is impossible to look back to the time-serving shifts and changes of the law in the reigns of Henry VIII., Mary, and Elizabeth without feeling ashamed that matters so momentous as marriage and legitimacy should be the sport of successive sovereigns and of rival politicians. It is equally impossible to regard the Act of 1835 as anything else than a piece of ecclesiastical legislation both inconsistent and cruel, justified by no principle, actuated by no good-will, and followed only by

the sorrowful and angry reproaches of, those who are wounded in their own persons and in the persons of those most dear to them; who writhe under a sense of intolerable injustice, and whose prayers for relief have hitherto been requited only with hope deferred and expectation disappointed.

But whilst this has been going on among us at home, what has occurred in relation to our colonial fellow-subjects? Bills for legalizing marriage with a deceased wife's sister have been passed by the following Colonial Legislatures, and have received the Royal assent in England: South Australia, in 1871; Victoria, in 1873; Tasmania, in 1873; New South Wales, in 1875; Queensland, in 1875; Western Australia, in 1878; Natal, in 1879; and in Canada, such a Bill carried by an overwhelming majority in the House of Assembly, was defeated only by one vote in the Senate, and, it is believed, will certainly be carried through both Houses next year. In the face of such legislation as this in our Colonial dependencies, what possible objection can there be to the passing of a similar measure at home? Why are home subjects to be placed under a disqualification from which their brethren abroad have been relieved? But the hardship and injustice of refusing this relief is not the only inconvenience which it entails. So long as the present law continues in force among us, so long will the emancipation of the colonists remain imperfect and illusory. A year or two ago the question was raised at home as to the *status* of those who, having contracted the marriage in question under the Colonial law—a perfectly legal and valid marriage, under the sanction of the Crown—should come to the mother country to spend the rest of their days. It might have been thought that no serious question on such a point could be raised, and that a union good and valid under both Colonial and Imperial sanction would be good for all time and in all places. But no; we are assured, on the highest authority, that such is not the case; that the marriage with the wife's sister is valid only in the colony and totally void in England. So that when the colonist takes ship with his wife and family to return home, the bond of their union is at once relaxed, becomes looser with every mile of the homeward voyage, and is totally dissolved when he lands at Liverpool. The wife becomes only a concubine—the children lose their *status* of legitimacy. A result more cruel and revolting can hardly be conceived; and yet it is defended and justified on the ground that, in England, such marriages cannot stand on a better footing than similar marriages here. It might well be argued that the cases are totally unlike; the colonist having contracted *legally*, the Englishman *illegally*, in the former case a perfectly good marriage is annulled; in the latter there is no marriage to annul. The anomalies which might



spring from this state of the law are strange and monstrous. Take only one, as an example: The returned Australian, set free from the marriage bond, may take another wife and be guilty of no crime. He may then return to his former home, and there be indicted for bigamy in contracting the second marriage in an English church: which of the two women is his wife will depend upon geographical considerations alone. In Melbourne the woman married to him there will have all the rights and position of a wife, and legal remedies against her husband, if he withhold them. In London, the woman he married here will have the same claims upon him, and he will be subject to a similar process for vindicating them. His position is hopelessly false and embarrassing. Nor is it a sufficient answer to say that the second union is his own act. The law has dissolved his marriage, and made his children illegitimate, and family considerations may prevail over moral, and induce him to replace by a valid union the family ties which have been cruelly sundered by an unjust law. No wonder that memorials to the Queen, in support of the Colonial Marriages Bill, have been passed unanimously by both Houses of the South Australian Legislature, and in other colonies. This measure, introduced by Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, to correct the mischiefs above-mentioned, passed a second reading in the House of Commons in 1878; but has made no further progress. So the colonist has to put up with an illusory, merely local, relief, lest, if complete justice were done him, the absurdity of the restriction at home should be made still more flagrant, and its longer continuance be rendered impossible. One injustice is thus made the plea for another; the Australian is defrauded and deceived in order that the Englishman may have less chance of getting released from a yoke which neither he nor his fathers have been able to bear. Can these things really be so—can they much longer remain so? But the colonists are not the only sufferers from the anomalous state of the law. English subjects have a similar ground of complaint. The marriage in question is, by the Act of 1835, absolutely null and void to all intents and purposes whatsoever; yet, if it is contracted by a married man, he is nevertheless guilty of bigamy: if it is contracted by a man with a woman entitled, as the widow of a deceased officer, to a Government pension, the marriage is held to be good for the purpose of forfeiting the pension; yet it is bad for the purpose of passing property under a will, unless the testator (the husband) describes his wife and children in terms which he would deem it odious to use. For the purpose of collecting revenue, in the form of legacy duties, the parties are deemed not to be related, and ten per cent. duty is chargeable; yet their relationship is too close to make their marriage lawful. Inconsistency and injustice can scarce go farther.

What, then, are the objections in view of which the Bill which proposes to remedy all this has been resisted for forty years? The first was the theological objection. With this the opposition started, and for many years it maintained its ground. But for the last seven years it must be considered as having been abandoned. The more the matter was investigated, the more clear it became that the objection had no real foundation. All Biblical criticism, ancient and modern—Roman Catholic and Protestant, Jewish and Christian—was against it. At length the Commentary on the Bible brought out, a few years ago, under the auspices of the late Speaker, and written by the most eminent theologians and scholars of the day, finally settled the question against the opponents of the Bill. So much for the objection to the *principle* of the measure; now for the objections to the *frame* of it. First, it is said it does not go far enough—that it falls short of a thorough carrying out of its own principle; for why is permission not given to the man to marry his brother's widow? Without going into the question as to whether the wife's sister and the brother's widow are analogous, it is sufficient to say that, as it is drawn, the Bill would relieve ninety persons out of every hundred who complain of the present restriction. Practically, the existing grievance would be removed; and an objection that we should go further, though deserving of respectful attention when urged by our friends, is worthy of none when pressed by our opponents. Their object is to defeat the remedy we propose, not to make it more effective. If we cannot altogether reverse a false principle, we do, nevertheless, accomplish a great good by limiting the range of its operation. If we can diminish by nine-tenths the mischiefs which we are unable wholly to rectify, we have rendered a great public service, and a sneer at our inconsistency for not attempting more may easily be borne.

Next, it is said, that to interpose for those who have broken the law is to encourage the law-breakers, and lead them to suppose that they can transgress with impunity; that if we put the transgressor into the same situation as the observer of the law, we invite transgression. To this there are two answers—First, that the Bill does *not* put the offender into the situation he would have occupied had he been obedient to the existing statute; for, while it would restore *status* and legitimacy, it leaves untouched all interests in honour and property already vested; the basis of the objection is therefore gone. But, secondly, the objection is worth little, estimated at the highest; for the commonest way in which unjust laws are brought into that degree of public odium which afterwards leads to their repeal, is to show that the general opinion does not support them, nor the people obey them; and, hence, they either remain

obsolete on the pages of the statute book, and are not invoked for the purpose of punishing transgressors, or, if so invoked, they are at once swept away in a burst of popular indignation. It must not be quietly assumed that to break a law is necessarily to commit a sin, though, in doing so, a man is (technically) guilty of a crime; such breach of law may be a venial offence, a moral right, or a solemn duty, according to the nature of the law transgressed. No platitudes about the duty of obeying the law can convince people that they are to sacrifice natural and inalienable rights at the bidding of a blind, an ignorant, or a prejudiced legislation. It is still true that there are cases in which it is right to obey God rather than man; and, undoubtedly, if there be a region within which human freedom, and not positive law, should take its course, marriage is that region. "Those whom God has joined together," ought not by human laws to be put or kept asunder.

But, further, on this question of the retrospective clause of the Bill, to which so much hasty and superficial objection is taken, it ought to be known to such critics that there is *no precedent* for an Act to alter the law of marriage *which has not been retrospective*. The Act of 1835 found its sole reason, as well as its occasion, in its retrospective provisions. Without them it would never have been proposed; without them it would never have been passed. But Lord Lyndhurst's Act validated only certain marriages before then voidable by process in the Ecclesiastical Court. But take an earlier, and a far stronger, instance of the retrospective making good of marriages—not when they were so far only without sanction of law as to be liable to be set aside by the proper tribunals, but when they were crimes—not misdemeanors only, punishable by fine and imprisonment, but felonies—capital felonies—punishable with death. Such were the marriages of priests for several centuries in this country. But what was done by Parliament in relation to such marriages? Why, after certain statutory mitigation of atrocious penalties, ultimately, by two successive Acts, they were declared to be good and valid to all intents and purposes, and their issue was made legitimate. No objection was then taken that men, whose lives had actually been forfeited by the commission of a crime so heinous as that of marriage, could not be entitled to legislative absolution and restoration to social *status*—that such unparalleled leniency would encourage future transgressors, and bring the law into contempt! It was reserved for the opponents of this Bill to recommend the monstrous injustice of repealing a restriction on marriage which could no longer be justified or maintained, and which never ought to have been imposed; and, at the same time, of leaving under the ban of unlicensed con-

cubinage and of illegitimacy the parents and children who had already suffered so much under the obnoxious law. This would be to bless and curse in the same breath—to declare the marriages in question to be both infamous and innocent in the same sentence—and, by the same enactment, both to allow and to disallow them.

But suppose the Bill passed without a retrospective clause, and all precedent thus set at defiance; what would be the effect of such a measure? First, it would punish the wrong persons; for the guilty parents could at once walk over to the Registrar's Office and be lawfully married, and so the real culprits would evade the threatened penalty, while their innocent offspring, born before such marriage, will be illegitimate (in England though not in Scotland), whilst those born thereafter would be legitimate; and so one-half of every family would have a brand on them—a stigma inflicted by a wicked law; the other half would be free: and thus the bitterest of all enmities would be awakened in the homes of English subjects—and schisms and hatreds be sown among the offspring of the same parents, bound under the highest obligations to love one another. A Bill, not retrospective, would, therefore, be a deliberate defiance of all legislative precedent, and an open abandonment of all principle. It would be a Bill to punish the innocent, and leave the alleged guilty to go free; a Bill to introduce and to perpetuate, in our happy homes, jealousies and discords of the most painful description.

But there yet remain other objections to be examined; objections founded on sinister augury and dark insinuation as to the moral and social consequences of the proposed change in the law. The objections may be thus stated as coming from the lips of the objectors. To enable a man to marry his deceased wife's sister would be to alter his whole relation to his sister-in-law; to preclude that free, frank, and affectionate intercourse which at present binds the family together, and replace it by a hard and distant courtesy without warmth or cordiality. That if the widower might marry his sister-in-law; it would be impossible for her to reside in his house and take charge of his motherless children; that scandal would arise; that the purity of domestic life would be seriously endangered, and our national character deteriorated; that whilst a restricting law is unnecessary in the case of near relations, because in all well-constituted minds there is an insurmountable repugnance to the marriage of such persons, yet that, in proportion as you pass to those relatives more distantly connected, it becomes more imperatively necessary to restrain marriage by force of law; and whilst nearness in consanguinity, of itself, at the dictate of Nature, precludes a

sexual connexion, that is by no means the case where affinity is in question. Here Nature dictates no such forbearance, and unless statutory prohibition existed, there would seem to be no obstacle to such union; so that the necessity and importance of legal prohibition is in exact proportion to the distance of the relationship between the parties, and the decency, purity, and propriety of home life—left in peril so far as natural instincts are concerned—must be secured and protected by legislative penalties.

We have stated these objections as fairly and forcibly as we could. Let us take the last argument first, and submit it to quiet examination. Surely it has a strange aspect. Marriage is a law of Nature; the union of the sexes is the strongest natural instinct. The God of Nature has fenced it round with such securities as prevent the marriage of the nearest blood relations—a self-acting and perpetual protection. But, say these objectors, Providence has not done enough; it has left it open for persons related by this affinity to marry freely, without shame or conscious impropriety. This will never do. The legislature must step in to remedy an oversight so glaring. The sanctity of marriage, the purity and peace of domestic life, all lie exposed and defenceless, so far as Divine law is concerned, and hence what may be done without breach of sacred precept, or the wounding of a natural instinct, shall be forbidden by arbitrary enactment, and punished with the heaviest penalties. The freedom given by the Author of Nature must be fettered to make it safe, and new restraints must be imposed to effect some good objects which seem to have been overlooked by the Supreme Legislator. Verily, this doctrine savours rather of the irreverent, to say the very least; for why are Archbishop Parker and all his brethren, and successors, to step upon this hallowed ground, charge Divine Law with being defective, and supplement it with arbitrary precepts and provisions of their own? Why allow first cousins to marry? Why not add a long catalogue of blood relations more distant than those now included in the Table of Prohibited Degrees? You are engaged in a noble task—helping Divine Providence to purify and make more perfect the domestic relations. Be true to your principle and convictions; your principle is that God's Law must be mended; your conviction is that you know how to do it. Be worthy of your lofty aims: those aims are, the purification and rectification of domestic relations, the enhancement and security of the virtues and affections of home, by penal and prohibitory legislation, dictated by your own wisdom and philanthropy! Nay, but this plan has been tried before. Restriction and prohibition have done their best and their worst; and with what result let the history of

Christendom tell. Forbidding to marry, described by an Apostle with solemn severity, as a "doctrine of devils," has been the cause of more crimes and miseries, more scandals and sins, than can be traced to any other agency; their name is legion, their memorial is on the face of history and literature. Long centuries of shameful impurities; whole volumes of loathsome Church censures; and indignant Church denunciation; Popes and Bishops in one breath, both causing and cursing the profligacy which made society putrid; forbidding marriage, and so encouraging licentiousness; resolutely refusing to natural instincts their pure and appropriate and Divinely-sanctioned gratification, and so opening the floodgates of a debauchery, such as the world had never witnessed before; yet all this while putting forth the pretext of purity, a purity above and beyond that which God had demanded; a purity beside which the institution which God had hallowed was to be deemed unclean, and, as might have been expected, just in proportion as the professed aim was to raise men above the level of the morality prescribed by the Divine Law, so men fell below the level even of the heathen profligacy. Every new prohibition created a new sin, every new restraint brought in a fresh license. At length the world sickened at the spectacle, and lay legislatures began the wholesome work of repealing and undoing the infinite mischiefs which had been wrought by priestly devices; one fetter after another was struck off, and one vice and misery after another died away; and it became obvious that, while restraint on marriage was the fruitful source of evils nameless and numberless, liberty to marry was the great sweetness of our domestic life; for prudery is not purity; its alliances are quite in the opposite direction. Peril is very near our most cherished domestic virtues when men talk of refining natural instincts by a process having no Divine sanction, and our bishops and priests holding such views and legislating on such principles may be safely charged with the unspeakable horrors of a thousand years. This argument answers all the rhetoric of the meeting at St. James's Hall in February last. But, if this be thought inconclusive,—if it should be said we do not forbid marriage, but only certain marriages, the forbidding of which on lofty and transcendental grounds is demanded by the exalted standard of New Testament morals, then we pass to another consideration not less forcible and conclusive of the controversy. Our opponents argue that prohibition, more or less extensive, and purity go together. To this, we reply, as above, that the reverse is signally and universally true. But we go farther, we say that as restriction was tried for a thousand years, and ended in producing only a shameless debauchery, so for hundreds of years in

this country, subsequent to the Reformation, an unrestrained liberty, a license of the widest description, produced no traceable evils in society whatever. For this statement the authority of the late Lord Campbell may be cited. He was a strong opponent of the Wife's Sister Bill; but in a powerful speech against it in the House of Lords he stated that for several hundred years a man, practically, might marry whom he pleased, and yet during all this long period, when marriages within the prohibited degrees might be contracted without fear of punishment or detection, there is absolutely no trace whatever on the pages of our national history—in the records of our Courts of Justice—in the volumes of our literature, secular or sacred—in biographies and diaries, of any scandal or flagrant immorality consequent on the state of the law which Lord Campbell described. The force of this argument can hardly, we think, be overrated, nor can the fact be denied. It is simply incredible if frequent infringements of the law of Nature had occurred, by the marriage of very near relations, so as to taint society in general, or be available as an argument at all, that no notice of it should be found in our satirical poets, whose function it is to lash the vices of the age; none in our historians, whose business it is to give a faithful portrait of the people; none in our divines, whose duty it is to denounce wickedness and sin. Yet from none of these quarters can any evidence be obtained to justify the inference that unrestricted liberty to marry led, to any appreciable extent, to improper and incestuous marriages. But, if this be so, then contrast the picture of society groaning under the intolerable restraints of the Church, and yet sunk in the depths of a loathsome depravity, with the infinitely higher tone of morals and domestic purity which prevailed among us when the thunders of prohibition were silent, and when even the wholesome and unobjectionable restraints of positive law were suspended. The great experiment of social morals has been tried under both systems, both pushed to an extreme,—license and restraint—and the issue, broad, clear, irresistible, remains for the instruction and admonition of the civilized world. Every syllable of sinister prediction uttered by our opponents as to the loosening of moral bonds and laxity of sexual morality should the Bill in question be passed, is not only without shadow of proof, but it is refuted, in the most conclusive way, by the history of morals under the hardest bondage of restraint and under the law of the widest irresponsibility and license. What comes, then, of the puerile assertions or insinuations that, because in countries where a man may marry his sister-in-law, some one here and there is found who marries his niece or his stepdaughter, that therefore these objectionable

alliances *result* from the liberty given to marry the deceased wife's sister? The instances are too few to sustain an argument at all, and they occur in countries under which, not freedom to marry, but forbidding to marry had been the rule for many ages. The whole prophecy is a dream and a delusion. Everywhere in Christendom, except in Great Britain, the forbidden marriage is allowed, and among ourselves thousands of such marriages have been contracted; where can it be shown that any vice has been created, any immorality fostered, by reason of this freedom to marry?

But this is only half the argument—nay, less than half; for while no case, even plausible, can be made out for these croakers of evil omens, an overwhelming case is established, on irresistible evidence, to show the mischiefs of the present restriction. It is among the poor that the unions in question most frequently take place. The widowed labourer or artisan finds his home desolate by reason of his bereavement, his children motherless and uncared for. By sheer necessity he must have his sister-in-law to take charge of his family. In defiance of the law, but in deference to propriety, he marries her, or he does infinitely worse, and establishes not only an unlawful but an immoral connexion. No wonder that, many years ago, the Bishop of London and four hundred of the metropolitan clergy petitioned in favour of this Bill, because of the frequent and frightful immoralities and scandals occasioned by the present law. No wonder that Dr. Vaughan (Dean of Llandaff and Master of the Temple), who had been for years Vicar of Doncaster, declared that the Act of 1835 “created sin.” Such a result hardly requires to be proved by statistics, for it is inevitable. Yet there is no minister of religion, no medical man well acquainted with the poor, who does not know the unspeakable mischiefs which flow from this absurd restriction on marriage. The land is tainted with them. And at whose door must these sins and sorrows be laid?—at the door of the Bishops' Bench in the House of Lords. A word from them for justice and purity would, long years ago, have altered the law and healed the morals of the people, but they never uttered it. Their attendance as legislators is never so sure as when this reproach is sought to be wiped away. A Bill sent up from the Commons to abolish that unspeakable nuisance, the small suburban races, with all their degrading and demoralizing associations, found not half-a-dozen prelates to support it, whilst, on eight occasions, they have mustered in dozens to refuse the redress asked for by this Bill. We not only indignantly deny that decency and purity can be injured by its passing—we most confidently rebut the charge—not with vague confidence and sinister prediction, but with plain, positive, irrefutable facts. What issue to this controversy of forty years can there be but one,—the pass-



ing of the measure? The divorce between positive law and the public feeling widens every day. Those who contract the marriages in question have the sympathy of the people. Society does not condemn, but condones, the technical illegality. Men of all ranks, even the highest, of all professions, even the most sacred, enter into these unions and are held irreproachable. It is felt that, in almost all instances, they are dictated by love for motherless children, and deference to the expressed wish of the dying mother. It is recognized that the tenderness of the step-mother, who is also an aunt, who has known the children from infancy, and already learnt to love them, must far exceed that of a stranger suddenly ushered into the home; that in certain ranks of life, and among millions of the population, this marriage is the only practicable alternative to concubinage; and that the public morals and the national character are concerned in the question. The public see in the persistent and virulent opposition to the Bill nothing but ecclesiastical rancour and sentimental repugnance; and though both be combined they can find no justification for this flagrant infringement of civil and religious liberty. The ecclesiastic may cling to his clerical superstition, the sentimentalist to his æsthetic aversions, but the mass of mankind must not on that account be stinted of their freedom in a matter so near and so dear to them as this. The domestic honour, purity, and peace of thousands of British homes must be vindicated and secured, though a bishop may be shocked at the infringement of an obsolete canon, and the over-delicate refinements of an aristocrat be wounded. Legislation must be guided by the instincts of the masses, and be framed to secure their interests. A law which offends the public sense, and encourages crime and wickedness, cannot be altered too soon. Every day that it continues to deface the statute-book it affronts the opinion and lowers the morals of the whole people. A long series of eminent senators and statesmen, politicians and divines, philosophers and moralists, have argued and struggled in this cause. Every objection has been met and refuted; opponents have been driven from every position in succession. The country has been enlightened and convinced. In every form in which public opinion can express itself, it has spoken in favour of this change. The women were once against it, but are brought round. Scotland, bent and bound under the bondage of an ecclesiastical covenant, has shaken itself free, and ranges itself among the friends of the Bill; not only its municipalities but its presbyteries petition in its favour; Church censures are revoked, Church discipline relaxed—nay, Church formularies revised in favour of the Bill; Parliament, so far as the Lower House is concerned, has a majority of near four to one in its favour. In

the Lords the Heir Apparent and other Royal Princes support it. Nothing stands in the way of the immediate triumph of the cause but a handful of High Church members of the House of Commons, armed with a standing order of the House, which enables them to stay the progress of the Bill as effectually as a single file of soldiers may stay and defy an enemy at the mouth of a pass. This obstruction only the Government have the power to remove, and an appeal (not yet successful) is now made to the Premier to interpose, for the sake as well of the dignity of Parliament as of the sacredness and justice of the cause. Both of the great Parties in the State have, through the Colonial Office, allowed the Colonial Bills, and have obtained for them Imperial sanction. The civilized world looks on with amazement at the confusion—every year worse confounded—which the anomalies and inconsistencies of our system present, anomalies for which our Cabinets and our Parliaments are both responsible. They could not remain uncorrected and unremoved for a month were it not that the actual numbers interested, although large, are not large enough to give impetus and momentum to the movement for redress. It is safe to trample on the feelings and resist the appeals of a few thousands; and to minds of a certain class there is a kind of fascination in being able, year after year, to mock the prayers and defeat the hopes of those who suffer, without power to take revenge. Their only appeal is to the kindly sympathy; their only trust is in the earnest support of the millions who have no personal interest in the question. Whether the aid from that source shall come in force sufficient for the purpose this year or next, or at a remoter period, remains to be seen, but come it undoubtedly will.

---

ART. V.—THE LIFE OF THE PRINCE CONSORT.

*The Life of His Royal Highness the Prince Consort.* By THEODORE MARTIN. Vol. V. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1880.

IN reviewing this volume we shall pursue the same course as we followed with regard to the earlier ones—viz., We decline to follow Sir Theodore Martin into the history of that portion of the Queen's reign to which the volume relates, and shall confine ourselves to the personal life of the Prince Consort.

The familiar antithesis between preaching and practice receives abundant illustrations from this volume. In all but the

last letter the Prince wrote to the Crown Princess of Germany, and which was sent to greet her on the twenty-first anniversary of her birth, he repeated to her a caution often before given : " Without the basis of health it is impossible to rear anything stable. . . . Therefore see that you spare yourself now so that at some future time you may be able to do more."\* Most excellent advice ! By way of comment on it we read in a letter written from Osborne, to the same correspondent (23rd May, 1860):—

" Your letter of the 20th has found me in the enjoyment of the most glorious air, the most fragrant odours, the merriest choir of birds, and the most luxuriant verdure ; and were there not so many things that reminded one of the so-called world (that is to say of miserable men), one might abandon oneself wholly to the enjoyment of the real world. There is no such good fortune, however, for poor me, and this being so, one's feelings remain under the influence of the treadmill of never-ending business. The donkey in Carisbrook,† which you will remember, is my true counterpart. He, too, would rather munch thistles in the Castle Moat than turn round the wheel at the Castle well ; and small are the thanks he gets for his labour."‡

The Prince seems to have overlooked the distinction between the position of the donkey at Carisbrook and the man at Osborne—viz., That the donkey's work was compulsory, while the man's was voluntary ; that a great part of the man's multifarious labours were self-imposed, and that the overwork under pressure of which the Prince in the end succumbed, was caused by his assuming or interfering with the discharge of duties which might equally well, if not better, have been left in the hands of those properly responsible for their due performance.

This letter also illustrates what we said of the Prince in a former article, " that amidst all the splendour of his position, if he was not actually unhappy, his state of mind was habitually melancholy and morbid."§ That opinion was formed on the evidence|| of a trustworthy and competent witness (Dean Stanley), and his evidence is confirmed by the biographer :—

" It was a characteristic of the Prince Consort that he contemplated the prospect of death with an equanimity by no means common in men of his years. This was owing to no indifference or distaste of life. He enjoyed it, and was happy and cheerful in his work, in his family circle, in loving thoughtfulness for others, and in the sweet return of affection which he brought back for himself. *But he had none of that strong yearning for life and fulness of years which is felt by*

\* " Life," vol. v. 414.

† Employed in pumping up water for the supply of the Castle.

‡ " Life," vol. v. p. 111.

§ WESTMINSTER REVIEW, N.S., No. cvi. p. 438.

|| Ubi supra.

those who shriek from looking beyond the warm precincts of the genial day 'into a strange and uncertain future.' He had no wish to die, but he did not care for living. Not long before his fatal illness, in speaking to the Queen, he said, 'I do not cling to life. You do; but I set no store by it. If I knew that those I love were well cared for, I should be quite 'ready to die to-morrow.' In the same conversation he added, with prophetic foresight, 'I am sure if I had a severe illness, I should give it up at once; I should not struggle for life; I have no tenacity of life.' This was said without a trace of sadness: he was content to stay, if such were Heaven's will; he was equally ready to go hence, should that will be otherwise. Death, in his view, was but the portal to a further life, in which he might hope for a continuance, under happier conditions, of all that was best in himself and in those he loved, unclogged by the weakness and unsaddened by the failures, the misunderstandings, the sinfulness and sorrows of earthly existence."\*

The Prince's words speak for themselves, and we think that in spite of the gloss his biographer attempts to put on them, they justify our assertion as to his habitually melancholy and morbid condition of mind. Further proof of our assertion is to be found in the following passage in a letter from the Prince to his daughter, referring to the marriage of her sister to the Prince Louis of Hesse: "Louis already begins to say and to complain that the marriage is unnecessarily postponed, and that the interval ought to be abridged. Such is man! He desires to see the fairest moments of his life curtailed, because he knows the issue, and longs to leap towards it at once. How wisely is it ordained that in general we do not know our destiny and end; but for this no one would wish to live."† Again, referring to the twenty-first anniversary of his marriage, he says, "It is now with these twenty-one years as with the fourscore years of the Bible, if they have been delicious, yet they have been labour and trouble."‡ The biographer also speaks of the Prince's "patient, cheerful, considerate spirit, which toil, and trial, and disappointment seemed only to ripen into fuller beauty."§ Labour, trouble, and disappointment were not what people generally thought the characteristics of the Prince's career; and we must say this biography is singularly wanting in proof that they were so.

This volume also confirms the suspicion we before expressed, "that the Prince's Diary, and his Letters to the Queen and to other members of the royal family, were always written in German, and that German was the language in which the family usually conversed.|| His biographer says, "he thought in German if he wrote in English," and that—

"Life," vol. v. p. 413, conf. WESTMINSTER REVIEW, No. cvi. p. 438.  
*Ibid.* p. 259. † *Ibid.* p. 292. § *Ibid.* p. 332  
*Vide* WESTMINSTER REVIEW, N.S., No. cxi. p. 153, note.

"Not feeling sure of the idiomatic accuracy of his English he would constantly bring his English letters to the Queen to read through, saying, '*Lese recht aufmerksam und sage wenn irgend ein Fehler da ist*' ('Read carefully, and tell me if there be any faults in them'). Or, in the case of Drafts on political affairs, he would say, '*Ich hab' Dir hier ein Draft gemacht lesees mal, Ich dächte es wäre recht so*' (Here is a draft I have made for you. Read it. I should think this would do'). He kept up this habit to the close of his life."\*

That this supervision was needed appears from the facsimile of the Prince's last draft, given at p. 423, where his original wording, "the doubtless breach of international law," is corrected by the substitution, in the Queen's writing, of '*undoubted*' for '*doubtless*'.

In a previous Paper we ventured to express our "doubt whether the movement for Italian unity had the entire and cordial sympathy of the Prince. It was too democratic in its spirit and operation."† This doubt is strengthened by the perusal of this fifth volume.

To the ever-sympathising Stockmar the Prince indulges in a sneer at the two Ministers of England, adopting a nickname given Lords Palmerston and Russell by the late Lady William Russell: "In Italy," he writes (24th January, 1861), "strange things are taking place." It is still, however, the idol of the two 'old Italian masters,' who are, nevertheless, alarmed at the spread of the Revolutionary conspiracies throughout Eastern Europe."‡ The head and front of Lord Russell's offending was his celebrated Note to Sir James Hudson of the 27th October, 1860:—

"You, too," writes the Prince to Stockmar (29 Nov. 1860), "will have been annoyed at Lord John's note; a country like this ought not to help to increase the general confusion of what is legal and right, but should uphold the moral law. The craving of individual statesmen to thrust themselves into the van in the general movement, and to make themselves conspicuous, is a constant temptation to mischief. . . . Sir George Lewis said to me lately, 'I find that the Cabinet is an institution intended to prevent individual Ministers from immortalizing themselves at the expense of the country.' This would be a valuable institution if ever it fulfilled its destiny."§

On another occasion he unbosoms himself to the same willing recipient of his contemptuous feelings towards Lord Russell: "Lord John, who is now called Earl Russell, will perhaps be surprised when he sees his influence in the country damaged. However, the atmosphere of the Upper House may perhaps have a soothing effect upon him."||

\* "Life," vol. v. p. 273. Conf. p. 275.

† WESTMINSTER REVIEW, N.S. cxi. p. 179.

‡ "Life," vol. v. p. 287.

§ *Ibid.* pp. 251, 252.

|| *Ibid.* p. 372.

Whether, as was said, the despatch in question gave offence to nearly all the European Governments, we will not undertake to say, but this volume gives us, without reserve, the opinions as to it of the Prussian Government. The Prince Regent of Prussia—the present Emperor of Germany—having informed the Prince Consort of the nature and spirit of the proceedings of the meetings of Sovereigns at Warsaw, in the fall of 1860, “The Prince,” we are told, “communicated, without loss of time, to Lord Palmerston and Lord Russell, a summary of his correspondent’s communication.” The permanent and irresponsible Minister of the Constitutional Queen of England thus conveys to her responsible Ministers, the censure of the meeting of arbitrary monarchs on the Italian policy of England:—

“The Prince [of Prussia] does not deny that the late Italian policy of England was viewed with very great regret. . . . He seems very unhappy about Lord John Russell’s last published despatch, which he calls a tough morsel to digest, in which he sees a description of the law of nations as hitherto recognised, *and of the holy ties which bound people and Sovereigns*, and a declaration on the part of England, that wheresoever there exists any dissatisfaction among a people, they have the privilege to expel their Sovereign, with the assured certainty of England’s sympathy. The Prince sees great difficulty in the way of future agreement with England if that is to be the basis of her policy, and regrets the effect it has had in destroying the sympathies which were arising for her on the Continent.”\*

Were these nascent sympathies, we may ask, founded on a supposed deflection of England to arbitrary principles of government? The Prince Consort in nowise dissented from the opinions of the Prince Regent, nor intimated that he held them, subject to any reservation or qualification, and his biographer improves the occasion by pronouncing, *ex cathedra*, the following judgment on the despatch and its author, which, we are told, was that also of the Prince:—

“A simple recognition of the change which had taken place in Italy was all that was required from England, any vindication of the means by which it had been brought about was quite uncalled for; and a vindication upon the grounds on which it was rested by Lord Russell’s despatch, however valuable to the Italians, was scarcely prudent from the pen of an English Minister, involving as it did the assertion of principles which might prove extremely inconvenient and even perplexing to himself or his successors in upholding English rights and English interests under certain possible contingencies. It was said, with great force at the time, ‘that any Emperor or President of a Republic, who entertained an inconvenient sympathy for Canada, for Ireland, for India, or for the Channel Islands, will remember that

\* “Life,” vol. v. pp. 225—6.

Vattel and Lord John Russell approve of foreign intervention against oppressive and unpopular Governments.' The remedy in the case of Italy, like the circumstances, was wholly exceptional, and nothing was to be gained by an attempt, like that made in this despatch, to reduce to a legal basis what was, in effect, the violent breach of every legal right."\*

With lawyer-like astuteness Sir Theodore Martin does not give his readers the opportunity of comparing Lord Russell's despatch with his adverse criticisms on it, and so enable them to judge how far these censures were deserved.

In justice to the memory and reputation of Lord Russell, we will give our readers the more important passages of the despatch, that they may form their own judgment on the question. In reading it our readers will bear in mind Lord Russell's celebrated definition of what an English Foreign Secretary should be—viz., that he should not be the Minister of Austria, the Minister of Russia, nor the Minister of France—he would certainly, had he thought of it, added Prussia,—but he should be the Minister of England; and it was as an English Minister that he composed this despatch. He desired to tell the people of Italy that—

"Though the power of England, so far as it was physically concerned, was not to be employed to coerce their rulers, but that, in so far as the moral influence of England and of its Government is concerned, the world shall know that we are friendly wheresoever we find a large endeavour, on the part of any body of men, to vindicate to themselves the right of self-government."†

Lord Russell says, of this despatch, that in it he "evinced the sympathy which the British Government felt towards the people of Italy, and confirmed, by the authority of Vattel, the maxim, that when a people, from good reasons, take up arms against an oppressor, it is but an act of justice and generosity to assist brave men in the defence of their liberties." It is, therefore, the character of an asserter, and not a disturber, of the Law of Nations in which Lord Russell appears in this despatch. His description of the relations of the Roman and Neapolitan Governments to their peoples is an admirable comment on the Prince Regent of Prussia's idea of the "holy ties which bind people and Sovereigns."

"It appears," writes Earl Russell to Sir James Hudson, "that the late proceedings of the King of Sardinia have been strongly disapproved of by several of the principal Courts of Europe. The Emperor of the French, on hearing of the invasion of the Papal States by the army of General Cialdini, withdrew his Minister from Turin, expressing at

---

\* "Life," vol. v. p. 227.

† Vide Debate on the Foreign Policy of the Whig Ministry, July, 1850.

the same time the opinion of the Imperial Government, in condemnation of the invasion of the Roman territory.

“The Emperor of Russia has, we are told, declared, in strong terms, his indignation at the entrance of the army of the King of Sardinia into Neapolitan territory, and has withdrawn his entire mission from Turin.

“The Prince Regent of Prussia has also thought it necessary to convey to Sardinia a sense of his displeasure; but he has not thought it necessary to remove the Prussian Minister from Turin. After these diplomatic acts it would scarcely be just to Italy, or respectful to the other Great Powers of Europe, were the Government of Her Majesty any longer to withhold the expression of their opinions.

“In so doing, however, Her Majesty’s Government have no intention to raise a dispute upon the reasons which have been given in the name of the King of Sardinia for the invasion of the Roman and Neapolitan States. Whether or no, the Pope was justified in defending his authority by means of foreign levies; whether the King of the Two Sicilies, while still maintaining his flag at Capua and Gaeta, can be said to have abdicated—are not the arguments upon which Her Majesty’s Government propose to dilate.

“The large questions which appear to them to be at issue are these: were the people of Italy justified in asking the assistance of the King of Sardinia to relieve them from Governments, with which they were discontented, and was the King of Sardinia justified in furnishing the assistance of his arms to the people of the Roman and Neapolitan States?

“There appear to have been two motives which have induced the people of the Roman and Neapolitan States to have joined willingly in the subversion of their Governments. The first of these was, that the Governments of the Pope and the King of the Two Sicilies provided so ill for the administration of justice, the protection of personal liberty, and the general welfare of their people, that their subjects looked forward to the overthrow of their rulers as a necessary preliminary to all improvements in their condition.

“The second motive was, that a conviction had spread since the year 1849, that the only manner in which Italians could secure their independence of foreign control was by forming one strong Government for the whole of Italy.

“The struggle of Charles Albert, in 1848, and the sympathy which the present King of Sardinia has shown for the Italian cause, have naturally caused the association of the name of Victor Emmanuel with the single authority under which the Italians aspire to live. Looking at the question in this view, Her Majesty’s Government must admit that the Italians themselves are the best judges of their own interests.

“That eminent jurist Vattel, when discussing the lawfulness of the assistance given by the United Provinces to the Prince of Orange when he invaded England, and overturned the throne of James II., says, ‘The authority of the Prince of Orange had doubtless an influence on the deliberation of the States-General, but it did not bind them to the commission of an act of injustice; for where a people, from



good reasons, take up arms against an oppressor, it is but an act of justice and generosity to assist brave men in the defence of their liberties.

“Therefore, according to Vattel, the question resolves itself into this: Did the people of Naples and of the Roman States take up arms against their Governments for good reasons?”

“Upon this grave matter Her Majesty’s Government hold that the people in question are themselves the best judges of their own affairs. Her Majesty’s Government do not feel justified in declaring that the people of Southern Italy had no good reasons for throwing off their allegiance to their former Governments; Her Majesty’s Government cannot, therefore, pretend to blame the King of Sardinia for assisting them. There remains, however, a question of fact. It is asserted by the partisans of the fallen Governments that the people of the Roman States were attached to the Pope, and the people of the Kingdom of Naples to the dynasty of Francis II., but that Sardinian agents and foreign adventurers have, by force and intrigue—subverted the thrones of these Sovereigns. It is difficult, however, to believe, after the astonishing events that we have seen, that the Pope and the King of the Two Sicilies possessed the love of their people. How was it, one must ask, that the Pope found it impossible to levy a Roman army, and that he was forced to rely almost entirely upon foreign mercenaries? How did it happen, again, that Garibaldi conquered nearly all Sicily with 2,000 men, and marched from Reggio to Naples with 5,000? How, but from the universal disaffection of the people of the Two Sicilies?”

“Neither can it be said that this testimony of the popular will was capricious or causeless. Forty years ago the Neapolitan people made an attempt regularly and temperately to reform their Government under the reigning dynasty. The Powers of Europe assembled at Laybach, resolved, with the exception of England, to put down this attempt by force. It was put down, and a large foreign army of occupation was left in the Two Sicilies to maintain sound order.

“In 1848, the Neapolitan people again attempted to secure liberty under the Bourbon dynasty, but their best patriots atoned, by an imprisonment of ten years, for the offence of endeavouring to free their country. What wonder, then, that in 1860, the Neapolitan mistrust and resentment should throw off the Bourbons, as, in 1688, England had thrown off the Stuarts?”

“It must be admitted, undoubtedly, that the severance of the ties which bind together a Sovereign and his subjects is in itself a misfortune. Notions of allegiance become confused; the succession to the throne is disputed; adverse parties threaten the peace of society; rights and pretensions are opposed to each other and mar the harmony of the State. Yet, it must be acknowledged, on the other hand, that the Italian revolution has been conducted with singular temper and forbearance. The subversion of existing power has not been followed, as is too often the case, by an outburst of popular vengeance. The extreme views of democrats have nowhere prevailed. Public opinion has checked the excesses of the public triumph. The venerated forms

of Constitutional Monarchy have been associated with the name of a Prince who represents an ancient and glorious dynasty. Such have been the causes and concomitant circumstances of the Revolution of Italy. Her Majesty's Government can see no sufficient ground for the severe censure with which Austria, France, Prussia, and Russia, have visited the acts of the King of Sardinia.

"Her Majesty's Government will turn their eyes rather to the gratifying prospect of a people building up the edifice of their liberties, and consolidating the work of their independence, amid the sympathies and good wishes of Europe."\*

This view of the Italian situation was the one natural and proper to be taken by the leader of the great historic Party, whose greatest achievement was the accomplishment, on the principles of this despatch, of "the Glorious Revolution of 1868," and not the least prominent article of whose party's creed is "Civil and Religious Liberty all over the world." To quote a journal which, during Lord Russell's life, never gave him more than a grudging and reluctant support, but at the close of his life gave a tolerably fair summary of his career:—

"Earl Russell had a healthy detestation of the despotic principles which, in his own youth, were favoured by CASTLEREAGH, and which cast reproach on the name of England. He was far more clear-sighted than some masters of foreign policy who have left greater fame. . . . The struggle of the Italians for unity found in him sagacious sympathy; and, indeed, he must have known that all the artificial arrangements made and sanctioned by the Congress of Vienna must swiftly come to an end."† Of course, this despatch could not have been read otherwise than with hearty disapproval at Vienna, Paris, Berlin, and St. Petersburg, and equally so by the Prince Consort, although his disapproval of it involved disloyalty to the principle of the Revolution which placed the House of Brunswick on the throne of England. Those principles are shown in the forcible statement of the grounds and circumstances of our glorious Revolution, to be found in the Preamble to the Articles of Impeachment in the Sacheverell case:—

"Whereas, His late Majesty, King William III., then Prince of Orange, did, with an armed force, undertake a glorious enterprise for delivering this Kingdom from Popery and arbitrary power; and divers subjects of this realm, well affected to their country, joined with and assisted His Majesty in the said enterprise; and, it having pleased Almighty God to crown the same with success, the late happy Revolution did take effect and was established."‡

\* "Recollections and Suggestions" by John, Earl Russell, p. 279, et seq. *Vide* also Earl Russell's "Speeches and Despatches," vol. ii. p. 259.

† Biographies reprinted from *The Times*, 1870-1879, p. 205, Art. "Earl Russell."

‡ Burton's "History of Anne," vol. ii. p. 200.

Earl Russell, whose object, end, and aim was to be and speak as the Minister of England, would care little for the disapproval of his despatch by despotic Courts. It, therefore, was an impertinence on the part of the Prince Consort to convey to him their disapproval; nor can we reconcile this act of the Prince's with his professed reverence for, and submission to, the Constitutional doctrine of Ministerial responsibility.

If any annoyance were felt by Earl Russell on reading the Prince Consort's communication, it was far more than compensated by the grateful acknowledgment of Count Cavour and General Garibaldi of the efforts made by British statesmen to help Italy in the good work of securing for herself the blessings of independence and freedom."\*

We recur to the Prince Consort's views on the question of Ministerial responsibility.

The Government of Prussia contemplated the introduction of the principle of Ministerial responsibility into the Government of that country. Grave apprehensions were entertained in high quarters in Prussia as to the safety and propriety of this proceeding. For the purpose of removing these apprehensions the Crown Princess, after the manner of her father, wrote "A Memorandum upon the Advantages of a Law of Ministerial Responsibility." Our official and courtly biographer assures us that the

"Prince must have read this paper with no ordinary satisfaction and pride. It would have been remarkable as the work of an experienced statesman; and as the fruit of the liberal political views in which the Prince had been at pains to train its author, it must have filled his mind with the happiest auguries for her fulfilment of the great career which lay before her."† With reference to the liberality of opinion here imputed to the Prince, we have, on the other hand, the testimony of Bishop Wilberforce. "In conversation with the Prince (writes the Bishop to his brother) he showed himself very right principled, regretting the Liberal tendencies of things undisguisedly."‡

Our eyes are not gladdened by a perusal of this interesting State Paper; but, instead, we have a translation of a letter from the Prince to his daughter, containing his own views on the subject, which we are at a loss to reconcile with his practice. We give this letter in full:—

"The notion that the responsibility of his advisers impairs the monarch's dignity and importance (*Wurde*), is a complete mistake. Here we have no law of Ministerial responsibility, for the simple reason that we have no written Constitution; but this responsibility

\* "Recollections and Suggestions," p. 285.

† "Life," vol. v. p. 260.

‡ Ashwell's "Life of Wilberforce," vol. i. p. 200.

flows, as a logical necessity, from the dignity of the Crown and the Sovereign. 'The King can do no wrong,' says the legal axiom, and, hence it follows that somebody must be responsible for his measures, if these be contrary to law or injurious to the country's welfare. Ministers, here, are not responsible *qua* ministers, that is, *qua* officials (as such they are responsible to the Crown), but they are responsible to Parliament and the people of the country, as 'advisers of the Crown.' Any one of them may advise the Crown, and whoever does so is responsible to the country for the advice he has given. The so-called 'accountability' of Ministers to Parliament does not arise out of an abstract principle of responsibility, but out of the practical necessity which they are under of obtaining the consent of Parliament to legislation and the voting of taxes, and as an essential to this end of securing its confidence.

"In practice, Ministers are liable to account for the way and manner in which they have administered *the laws which they conjointly with Parliament, have made*, and for the way they expended the moneys that have been voted for definite objects. They are bound to furnish explanations, to justify their proceedings, to satisfy reasonable scruples, and the answer, We have, as dutiful servants, obeyed the Sovereign will not be accepted; 'Have you acted upon conviction, or have you not?' is the question. 'If you have not, then are you evil servants of the Crown, who counsel and do what you consider wrong or unjust, with a view to retain your snug places, or to win the favour of the Sovereign;' and this being so, Parliament, as a matter of course, withdraws its confidence from them.

"Herein, too, lies that Ministerial power of which Sovereigns are so much afraid. They can say, 'We will not do this or that which the Sovereign wishes, because we cannot be responsible for it.' But why should a Sovereign see anything here to be afraid of? To him it is, in truth, the best of safeguards. A really loyal servant should do nothing for which he is not prepared to answer, even though his master desires it. This practical responsibility is of the utmost advantage to the Sovereign. Make independence, not subservience, the essential of service, and you compel the Minister to keep his soul free towards the Sovereign, you ennoble his advice, you make him staunch and patriotic, while time-servers—the submissive instruments of a monarch's extreme wishes and commands—may lead, and often have led, him to destruction. . . . The Sovereign should give himself no trouble about details, but exercise a broad general supervision, and see to the settlement of the principles on which action is to be based. This he can, nay, must do where he has responsible Ministers, who are under the necessity of obtaining his sanction to the system which they pursue and intend to uphold in Parliament. This, the personally-ruling Sovereign cannot do, because he is smothered in details, does not see the wood for the trees, and has no occasion to come to an agreement with his Ministers about principles and details which, both to him and them, can only appear to be a great burthen and a superfluous nuisance."\*

\* "Life," vol. v. pp. 260, 265.

We have no wish to be hypercritical, but we must point out an error of no small importance in this exposition of Constitutional principles.

The Prince speaks of "the laws which they (the Ministers) have made conjointly with the Parliament." This attributes to the Ministry for the time being the possession of a co-equal and co-ordinate legislative power with Parliament; but, in fact, Ministers, whether collectively or singly, have no greater legislative power than any other member of Parliament. Of course, when we speak of power, we distinguish power from influence and the means and opportunities of exercising it. It is as a member of one or other House of Parliament, and not as a Minister that any Minister introduces any Bill, and he is exposed to the same liability to defeat—every one's memory will readily supply him with instances—as a private member. As members, Ministers, conjointly with a majority of other members, make the laws; but the Ministry, as a body separate and distinct from Parliament, does not conjointly with it make laws.

The Prince lays down an admirable maxim, viz.—"That independence, and not subservience, should be the essential of the service to be rendered by a responsible Minister to the Sovereign; but how can such independence exist if, as in the Prince's case, there stands beside the throne an irresponsible Minister ever ready to supervise, to check, to control, and, if it seem good to him, even to thwart the Minister responsible to Parliament and the country. "The common clay which forms earthly mortals" enters largely into the composition of all statesmen, even of those the most imperious towards their equals. This is shown when they have to deal face to face with the Sovereign, We know that even the haughty, high-minded and overbearing Chatham, when treated by George III., on resigning the seal of office, with some small marks of kindness, was so influenced by "misplaced sentiments of Loyalty," that he burst into tears in the presence of one who, as a moment's reflection must have convinced him, was playing a part to undermine his character, destroy his influence, and counteract all his great designs for his country's good."\* Nor does it make any difference whether the Minister's dealings with a Sovereign, when that Sovereign happens to be a Queen Regnant, are with her personally or with one who, like the Prince Consort, was persuaded by courtly advisers that he was the Queen's *alter ego*,† and who, if he himself did not in words assert the existence of that relation by his acts, made

\* Brougham, "Statesmen of George III.," p. 24. Edition (French) 1839.

† "Memoirs of Baron Stockmar," vol. ii. p. 504.

every one else feel that so he looked upon himself and expected them to do so likewise.

We refer to these five volumes, *passim*, for proof that the Prince's interference with Ministers tended to make them subservient rather than independent.

The contrast between the Prince's theory and his practice is even greater in the case of another of his maxims: "The Sovereign," he says, "should give himself no trouble about details." Yet, not even George III. entered more than the Prince into all the *minutiae* of business. The same authority from whom we just now quoted tells us, in the case of George III. :—

"Not a step was taken in foreign, colonial, or domestic affairs that he did not form his opinion upon it, and exercise his influence over it. The instructions to ambassadors, the orders to governors, the movements of forces, down to the marching of a single battalion in the districts of this country, the appointment to all offices in Church and State, not only the giving away of judgeships, bishoprics, regiments, but the subordinate promotions lay and clerical, all these form the topics of his letters; on all his opinion is pronounced decisively; on all his will is declared peremptorily."<sup>\*</sup>

The Prince Consort we know admired George III., whom he called "that good King who occupied the throne during sixty years, and carried this country successfully through the most momentous struggle of its history,"† and he not unsuccessfully endeavoured to follow the example of that monarch's universal interference. . . .

Though, as we have seen, he constantly complained that he was overwhelmed with business, his interference in all matters small and great continued unrelaxed to the end of his life.

For instance, he was much exercised in mind on the subject of the Order of Merit for India, "going into the whole question," says his biographer, "in his usual exhaustive way."

Great difficulties arose in settling the name and insignia of the Order, and it is startling to find so many men of ability engaged in the settlement of what to many would seem to be a very trifling matter. Our biographer's narrative supplies us with a characteristic illustration of Scottish shrewdness and tenacious regard for Scottish interests, shewn by that "Scotus Scotorum" Lord Chancellor Campbell. It has been agreed that the name of the new Order should be, "The Star of India and England," when the Lord Chancellor unexpectedly raised the objection that,

"England is colloquially used to represent the United Kingdom,

\* Brougham, *ubi supra*, p. 4.

† Speech at opening of Manchester Exhibition, 1857. "Speeches," p. 89.

but never internationally, or between the Crown and people. The proposed title would seem to exclude Scotland and Ireland from connection with India,—which," the Chancellor went on to say—"would be very unjust to the late Marquis of Dalhousie, and many other natives of Scotland, who have taken a distinguished part in conquering and governing India."

The Prince, on hearing from the Secretary of State for India that this objection was raised, wrote to him: "The fatality which attaches to the choice of a name for the Indian Order appears still to pursue it, and now the Lord Chancellor rises up as a giant against it! I am afraid we must bow to his objections and start afresh." The proposed name was abandoned, and others were suggested; but, wrote the Prince to the Secretary of State, "we get no further with the appellation of the Order than from one difficulty into another, and I might be inclined to give it the sign and name of a House at Toplitz," the sign being gilt figures of men rowing against a rock with the title of "The Golden Impossibility." In the end the name fixed on was "The Most Exalted Star of India," and "most of the Prince's suggestions (we are told), were carried out in the insignia of the Order."\*

The Queen had decided on annually giving at the then newly opened Wellington College a medal for good conduct, and the Prince must needs add to his other occupations the drawing up of the regulations in reference to its bestowal. The state of the Naval Reserve and the training of boys for the navy also engaged his attention. In fact, the biographer says, "There was no topic in connection with the national defences on which the Prince did not take means to keep himself thoroughly informed. The improvements in all kinds of firearms were the subject of his most careful study and observation." Within two months of his death we find him writing to Lord Palmerston that he was glad to see he was keeping up the steam "about our defences," and giving him his experience gained during his last deerstalking at Balmoral "of the advantages of the breech-loading rifle, which had not then obtained general recognition." The origin of his fatal illness was traced to his exposure to a day of what he called in his Diary "terrific rain," on which he visited the works of the new Military Academy at Sandhurst, made a careful survey of what was being done, and found, "to his satisfaction, that the works since he had last seen them had made good progress."† On reading these accounts

---

\* "Life," vol. v. p. 100—5. The then Secretary of State for India was Sir Charles Wood, Bart., M.P., now Viscount Halifax.

† "Life," vol. v. pp. 403—417.

of the Prince's restless activity, we are not surprised to find that when his illness had assumed a dangerous character, the Queen, on talking over with Sir James Clark and Dr. Jenner, what could have been its cause, was told "Great worry and far too hard work for long."\*

The biographer inserts a letter from Lord Palmerston to the late Sir Charles Phipps, for the purpose of showing that statesman's concurrence in the Prince's views on Constitutional questions, stated in his letter to his daughter, and his testimony to the fact that they had been uniformly acted upon by the Queen and inculcated by the Prince.

The letter is dated 22nd November, 1863, nearly two years after the Prince's death, and we are not told on what occasion it was written:—

• "As to the Queen," Lord Palmerston writes, "her steady adherence to, and studious observance of, the principles and practice of the Constitution have, during the whole of her reign, been appreciated and admired by men of all political parties.

"One great security for the Throne in this country is the maxim, that the Sovereign can do no wrong. This does not mean that no wrong can be done, but it means that, as the Sovereign accepts and acts by the advice of those Ministers who, for the time being, enjoy the confidence of the Crown, it is those Ministers, and not the Sovereign personally, upon whom must fall the blame or the criticism which any acts of the Royal prerogative may produce. There is scarcely any action of the power of the Crown to which some persons or some parties would not object; and if the objectors could throw upon the person of the Sovereign the blame which they may be led by their view of the matter to attach to the action of the prerogative, the result would be very injurious to our monarchical institutions. A strict observance of these fundamental principles does not, however, preclude the Sovereign from seeking from all quarters from whence it can be obtained the fullest and most accurate information regarding matters upon which the responsible Ministers may from time to time tender advice, and upon which it is not only right, but useful, that the Sovereign should form an opinion, to be discussed with the Ministers if it should differ from the tendered advice."†

It would be more satisfactory if we knew under what circumstances this letter was written, but the countenance here given to the practice of the Sovereign consulting advisers other than the responsible Ministers, is not in accordance with Lord Palmerston's earlier views on the subject. This appears from a letter of his written at the time of the Ministerial changes of 1822.

The opinions expressed in this letter are, it will be seen, quite

---

\* "Life," vol. v. p. 432.

† Ibid. p. 265.



inconsistent with the admission of the Prince's claim to be the Queen's Private Secretary and permanent Minister:—

"You see," writes Lord Palmerston to his brother, "Bloomfield is ousted, it is a vile intrigue of Knighton and the Conynghams. The Cabinet, however, has taken this opportunity to insist upon the abolition of the office of Private Secretary, which was a most unconstitutional intervention between the King and his confidential advisers; the Secretaries of State are the Secretaries of the King."\*

One thing we are glad to learn from the Prince's epistolary treatise on Constitutional questions, that he had outgrown the Prussian idea of the "Holy ties which bind peoples and Sovereigns." The Princess, in her Memorandum, had dealt with the proposition that the patriarchal relation in which monarchs of old were supposed to stand towards their people was preferable to the Constitutional system, which interposes the Minister between the Sovereign and his subjects—

"The patriarchal relation," replies the Prince, "is pretty much like the idyllic life of the Arcadian shepherds—a figure of speech, and not much more. . . ."

"It was the fashionable phrase of an historical transition period . . . . fostered with the sentimentalism of the Kotzebue school, and the betrayed peoples were required to become good children, because the Princes styled themselves good fathers. . . . The July Revolution, and all that has taken place since then, sufficiently demonstrates that the peoples neither will nor can play the part of children."†

We have referred to one point of likeness between the Prince Consort and his great exemplar George III., and we cannot omit to point out another—viz., a scarcely concealed dislike of Parliamentary Government, and an unconcealed desire to be quit of the presence of Parliament and of its supervision and control over the Government of the day. As we find George III., in his correspondence with Lord North, at one time "commenting on the line taken in debate as 'dangerous,'" at another as "timid and vacillating," at another suggesting "that the journey of Mr. Fox to Paris should make the different departments bring on all their business before he comes back, as we shall have much less noise for the next three weeks," or, again, expressing his conviction "that the Speaker's illness is feigned, and all to let the Opposition have their pleasure at Newmarket." So, also, do we find, in the Prince Consort's letters

\* Ashley's "Life of Palmerston," vol. i. p. 88. Bloomfield had been Private Secretary to George IV. The story of Bloomfield's dismissal is related by Greville, "Journal," vol. i. p. 50.

† "Life." vol. v. pp. 262-3.

mostly in those to Stockmar, whom we know, by his own confession, looked upon and stigmatized the House of Commons as "absurd and usurping," such remarks as these:—

"In politics all the fiends have been let loose with a vengeance. . . . In Parliament, too, things look no better. . . . Even our Cabinet is beginning to see things rightly. The Reform Bill is happily withdrawn. . . . Here Parliament has up to this time been very quiet. Later on we shall have difficulties to deal with, as I fear there will be a considerable deficit. . . . "Our Parliament is tolerably quiet; in Berlin, on the other hand, the debates have been very keen."\*

It is significant of the Prince's views that the very reactionary speech of Sir Bulwer Lytton against the Reform Bill of 1860, is pronounced by him to be "a real masterpiece."†

On one of the greatest events of the present reign the Cobden Commercial Treaty, the Prince looked with small favour:—

"The Commercial Treaty," he writes to the Prince Regent of Prussia, "which was signed two days since in Paris, will not give satisfaction here, because it gives France our coal and iron—the two elements of our superiority hitherto—and in return, by loss of duties upon wine and articles of luxury, causes us an immediate deficit in income of two millions! while eighteen months will elapse before facilities will be given for the introduction of our wares."

Yet the Prince professed to be a Free-trader, he foresaw—

"That the adoption by France of the Free-trade system must give Germany an impulse in the same direction, and that the advantages of that system will be far greater for that country than any which can be foreseen for France."

To his daughter (the Princess Royal) he preaches sound Free-trade doctrine:—

"The lowering of import duties, according to all *practical experience*, increases consumption, so that larger imports are made than under the higher tariff. It is not the few who are able to pay largely that produce large amounts, but the multitude, who individually are able to pay but little; and therefore the revenue gains by the reduction of duties, and ours has done so enormously. Protected industries do not thrive because, but in despite, of protection. This is a theorem that has been proved to absolute demonstration. A country's industrial power is something quite irrespective of its size. Windsor is a little place, with 14,000 inhabitants, and competes in the manufacture of soap with London, which has two millions and a half. Dorsetshire is smaller than Prussia, and yet it has to compete with all England."‡

The cause of the Prince's indifference, if not hostility, to the Cobden Treaty, has been thus truly stated: "The majority of

\* "Life," vol. v. pp. 108, 134, 179, 271, 305, 308.

† Ibid. p. 88.

‡ Ibid. p. 14, 23, 53.

the Cabinet were clearly not very eager for Cobden's complete success. The tone of the Court was hostile to the French Emperor, and in the then nearly balanced state of political parties the Court had great influence.\*

In reading this volume we see in each successive chapter the gradual cooling, and in the end the extinction of the warm personal friendship which at one time existed between the Courts of England and France.

In the course of the last year but one of the Prince's life he delivered the latest, and one of the best, of his public speeches. It was the Inaugural Address at the London meeting of the "International Statistical Congress" (16th July, 1860). The Congress owed its establishment to M. Quetelet, of whose invaluable instruction in the principles of statistical science the Prince enjoyed during his stay at Brussels in 1836.

Some materials for the Prince's Address were supplied to him by our great English statistician, Dr. Farr, who records that he was struck by the mastery of the subject shown by the Prince, and the use he made of the information Dr. Farr had given him; but "the Prince's Address," he adds, "was entirely his own"; and we have the following testimony of Lord Palmerston that "it excited universal admiration in all its hearers and all its readers." We can only afford space for one extract:—

"We hear it said that the prosecution of statistical science leads necessarily to Pantheism and the destruction of true religion, as depriving, in man's estimation, the Almighty of His power of free self-determination, making His world a mere machine, working according to a general prearranged scheme, the parts of which are capable of mathematical measurement, and the scheme itself of numerical expression! that it leads to Fatalism, and therefore deprives man of his dignity, of his virtue, and morality, as it would prove him to be a mere wheel in this machine, incapable of exercising a free choice of action, but predestined to fulfil a given task, and to run a prescribed course, whether for good or for evil. These are grave accusations, and would be terrible if they were true. But are they true? Is the power of God destroyed or diminished by the fact that the earth requires 365 revolutions upon its own axis, to every revolution round the sun, giving us so many days to our year, and that the moon changes thirteen times during that period; that the tide changes every six hours; that water boils at a temperature of 212 degrees, according to Fahrenheit; that the nightingale sings only in April and May; that all birds lay eggs; that 106 boys are born to every 100 girls? Or is a man a less free agent because it has been ascertained that a generation lasts

\* Article in the *Fortnightly Review* for March, 1877, by Mr. J. Slagg, now M.P. for the city of Manchester, and quoted in Ashworth's "Cobden and the League," p. 380.

about thirty years; that there are annually posted at the post-offices the same number of letters on which the writer had forgotten to place any address; that the number of crimes committed under the same local, national, and social conditions is constant; that the full-grown man ceases to find amusement in the sports of the child? But our statistical science does not even say that this must be so; it only states that it has been so, and leaves it to the naturalist or political economist to argue that it is probable, from the number of times in which it has been found to be so, that it will be so again, as long as the same causes are operating. It thus gave birth to that part of mathematical science called the calculation of probabilities; and even established the theory that in the natural world there exist no certainties at all, but only probabilities. Although this doctrine, destroying man's feeling of security to a certain extent, has startled and troubled some, it is nevertheless true that, whilst we may reckon with a thoughtless security on the sun rising to-morrow, this is only a probable event, the probability of which is capable of being expressed by a determined mathematical fraction.

“But we are met also by the most opposite objection; and statistics are declared *useless* because they cannot be relied on for the determination of any given case, and do only establish probabilities where man requires and asks for certainty. This objection is well founded, but it does not affect the science itself, but solely the use which man has in vain tried to make of it, and for which it is not intended. It is the essence of the statistical science, that it only makes apparent general laws, but that these laws are inapplicable to any special case; that therefore what is proved to be law in general is uncertain in particular. Herein lies the real refutation also of the first objection; and thus is the Power, the Wisdom, and Goodness of the Creator manifested, showing how the Almighty has established the physical and moral world on unchangeable laws, conformable to His eternal nature, while He has allowed to the individual the freest and fullest use of his faculties, vindicating at the same the majesty of His laws by their remaining unaffected by individual self-determination.”\*

In composing this last passage, had the Prince, consciously or unconsciously, in his mind Pope's line:—

“And binding nature fast in fate,  
Left free the human will”?

Our biographer does not give us much information as to the Prince's literary tastes and judgments, or as to his acquaintance with English literature, but we find a letter from him to Mr. Tennyson, requesting him to write his name in the Prince's copy of the “*Idylls of the King*”:—

“You would thus add,” writes the Prince, “a peculiar interest to the book containing those beautiful songs, from the perusal of which I

derived the greatest enjoyment. They quite rekindle the feeling with which the legends of King Arthur must have inspired the chivalry of old, whilst the graceful form in which they are presented blends those feelings with the softer tone of our present age.”\*

During the last year of his life the Prince read “The Mill on the Floss,” “Hypatia,” Hamley’s “Life of Wellington,” and “The Woman in White,” which last he describes as being “a most interesting and exciting book.”†

The Prince’s letters referring to the engagement of the Princess Alice to Prince Louis of Hesse, as to which this volume gives many particulars, exhibit his character in its most amiable light. On another aspect of his character we derive information from a different source than Sir Theodore Martin. In Canon Ashwell’s fragment of a “Life of Bishop Wilberforce” we find the following extract from one of the Bishop’s letters to a friend :—

“The Prince is a thoroughly sincere Lutheran, and, not feeling our mode of keeping Sunday to be essentially religious, he does not feel bound to conform to it, whilst he does feel that as its mode of keeping with us is now associated with all our religious feelings, he would on no account violate the religious feelings of others, consequently *cards* are always banished on Sundays, but very often he plays at a round German game of four at chess with three gentlemen present. I never play, because, I explained, that whilst I could not say that I thought the *act* wrong, yet I thought it would be highly inexpedient in me to have it said that a clergyman played. I have never been asked again, but always sit at another table in conversation with the Queen.”‡

The time was now approaching for the Prince to pay the penalty of his sins against those natural laws, the duty of obedience to which he always enforced on others. Early in 1860 the Prince wrote to Stockmar: “I am tired to death with work, vexation, and worry.” In the spring of that year he “had real influenza, with fever.” In the autumn he paid what proved to be his farewell visit to Coburg, and while there took part in a Wild Boar Drive. One of his companions on this occasion was Lord John Russell, whom we should have as little expected to find engaged in such a sport as to have found him—to quote the well known words of Sydney Smith—“commanding the Channel Fleet or performing the operation for the stone.”

Greater success attended him on this occasion than—if Sydney Smith be right—was usual, for the Queen records that “the Prince shot three boars and Lord John one!” During this visit an accident occurred to the Prince’s carriage, by which his life was exposed to serious danger, and the shock then given to

\* “Life,” vol. v. p. 91. † Ibid. pp. 91, 352. ‡ P. 377; *vide* also p. 259.

his overwrought nervous system weakened him to resist the attacks of the disease to which he succumbed. There were now abundant signs that the Prince's constitution began to show how much too great the strain upon it had been; and so when, in 1860, the Society of Arts renewed the proposal for holding the second International Exhibition, the Queen, without the knowledge of the Prince, wrote to Lord Granville, expressing her earnest hope that he would do all that in him lay to prevent the responsibility and labour of conducting the undertaking being thrown in any way on the Prince.

"The Queen felt deeply the necessity for averting any addition to the heavy work already entailed on the Prince, by the assistance and support (every day more needful to her) which he gave her in the transaction of all public business; and Her Majesty was convinced that he could not again undertake the labour he had gone through in conducting the first exhibition to its successful termination, without injury to that health, which was not only most precious to herself and his family, but to the country, and even to the world."\*

Nevertheless, we are told that the work of organizing the details of the Exhibition added very largely to the labours of the Prince during the last spring and summer of his life. At the close of this year the Prince had an attack of "real English cholera," and in February, 1861, he was attacked with an illness which took the form of inflammation of the nerves of the upper part of the cheek, indicating "a serious disturbance of the nervous system, and general lowering of the vital powers."†

In the following month the death of the Duchess of Kent occurred, and the effect produced on the Queen of "this first great sorrow of her life," compelled the Prince to take upon himself even more than his wonted labours, in lightening for her the daily and hourly duties of communicating with her Ministers." Unfortunately, also, Sir George Couper, who for many years had been the Duchess's secretary and comptroller of her household, died just fourteen days before her, and so was not able "to hand over her complicated affairs to any one;" and the Prince, her sole executor, "was left wholly without advice or assistance, and had to puzzle out everything and to hunt up whatever was necessary for their comprehension." This was no slight aggravation of his fatigues.‡ Those who saw him at the opening of the Royal Horticultural Gardens, on the 5th June of that same year, will remember "his pallid and worn look."

On the 16th of June the Prince's diary contained this entry:

---

\* Vide Sir Arthur Helps. Introduction to the "Speeches and Addresses of the Prince Consort," p. 44. Edition 1864.

† "Life," vol. v. 291, 295

‡ Ibid. 333-6.

"Am ill, feverish, with pains in my limbs, and feel very miserable." A similar attack followed in July, and such attacks were now recurring with alarming frequency. A visit to Ireland gave him some rest and change. From Ireland the Court went to Balmoral, for what proved to be the Prince's last visit to the home which, it is scarcely too much to say, he had created.

Another marriage amongst the Royal children now loomed in the future. "We hear nothing but excellent accounts of the Princess Alexandra," the Prince notes in his diary; and adds, with obvious satisfaction, "that the young people seem to have taken a warm liking for each other."\* On his return to Windsor the Prince was much distressed and affected by the sudden death of his relative, the King of Portugal, and an unexplained "anxiety and annoyance of a private nature haunted him with the persistency with which even trifles haunt the mind when the nervous system has been overtaxed."

In reference to this anxiety he wrote, in his very last letter to Stockmar: "I am fearfully in want of a true friend and counsellor, and that *you* are the friend and counsellor I want you will readily understand." Sleeplessness set in, and we learn from his diary of the 24th of November, "That the last fourteen nights had been almost entirely wakeful." Nevertheless, he ceased not from his labours. His journeys to London, on various matters, became so frequent that the Queen wrote to Sir Charles Phipps (his secretary), calling his attention to their repeated recurrence, and urging him to save the Prince from unnecessary business.

The end was now at hand: at the close of November the fatal illness set in; the distressing details of its progress and of its termination are told by our author with painful minuteness. Into these details we shall not enter. On the 1st of December the Prince rendered his last service to the Queen and the country. He rose at seven A.M., "though so weak that he could hardly hold his pen while writing," and "wrote a draft for the Queen to write to Lord Russell in correction of his draft despatch to Lord Lyons" (in reference to the complication with the United States), arising out of the "Trent" affair, "which the Prince did not approve." We are told that the Prince's amendments "at once commended themselves to Lords Palmerston, Russell, and Granville." Our author gives us the Prince's memorandum, but withholds Lord Russell's despatch. His readers, therefore, are left without the means of forming any opinion of the respective merit of the Prince's and the Minister's drafts.†

The Prince grew worse from day to day. In one of his last

---

\* "Life," vol. v. 391, 413.

† "Life," vol. v. 421, 422. Vide *Saturday Review*, 3rd of April, 1880.

conversations with the Queen he said to her: "That he did not know what his illness could come from." "I told him," her Majesty writes, "it was overwork and worry." He said: "It is too much; you must speak to the Ministers." We think we are justified in saying that the Prince's overwork and worry were not caused by any Ministers, but by his unceasing interference with them. The disease rapidly made progress. Towards the close a cloud of unconsciousness descended upon the sufferer, and he died without pain, surrounded by his sorrowing wife, children, and friends, of whom his state prevented his taking any formal farewell.

The time has not yet come for forming an exact and dispassionate judgment on the Prince's character and his influence on the time, the country and the institutions in which he lived. The sketch of his character by Sir Arthur Helps, prefixed to the volume of "Speeches and Addresses," and the final chapter of Sir Theodore Martin's "Life," cannot be otherwise considered than merely official *éloges* written to order. Into critical examination of them our want of space forbids us to enter. We part with Sir Theodore with the expression at once of our thanks for much pleasure and information derived from his work, and of our hope that he will, in future editions, improve it by judicious compression, and by the removal of the blemishes caused by the introduction of topics of merely party and temporary interest.



#### ART. VI.—GAME LAWS AND GAME PRESERVING.

1. *A Bill for the better Protection of Occupiers of Land against Injury to their Crops from Hares and Rabbits.* (Parliamentary Paper.)
2. *The Game Laws.* A Speech of Mr. P. A. TAYLOR, in the House of Commons, March 2, 1880. (The Anti-Game Law League.)
3. *The Anti-Game Law Circular.* 1872-3. (The Anti-Game Law League.)

**P**UBLIC attention has latterly been drawn with increasing urgency to the general question of game preserving in England, partly by the unfortunate condition of the agricultural classes for several years past, which has given special prominence to all the causes of their depression, and partly by the measure which Parliament has been asked to enact for their relief. It is



natural that both interest and controversy should be excited over this intrusion into the Legislature, under Government auspices, of a question which has so long and so studiously been kept beyond the pale of Cabinet reforms. It is true that even now we are but lopping a branch from an evil of gigantic growth, and that years may elapse before we see the axe laid to the root of the tree. The Bill which (at all events in theory) is to place a new weapon of self-defence in the farmers' hands purports to deal with only one aspect of the system of game preservation; it does not touch the moral side of the question in any adequate sense, and it barely so much as recognises the existence of the Game Laws, with their unsatisfactory administration and their unhappy effects. But if we have less to be grateful for than might have been the case, and if the instalment of reform which is offered to us appears to be smaller than the authors had the power to grant, it would be unreasonable to depreciate that which is actually set before us. For the first time in our history a popular Liberal Government, raised to office with a special mandate for social legislation, and representing in a particular manner the democratic forces of the country, has undertaken to deal with this very difficult and complicated question essentially, not to say exclusively, in the interests of the masses. More than this, the measure which is to restrict the undue preservation of game by landlords on the holdings of their tenants has been introduced into the House of Commons by Mr. Gladstone and his principal colleagues, and it has been placed by the Cabinet in the forefront of its programme. They who have for years past been more or less ardent advocates of reform in this direction, from such as would altogether sweep away the Game Laws and the game preserving system to such as would at any time have accepted a moderate compromise, may fairly claim this fact as a justification for whatever ardour and insistence they may have displayed in attacking one of the last remnants of feudal injustice. It may be interesting at this moment to take a general survey of the social and political question which has sprung out of the existence of the Game Law code, to trace the progress of the long struggle for reform, and to estimate the probable value of the measure introduced by Government.

The common law of England recognized no property in game or other wild animals, unless it were acquired by taming or confining them; but a qualified property became vested in the occupier of land on which animals *feræ naturæ* were born or killed. The right was to be earned, in the words of the old law books, *per industriam, propter impotentiam, ratione soli, or propter privilegium*—the latter condition applying in the case of those who received free forest rights, park or warren rights

and thus had the privilege of taking and appropriating game to the exclusion of others. It is clear that the common law principle which shut out the notion of absolute property in game, in every case where the animals were not reduced to the condition of stock or merchandise, or to an article of food in the hands of one capable of dealing with it as such, was based upon natural and necessary deductions. The fiction of property when strained beyond this, and the network of statute-laws which have practically transferred the game from the people to landowners, were the product of many centuries. The ante-Norman and Norman kings began the expropriation by numerous edicts and forest laws, which were protested against more or less vainly by those who framed the charters of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; though, in spite of edict and penal ordinance, the soundest exponents of the law never permitted the true doctrine to be lost sight of. Blackstone, in his "Commentaries," was only reiterating the declarations of his predecessors in every age when he wrote, "It is indisputable that the wild denizens of the field, marsh and forest, known to lawyers under the name of *feræ naturæ*, are the common property of men, be their degree what it may." The animals in question were always recognized as "*nullius in bonis*"—the goods of no man in particular; that is to say, the common property of mankind.

The rights claimed by the Norman kings, in the so-called "forest law," which was a concomitant of the feudal system, were stoutly contested, not so much in the interests of the people at large as in those of the great nobles and landowners. The *Charta de Foresta*, obtained in 1225, and several times confirmed, nominally put an end to the afforestation of the land of subjects by the monarch. Henry VIII. secured the assent of the owners over whose land he desired to create a chase at Hampton; but Charles I. re-asserted the claims of his forefathers, under circumstances of the most oppressive character. He did not, indeed, return to the ancient penalties of castration, loss of eyes or limbs, which existed up to the time of Richard I., but he made arbitrary seizure of the lands of many of his nobles, and extorted fines from trespassers and others to the amount of twelve thousand and even twenty thousand pounds. In course of time the forest laws, as such, fell into disuse; but unhappily their place was not left void. The aristocracy, which deserved credit for limiting the privileges of the Crown where these were unjust, must bear the blame of having, in their turn, encroached upon the popular rights by legislation or otherwise. The Game Law, as it was in the last century, and as we have it now, is what Blackstone called it in his own day, only a "bastard slip" from the same root as the forest law. Another legal writer, not unworthy of a

hearing, has declared that the new system is "attended with particular circumstances of aggravation; for whereas the old law was for the protection of the King's diversions, and was local, this is in favour of all lands and great landholders, and extends to every spot of ground in the kingdom; so that, coming more nearly home to the observation of men, it is more generally felt, though indeed less severely, than the Forest Law."\*

The revolution before which Charles I. succumbed, and the subsequent revolution which drove his son from the throne, effected a great change in the circumstances under which afforestation by the Crown had been possible. It was in the succeeding century that a Parliament by no means directly representing the people, though it did directly represent the aristocracy, built up a system of Game Laws specially calculated to protect the sporting privileges of the owners of land. The forest law wiped out, common law remained as the bulwark of popular rights in regard to the taking of game; and the tendency of legislation by landowners was, not unnaturally, to limit these common-law rights by specific statutes in a contrary sense. The effect of what they did is very well expressed by Blackstone, when he tells us that "the only difference between the old Norman Forest Laws and the new Game Laws is, that formerly there was only one great hunter throughout the land, whereas at present a petty Nimrod reigns in every manor-house." Verily the great commentator, whose sound legal instinct is rarely called in question, was animated by a wholesome and lively scorn of these oppressive statutes; but his condemnations of the Game Laws are matched in vigour and sternness by the judgments of a hundred authorities equally forcible with himself.

We need not examine the statutes passed before the year 1820, inasmuch as the Act 1 and 2 William IV., c. 32, repealed the majority of those which had preceded it, in order to consolidate and re-enact their provisions. An Act passed in the ninth year of George IV., specially exempted from the repealing Act of 1831, was framed "for the more effectual prevention of persons going armed by night for the destruction of game." The spirit of this statute, which has manifested itself in all succeeding legislation, may be judged of from the fact that it made night-poaching, or trespass by night for the purpose of poaching, punishable as a first offence by three months' hard labour, followed by surety for one year, or, in default of surety, by an additional imprisonment, with hard labour, for six months. Owners, occupiers, or their gamekeepers and other servants, are empowered to arrest offenders, who are to be tried before two

---

\* Reeves, "History of the English Law."

justices of the peace—possibly the owners or occupiers themselves; and as likely as not game preservers or sportsmen. On a second offence all the penalties are doubled. The third offence comes before a Court of Quarter Sessions, or a Judge of Assize, according to circumstances, and is punished as a misdemeanour by two years' hard labour, or, if the court or judge sees fit, by seven years' penal servitude. By another section of the same Act the offence of trespassing with intent to poach, in a company of three or more, and armed with weapons of attack, is punishable to the extent of fourteen years' penal servitude. An Act passed in the present reign (7 and 8 Vict., c. 29) makes the statutes above cited applicable to "public roads, highways, and paths," so that in point of fact these terrible penalties may be incurred by a man apprehended on the public highway, if the magistrate or judge is satisfied that his intention was to pursue wild animals.

The Act 25 and 26 Vict., c. 114 (1862) known as the Poaching Prevention Act, laid down an extended definition of "game," including in that term "any one or more hares, pheasants, partridges, eggs of pheasants and partridges, woodcocks, snipes, rabbits, grouse, black or moor game, and eggs of grouse, black or moor game." It provided that any constable or peace officer in any county or borough, or in any highway, street or public place, should be empowered "to search any person whom he may have good cause to suspect of coming from any land where he shall have been unlawfully in search or pursuit of game." If the searched person is found to be in possession of any "game, gun, part of gun, nets, or engines used for the killing or taking of game," he may be summoned, and, on conviction, fined up to £5, and that which is found upon him is to be confiscated. Under this Act comes the very remarkable and significant provision that "no conviction or order, or adjudication made, or appeal therefrom, shall be quashed for want of form, or be removed by certiorari or otherwise into any of her Majesty's superior courts of record; and no warrant of commitment shall be held void by reason of any defect therein." Appeal is allowed to quarter sessions, on the appellant entering into recognisances, and producing a sufficient surety, before a justice of the peace.

Such, then, is the character of our existing Game Laws, passed in former times by a privileged class in order to limit common-law rights, and cherished to this day with a resolution which has defied every effort to repeal or modify them. The other ten or a dozen Acts dealing more or less directly with game preservation and gaming privileges, passed between 1831 and the present time, have gone to build up the system as it now exists. The Night Poaching Prevention Act is the chief foundation-stone of the edifice, and all subsequent legislation has added walls and

bulwarks to the inclosure wherein the privileges of a class have been so jealously guarded. The principal features of the Game Laws, regarded from the legal point of view, may be summarized in a few words. They prevent trespass in pursuit of game by means of a scale of fines, imprisonments, hard labour, and sureties, the fines being generally cumulative; and the punishments which they provide, whether for day or for night poaching, are severe out of all proportion to the offence of trespass as such, or to the actual damage caused by the trespass, or to the value of the game which may be captured. They punish as harshly for trespass without poaching as for the poaching itself. They punish for a suspected intention to trespass, even if the suspected person has never left the public road. They give to the landlord, the landlord's keepers, and the keeper's substitutes, all the power that would be conferred on special constables in face of a threatened insurrection. They employ rate-paid policemen as watchers and searchers, authorizing violence, and the confiscation of game and poaching tackle, not only in the case of policemen, but also in the case of gamekeepers and their subordinates. They protect the game which injures crops even more strictly than ordinary "wild birds," which are the agriculturist's friends, by imposing licenses on sportsmen and dealers. They empower landlords to enter at will upon their tenants' land, and to kill the game which, by common law (in England at all events) belongs to the occupier; and they enable the same landlords to make their own terms with intending tenants, thus practically compelling the tenants to accept whatever contracts their landlords choose to dictate, and leaving them virtually no redress for the damage which they suffer. They over-ride the common law, common custom (as in defining rabbits as game for the purposes of particular Acts), and even common legal procedure (as in depriving offenders of the benefit of a writ of *habeas corpus* in their conviction). They give to landlords a double rent for their land, by enabling them to depute to others, for a consideration, the right of entry and pursuit over their tenants' occupation, while the tenants not only suffer pecuniary loss by such entry and pursuit, but are liable even for the chasing of a rabbit by the dogs employed in their farms. And they entrust the administration of this harsh code, in almost all initiatory proceedings, to the very men in whose interests the code has been passed.

This is a bare statement of the principles of our English Game Laws, as they are regarded from the standpoint of the general public. To the game preserver, the sportsman, and all who, not feeling the hardship of the system, are inclined to sympathize with the class which profits by it, these laws appear to be wholesome and beneficial, conferring legitimate privileges on the

owners of land, and encouraging a healthy and manly sport. Their severity is granted, but the poacher has come to be painted in such dark colours that his punishment rarely excites compunction. The complaints of the farmer are admitted to be based on reason, but they are treated as though the grievances complained of were natural and inevitable concomitants of English agriculture, known to agriculturists, before they enter on their holdings, and, therefore, to be endured as cheerfully as circumstances will permit. To men who take this line of argument, and who approach the subject in this spirit, the condemnation of the Game code by farmers, political economists, social reformers, or the public press, is attributed to selfishness, envy, moroseness, or warped judgment. But the candid mind, reviewing the whole question independently and impartially, is likely to be forced to the conclusion that the code as it now exists, and the system of which it is the centre, confer very few benefits on the community of a nature to counterbalance their injurious effects.

The uncompromising opponents of the Game Laws, who would have them swept away by one drastic and comprehensive act of legislation, are wont to draw up their indictment in very forcible terms, and to describe the general effects of the game-preserving system in plain and unambiguous language. According to them, the laws create an unjust monopoly and privilege, opposed to Nature as they are opposed to common-law rights. They contract popular liberties, not only by helping to divorce the people from the soil, but also in many ways restricting freedom of action, whether on the public roads, or on common lands, or on a man's own holding. They legalize brutality and cruelty, first in the prevention of poaching, and next in the sanction which they afford to any and every method employed in the killing of the game itself. They foster wild animals which are acknowledged to be injurious to the agriculturist, forbidding the latter to protect himself, and enabling landlords to feed a large head of game on the crops of their tenants. They practically compel tenants to sign unequal contracts with the owners of land, and keep alive a fertile cause of discord between men whose interests ought to be identical. They thus, in effect, benefit the rich at the expense of the industrious; they aggravate the worst features of the Land Laws; they add to the temptations, crimes, and misery of the poorest classes; they set class against class, incite men to break the peace, bribe informers by paying them a portion of the fines inflicted, multiply the number of criminals to a very serious extent, create legal offences where there is no moral offence, establish a partial administration of justice, and bring the general law into odium. They diminish the area of land under cultivation, limiting the production of food and paralyzing

the efforts of farmers. By so doing they increase the cost of food to the people, and at the same time impoverish the land, thus taking money out of the pockets of all concerned.

This is a grave charge to bring against a system of laws and customs which are, in an eminent degree, characteristic of our English country life, and which have had, for many generations, so large an influence on the manners, the modes of thought, the conditions and relations of our rural classes. So closely, indeed, do some landowners and sportsmen admit the system to be associated with their ordinary life, and so highly do they (on their own admission) value its privileges, that they are wont to regard the Game Law repealers as amongst their worst enemies—and, by a not unnatural inference, amongst the worst enemies of their country. There can be no doubt that many an ardent lover of the battue and the game-preserves considers that his sporting rights, as secured to him by the Game Laws, are the most valuable adjunct of property in land; and to such a man the assault made by reformers upon the Game Code is regarded as the worst possible form of attack upon the English Land Laws in general. The privileges of sport are in some quarters commonly spoken of as the outworks, the ramparts, almost the very citadel of the sacred right of property. It is no uncommon thing to hear an advocate of the Game Laws declaring that, if they were to be abolished, or even seriously modified, the life of a country gentleman would have lost its principal charm, that from the moment of such abolition or modification, landlords would begin to take more and more to the life of towns, and that all the evils of absenteeism would be inflicted upon hundreds and thousands of large estates. The argument is not without its force, whatever we may think of the temper which occasionally uses it as a menace. It seems only too probable that some ardent preservers, suddenly deprived of or curtailed in these cherished privileges, would live less constantly amongst their tenants, and, as a consequence, spend less money amongst their neighbours. To this, a zealous Game Law repealer might be tempted to make an off-hand reply, little complimentary to a landowner whose love for the mere privileges of his position is so exclusive. As a matter of fact, the balance of advantages would probably be on the side of an industrious tenant, who might gain more by the removal of the game-preserve than he would lose by the removal of the preserver. On the other hand, any loosening of the bonds which connect an owner of land with the management of his estate would, so far, be an evil. But that is a question for social economists and the Legislature. The considerations here raised would lead us deep into the wider questions of land-tenancy and land-owning; and with these questions Game Law repealers

can only deal on side issues of their own more immediate domain of thought. The conflict between the duties and privileges of a landlord is one which is very easily excited and aggravated. It would not be in the interest of the State to allow such a conflict to assume very serious proportions; but perhaps it would be safe to conclude that, in the long-run, whatever the test which may be applied to the good feeling and common sense of English landowners, the most patriotic and prudent view of their position would always prevail.

If the condemnation of the Game Laws and of game preserving is severe on the part of would-be repealers and reformers, it must be allowed that the most emphatic terms of reproach and argument have been put into their mouths by writers and speakers of the highest authority, and frequently by men who have been in no sense polemical or political. The system, either as a whole or in its several features, has been denounced by writers of fiction, of history, of poetry, of social disquisition, by lawyers, by bishops and clergymen, by naturalists and men of science, by statesmen and politicians, by men and women in every rank of life, and, in each successive generation, by lovers of genuine sport, as well as by men who have no special sympathy with sport, by landowners and magistrates no less than by tenants and victims of the law. A whole anthology of criticism might be gleaned from the pages of modern English literature, and it would be found to contain many expressions of vivid indignation from authorities who have at all times been listened to with respect.

Legal opinion on this subject has been plain and outspoken. Blackstone has already been quoted. He calls the Game Laws a "bastard slip" of the Forest Laws, declares wild animals to be indisputably "the common property of men, be their degree what it may," stigmatizes the notion of particular property as unreasonable, and the laws as "tyrannous." Sheriff Barclay, who had had much experience in the administration of the Scottish laws, and who wrote a volume on the "Curiosities of the Game Laws," after mentioning that legislators were as a rule careful to exclude interested persons from administering laws in which they had particular concern, goes on to say, "Almost all country justices are interested in game, yet their judgment on the merits of game cases brought before them is final. Should the offences of gamekeepers be tried by a jury of poachers?" Lord Hatherley once said, "I do not believe that the great grievance arising from the Game Laws can be relieved by any palliations; therefore they must be altogether got rid of." And his lordship further stated that "no one could doubt" what Mr. Bright had said as to "the want of confidence which existed



in the administration of the Game Laws by the magistrates." One more legal opinion adverse to the general spirit of the Game Laws may be quoted; and it must be received with all the respect due to the name of the eminent jurispudent Austin, who, in his "Province of Jurisprudence Determined," writes: "Offences against the Game Laws are not offences against positive morality, although they are forbidden by positive law. A gentleman is not dishonoured, or generally shunned by gentlemen, though he shoots without a qualification. A peasant who wires hares escapes the censure of peasants, though the squires, as doing justiceship, send him to the prison and the treadmill."

Even more striking, if not more cogent, is the testimony borne against the system of game preserving by members of the territorial class for whose special benefit it has been maintained so long, in many instances by sportsmen or preservers themselves, compelled by their convictions to speak in condemnation of their class interests and privileges. The Earl of Leicester, for instance, one of the most ardent of English agriculturists, went so far as to say, about eleven years ago, "I wish the words 'Game Laws' were removed from the statute book." Earl Granville said, "I am fond of shooting, but I must confess that, even in the excitement of the sport, it has always appeared to me *perfectly unjustifiable* that, for the sake of a few hours' amusement, the growth of an animal should be encouraged which destroys so much of the tenant-farmer's produce." At a rent audit held in the course of last year by the Marquis of Ailesbury, at Savernake, his lordship expressed an opinion on the Game Laws which was quoted with considerable effect by Mr. P. A. Taylor in a speech in the House of Commons, on the 2nd of March last.

"The peasant," Lord Ailesbury told his tenants, "comes home to his cottage, and there is hardly enough to make a dinner for his wife and children; over the next hedge are a lot of half-tamed pheasants, and the temptation is too much for the hungry man, and he commits an offence which those wicked laws constitute a crime, for which he is sent to prison. How can any just man attempt to defend such laws?" The Marquis went on to say that "he did not often sit on a bench of magistrates, but whenever he had done so, and poaching cases had come before him, he had always treated them with the utmost leniency possible, because he felt the glaring injustice of the laws he was compelled to administer." It is somewhat of a portent that, in the nineteenth century, laws thus gravely condemned, by such persons, against personal interest and in the face of social prejudice, are not instantly swept away—not even when a great and popularly elected Liberal majority is sent to the House of Commons with a mandate amply sufficient for the purpose.

There is no attempt on the part of these unprejudiced witnesses to persuade themselves or others that the loss of the farmer is compensated by a diminution in his rent. That contention has frequently been urged, and as frequently during the late renewal of the controversy as though the fallacy had never been refuted. But it is not the language of candour, or, at all events, not the language of reflection, to say that any modification of rent, however directly made, can compensate a farmer for damages to crops which may, and sometimes do, amount to as much as the whole sum paid to the landlord.

It may be supposed that the injurious effects of the over-preservation of ground game, in the impoverishment of the farmer and the decrease of the food of the people, are now sufficiently established. The introduction of the Hares and Rabbits Bill by the Government may be taken as recording the fact that public opinion has pronounced the final word on the subject. Theoretically, if not practically, the day of the farmers' deliverance has dawned; but, on the other hand, there is only too much cause to fear that a long struggle will yet be necessary in order to destroy the fabric of the Game Law system itself, which is in many respects more hurtful and ruinous than the wholesale reservation of ground game to the landlords. For this reason it cannot be superfluous to cite one or two additional condemnations of the code from a moral point of view.

No clerical authority has spoken or written more plainly on this point than the Bishop of Manchester. In a Report to Government, the special subject of which, we need hardly say, was not the operation of the Game Laws, Bishop Fraser wrote as follows:—"Game is classified into two species, 'ground game' and 'winged-game'—the first belonging to the quadruped, the second to the biped order. The first species is the one that works most mischief to the farmer; the second species is that which most harms the peasant. Rabbits and hares play havoc with the farmers' oats and barley; partridges and pheasants corrupt and demoralize the virtue of the labourer." The corruption and demoralization are brought about in many ways, but no doubt the gist of it all is in the distinction which Austin, as above cited, draws between positive morality and the positive law. Parish clergymen and prison chaplains have always been ready to bear testimony to the impossibility of persuading offenders against the Game Laws that they had committed crimes, in the ordinary sense of the word; and, indeed, it would be manifestly idle to expect a sense of moral criminality in the minds of the poor in respect of legal enactments which eminent lawyers, bishops, clergymen, landowners, and thousands of public writers and speakers, combined to describe as unjust. The great

majority of men in the humbler ranks of life are unequal to the effort of perceiving a crime in the evasion of an unjust law; and, even if they are unreasonable in this, the obliquity of judgment is easily accounted for. We may judge of the spirit in which a peasant is likely to estimate the sanction of a code whereof such a man as the late Rev. F. D. Maurice could write in these terms:—

“So long as Forest Laws or Game Laws exist, the name of the Lord will be a sanction for them to him who reverences the Commandment, if he dislikes them ever so much. But he *will* dislike them for this reason especially—that they bewilder the conscience respecting the weight and authority of the Eighth Commandment; that they provoke all kinds of casuistry respecting the limits within which it may be observed or disobeyed; that they do very often touch that point where the claims of property become robbery, where the individual privilege invades the common justice of the nation.”—*The Commandments considered as Instruments of National Reformation.*

It is plain that a Bill to protect farmers against injury to their crops from hares and rabbits, framed solely in the farmers' interests, will not touch the evils chiefly complained of by opponents of the existing law. Whatever solution of the difficulty may be proposed or carried, on the lines of Mr. Gladstone's measure for “the better protection of occupiers,” the most obnoxious portions of the statute law will not be affected by it, and the true spirit and animus of the system of game-preservation will survive. A blow may have been struck at a huge monopoly, which will seem, in the eyes of many sanguine persons, to presage the complete destruction of the monopoly at no very distant date. The belief is a consoling one, but they who remember the history of the Game Laws, and mark the bitterness which follows every suggestion of reform or compromise, will not be much disposed to entertain it.

Even on economical grounds, and as a matter of public interest, it is more than doubtful whether the concession of hares and rabbits to the farmers will remove the chief grievance of the system. Assuming for the moment that this concession would be generally operative, that it would rid the tenant of his fetters, and save his crops from devastation, it by no means follows that the game-preserving still sanctioned by law will cease to inflict a serious loss upon the nation. It is true that hares and rabbits, as animals, are more directly injurious to agriculture than partridges and pheasants. The ground game eats most; but, on the other hand, winged game is most expensive, not merely to the landlords who pay for the machinery of its preservation, but also to the community at large. The individual farmer whose crops are destroyed suffers a loss from hares and

rabbits, for which nothing can compensate him ; but this special loss does not amount to very much when it is spread over the thousands and millions of the entire population. And, probably, the whole aggregate of the actual destruction of food by game entails a loss upon each unit of the nation which is smaller than the average sum paid by a ratepayer towards the cost of preventing and punishing the various offences against the Game Laws. We will consider, hereafter, the possible and probable consequences of the measure of relief brought forward by the Government now in office ; but, first, it will be worth while to go a little deeper into the economical effects of the game-preserving system as it has existed up to the present day, both in regard to the ravages committed by ground game and also in regard to the preventive and penal machinery which the Hares and Rabbits Bill is intended to remove.

• It is almost superfluous to accumulate testimony on the great destructiveness of game, and on the consequent raising of the price of food. The facts have been admitted by men of every way of thinking, they have been abundantly proved before two Committees of the House of Commons, and they are copiously illustrated from day to day. They are indeed occasionally denied, in the course of discussions where any ill-informed writer or speaker is able to intervene at will ; but no man who has a title to be heard denies them. The axioms of the Game Law repealer assert not only that hares and rabbits consume many times their own market-value of food, that a couple of hares will eat and destroy as much as a sheep, that the most fertile land in the neighbourhood of a preserve or warren becomes as unproductive as a bad soil elsewhere, but also that the preservation of game keeps large tracts, even to the extent of millions of acres, out of cultivation. With regard to this latter point the evidence of practical agriculturists, not in any way prejudiced against the system and its supporters, has been frequently and unhesitatingly given. About eight years ago Mr. Clare Read, then M.P. for South Norfolk, said that, in one district alone of his county, as much as 18,000 acres was untenanted on account of the game, and that, if hares and rabbits could be "kept within reasonable bounds," 40,000 more sheep could be kept in the county. It is estimated that the hares and rabbits supplied to our markets from English soil furnish more than 10,000 tons of meat every year. Now, if it be true that the flesh of the animals costs so much more to produce, in proportion to its price in the market, than that of sheep and cattle, and if we remember that the number of hares and rabbits brought to market is but a tithe of those which feed upon the farmers' crops, it is plain that the actual loss occasioned by preserving them is one of the most

serious character, and that it could only be worth incurring for some great national object, in comparison with which an enormous expenditure ought to be undertaken without a murmur.

A remarkable illustration of the length to which game-preserving has sometimes been carried, and of the utterly reckless spirit in which animals, recognized by law as "vermin," have been allowed to increase on arable land, is afforded in the current issue of "The Suffolk Stud Book," in a notice of a gentleman who is described as a tenant-farmer so well-to-do, and so much above the necessity of making the most of his opportunities, that he would keep his wool and corn in his barns for years together. We quote a passage from page 61 of the book just named:—

"Five-and-twenty years ago, when Mr. Crisp lived at Chillesford Lodge, all the farms in that quarter were 'game farms,' as the word is used to express a state of things scarcely to be credited. This was in the time of the late Marquis of Hertford. Stover stacks close by the preserves were undermined by the hares till they had to be hurdled round to save the remnant from burying up the swarms that would come for a meal on a frosty night. Not a turnip could be left unclamped after October, and boys had to keep the pheasants off the pea-stacks. There were hares there at that time grey with age, with teeth turned up outside the jaw like the tusk of a wild boar. In 1849 three thousand were killed on the estate between Monday morning and Saturday night, and on one occasion two hundred and forty were killed in three hours, and then forty more, alive and hungry, were counted in a field close by where the slaughter had just taken place. They were coursed with greyhounds, till at last the dogs would wag their tails, turn their heads, and refuse to run another hare."

It may be said that this passage (which, by the way, is given to the public by a gentleman of Conservative politics, the brother of a Conservative member of Parliament, and presumably not anxious to aid in any vigorous indictment of the game-preserving system) refers to a state of things which has now passed away, and therefore has no special bearing on the question now before us. It would be well if we could think that this was the case; but, unfortunately, there is no reason to believe that the zeal of English preservers and sportsmen has diminished within the past quarter of a century. The evil has doubtless shifted its ground here and there, but its manifestations exist in 1880 as they existed in 1855. The evidence taken before the Committee of 1873 was no less striking, but rather more, than that taken before Mr. Bright's Committee of 1845. Neither human nature nor the spirit of the Game Laws has changed in the interval—unless it be that the severity of these laws has been aggravated. It was in 1862 that the Poaching Prevention Act was passed,

and it has been since that time that the popular condemnation of the laws has assumed its greatest intensity, hitherto entirely without result. It is within the last twenty or thirty years that the Scotch deer forests have been so inordinately extended, many thousands of acres having been thrown practically out of cultivation.

Before the Select Committee of 1873 a number of tenant farmers, valuers, and others gave testimony on the subject of damage by game, which was in every sense conclusive. Thus, Mr. Clare Read, who would not admit that the Game Laws were generally demoralizing, stated that "in a great number of cases of insolvent farmers in Norfolk, their ultimate ruin is attributable to the over-preservation of game." Mr. J. Shepherd, a tenant farmer in East Lothian, said that the repeal of the Game Laws would be the greatest deliverance which the Legislature could give to agriculture, and that under existing circumstances landlords had it in their power to ruin the tenants "simply by a little negligence." Mr. P. Christie, a tenant farmer and valuer, mentioned that he had in one year assessed 177*l.* 5*s.* damage on 500 acres, and subsequently 192*l.* on the same land; when the tenant, complaining of his estimates as being inadequate, gave up his farm in disgust. In another case he found a damage of 6*l.* an acre. Mr. A. Taylor, from Kincardine, reckoned the average cost of feeding a rabbit for market, when running wild among the crops, at 10*s.*, and its value at 9*d.* or 10*d.*, which represents a loss of over 400*l.* per ton of rabbits' meat. If this be so, and as hares are at least equally destructive, the annual 10,000 tons of hares and rabbits brought to market, as mentioned in a previous paragraph, represent an absolute loss of 4,000,000*l.* Mr. Matthews, a Perthshire farmer, who had had to give up his farm on account of the damage done by game, declared not only that hares were "quite as bad as the rabbits," but also that he had "suffered considerable injury from pheasants." Another Perthshire farmer had reckoned the damage done by game on some holdings at more than 3*l.* an acre, "half the value of the whole crop." Mr. J. Fisher, from Blairgowrie, mentioned the case of a Perthshire farmer who "had had the entire crop destroyed by grouse," and who, being unable to meet his landlord upon the rent day, had all his effects sequestrated," and was obliged to leave the place. Mr. J. Rooke, a farmer in Northamptonshire, related that he had put up four miles of wire fencing round his farm, at a cost of 71*l.* a mile, in order to protect himself against rabbits preserved by a neighbouring proprietor; since which his land had grown as much again as it formerly did. Mr. G. Begg, from Sutherland, asserted that he had had great losses by game, including pheasants and partridges. On forty acres the valuers

had found damage to the extent of 157*l.*, and of this he obtained 75*l.* after threatening a lawsuit.

It is needless to multiply such illustrations; but it may be observed that the evidence of several of the witnesses (quoted almost at random, from the reports of a few consecutive days), distinctly affirms the infliction of considerable damage by winged game. It may, however, be admitted that the agricultural argument against the Game Laws, or rather the argument based on the destruction of food, would be vastly weakened, though not altogether banished, if tenant farmers were to receive and exercise the right of protecting themselves against hares and rabbits. There would still remain a dozen other arguments; and, amongst them, the economical argument springing out of the cost of the preventive and penal machinery of the laws. For this cost the winged game is, in a very large measure, responsible. The machinery of the Game Laws has been created and maintained chiefly in the interest of sport; and it is incontestable that the winged game provides more valued and more general sport than the ground game. Now, the ratepayers are chargeable with the cost of this machinery, not merely through the wages of policemen, who are by statute required to act as game preservers, and not mainly through the expense of the administration of justice in petty and quarterly sessions, but through the whole paraphernalia of justice involved in the conviction and punishment of some ten thousand offenders against the code in every twelve months. Add to this the fact that, in very many cases, as soon as an offender is convicted his family forthwith comes for support upon the parish rates, and we may form an approximate idea of the vast expenditure to which the Game Laws more or less directly commit us. A part of this burden would doubtless be removed by a Bill giving the tenant a concurrent right in hares and rabbits; but it would be a sanguine estimate (especially if these animals are not expressly taken out of the existing scheme of laws) to consider that the financial relief will be a great one.

One word more by way of generalization. The power of injustice which the Game Laws put into the hands of reckless, or harsh, or oppressive magistrates, landlords, and gamekeepers, has doubtless done more than anything else to make the code obnoxious to the general public, and to add acerbity to the complaints of repealers. We know what mischief may be done by an unpaid magistrate devoid of tact or compunction, and even, at times, by a highly-trained stipendiary. The harsher the law, the more grievous is the effect of straining it, or of applying it without mercy or consideration; and this fact has been illustrated by innumerable convictions under the Game Laws. That these laws should occasionally be administered in a partial manner,

seeing that the judges of first instance are commonly selected from amongst game-preservers, or their friends and constant associates, is not to be wondered at. The wonder would be if they discharged the functions assigned to them without giving frequent ground for criticism. Mr. P. A. Taylor, M.P., in the speech above quoted, made just allowance for the partial administrators of the game code. "They are Englishmen," he said, "no better and no worse than their fellows, put in a thoroughly false position, and probably do no worse and no better than any other class in an equally false position would do." And Mr. Taylor cited a passage from a writer in the *Saturday Review* which states the facts of the case in convincing and conclusive terms:—"The magistrate who convicts a thief acts in the interest of every man in the court; the magistrate who convicts a poacher commonly acts in the interest of nobody but those on the bench. The number of magistrates who would consciously pervert the law to convict a poacher is probably very small, but the number of magistrates who unconsciously carry to the bench the passions of the preserve is very large." No doubt the conscious perversion has occurred in some instances; but the system is sufficiently condemned without relying upon such exceptional cases. The unconscious leaning of the game-preserving magistrate towards severity, when dealing with laws in themselves outrageously severe, manifests itself in frequent convictions, devoid alike of justice and of mercy. The law gives discretionary power; there are magistrates who use their discretion with a constant bias towards conviction. The law, for instance, tells a magistrate that he may convict on suspicion; some magistrates appear to construe this as a sanction for habitual and matter-of-course conviction. It is quite open to magistrates, in many instances, to mitigate the severity of the code by taking a lenient view of all minor and first offences. Many of them do so mitigate it; but, on the other hand, there are certainly many magistrates who habitually convict whenever the law enables them.

Illustrations of this bent towards harshness are, unhappily, too redundant in the annals of our sessional courts. Thousands of cases might be quoted, almost from memory, by anyone who has kept his attention fixed upon the administration of justice by rural magistrates—from the case of a farmer's child, fined for running at a partridge in his father's field, to the case of hardened offenders punished with as much severity as the law allows. It would be difficult to draw the line amongst the harsher class of convictions in such a manner as to decide where harshness is at its height, and oppression begins; but it is unquestionable that the Game Laws have been brought



into the greatest odium by repeated instances of oppressive administration. Nor is this the only form of oppression under the Game Laws; for the abuse of power which constitutes oppression is anything but rare in the relations between game-preserving landlords and their tenants, and in the relations between gamekeepers and those whom they regard with suspicion or enmity. Gamekeepers have many opportunities of inflicting annoyance and humiliation, not only upon the rural population in general, but also, and especially, upon farmers. The occupation of a keeper is at best an invidious one, and it would be marvellous if he could be on good terms with any tenant-farmer in the neighbourhood of his master's preserves; but when he chooses to wreak his petty spites upon one who has given him cause of offence, he has the power of making himself extremely obnoxious.

The game-preserving landlord, apart from his conduct on the bench, and his delegated authority in the hands of his agents and keepers, wields an independent instrument of oppression in his power to dictate the terms of his leases, or of his contracts with his tenantry. The common law in England, as we have seen, gives the game to the occupier, and it is necessary that a landlord who wishes to have the sporting right entirely in his own hands should make a specific contract to that effect with the men who cultivate his land. This he does not fail to do, and it has been computed that not more than one-eighth of the leased land in the United Kingdom is free from a contract reserving the furred and feathered game to the landlord.\* Much has been made of the argument which claims freedom of contract in connection with the tenure of land, and they who are opposed to any alteration in the Game Laws deny the right of the State, at all events from a moral standpoint, to interfere with this freedom. But such an argument appears to beg the question at issue. That the State is competent, as a matter of fact, to restrain individual freedom for the general good, is unquestionable. If it be contended that this restrictive legislation would be oppressive or unjust, a class of considerations is opened up which must necessarily be extended to the nature of the contracts which it is sought to place beyond the scope of legislation. A contract between two parties, and decidedly injurious to the rest of the community, or a contract specially injurious to one of the two parties, which, nevertheless, he is notoriously unable to refuse, can hardly claim to be exempted from the cognisance and control of the State. And the consensus of public opinion has certainly declared that the reservation of

---

\* In Scotland the game is the landlord's, by "privilege," without special reservation. In Ireland the law, in this respect, is the same as in England.

game by a landlord on the holdings of his tenants is a contract partaking of both these characters.

It would be harsh to maintain that every game contract of this kind is an instance of oppression. Of course it is not so consciously on the part of the landlord; but no doubt there are many cases in which the abuse of power is specially aggravated; and the hardship to the tenant becomes distinctly oppressive. It is so in contracts where, as mentioned by Mr. J. Shepherd to the Committee of 1873, the landlord stipulates with his tenant beforehand that he shall not be "subject to pay any damage done by game," or where he extorts the consent of a farmer to any other clause or stipulation intended beforehand to evade the law. Another witness before the same Committee stated that he held land under two leases, one of which reserved game and rabbits to the landlord, "notwithstanding any alterations in the existing Game Laws;" whilst the other reserved these animals "without any claim being competent to the tenant for damage alleged to be sustained by game, or those in pursuit of it." Mr. P. A. Taylor mentions the case of Mr. Clayden, an Essex farmer, holding a thousand acres, who, after his family had cultivated the same holding for seventy years, was actually "evicted because he would not submit to a clause preventing him from shooting rabbits or catching rats in banks." Cases of still more grievous injustice might be quoted; but these are less necessary for purposes of argument now that the moderation of the evil has become an object of Government solicitude. The pith of the Bill introduced by Sir William Harcourt is in its provision against the making of contracts to alienate the farmers' right of control over ground game—a provision whereof the principle, though not the form, was laid down in the Report of the Committee of 1873, which recommended that "when, upon the letting of any farm, game is reserved, the farming tenant shall not be criminally liable for the destruction of game upon the farm."

When the Game Laws, and the system of game preservation which has been gradually created in these islands, are viewed impartially, from a popular point of view, having regard both to their character and to their results, it is impossible to wonder at the condemnation which has been directed against them by so many weighty authorities, or at the animosity with which they have been attacked by ardent reformers for several generations. The records of political sentiment previous to the second decade of the present century are neither very precise nor very complete, and yet we have ample evidence that our forefathers, even previous to the time of Blackstone, keenly felt the injustice of this particular relic of feudalism. For more than fifty years, however, the condemnation has been growing in intensity and swel-

ling in volume, with the gradual aggravation of the evil complained of. We find evidence of the fact in the works and recorded words of such men as the author of the Letters of Junius, Lord Byron, Sydney Smith, John Grey of Dilston, Horace Smith, Jeremy Bentham, John Stuart Mill, William Cobbett, Scarlett, Reeves (the author of a "History of English Law"), the Earl of Dalhousie, Cobden, William Howitt, Miss Martineau, Sheriff Barclay, Canon Kingsley, Frederick Denison Maurice, Lord Beaconsfield, Louis Blanc, and a host of living authorities, some of whose opinions are quoted in the foregoing pages. No great reform in the whole budget of reforms which await solution by an intelligent and progressive generation has been more deliberately stamped with the fiat of enlightened opinion.

A Select Committee of the House of Commons was moved for and obtained by Mr. Bright in 1845. It had the fate of a vast number of Select Committees; its recommendations were treated as a dead letter, and its labours were absolutely futile so far as legislation is concerned. Nevertheless, it accumulated a mass of evidence of the most important and striking character, which has been an armoury of facts and illustrations to every one who has dealt with the subject from that time to this. Its effect upon the public mind was certainly very great, so great that it is not too much to say that for thirty-four years past the nation has been more than prepared for a sweeping amendment of the Game Laws. It would have been impossible that so long a period should have been allowed to lapse without the interference of the State if the system attacked had been less intimately bound up with the privileges and prejudices of the most powerful classes, and if the House of Commons had not been constantly recruited from the ranks of the territorialists and the plutocrats. But one result of this Committee, and of the incisive utterances of Mr. Bright during and after its existence, was to inspire a select but energetic school of reformers with an earnest resolve to attack a code and system so fertile of evil to the community. Of the new men some approached the question directly from the legal standpoint, others from the humanitarian, some from the point of view of the general public as consumers of food, others from that of the farmers as food producers. Amongst them was a writer who dealt with the subject in a spirit at once practical and philosophic. Mr. R. G. Welford, in a book entitled "The Influence of the Game Laws," classified and analyzed the evidence taken before the Committee, and drew many forcible conclusions from it. An Address to Farmers by Mr. Bright was prefixed to this volume, and was probably laid to heart by some of them; but the class as a whole showed no special sign of impatience with a state of things

which inflicted so much damage upon them. Mr. Bright has also been credited with the authorship of an article on the Game Laws in Morton's "Cyclopædia of Agriculture;" and it is notable that these two productions (if both are his) are amongst the very few literary efforts for which he is responsible. A more prolific writer whose attention was "seized" by the subject (to put it in his own terms) about the same time was William Howitt, who contributed a number of letters to the *Star* newspaper, which he subsequently published (in 1863), on "the revolting cruelties practised under the Game Laws, showing these laws to be one of the most prolific sources of convictions." The same, or, at least, contemporary influences affected the mind of Miss Martineau, whose "Forest and Game Laws" is a treasury of illustrations and arguments for all who would handle the subject.

Game Law reformers have naturally varied in the thoroughness with which their efforts have been directed towards finding a remedy for the evils, and whilst some have striven to modify the severity of the penal code, and others would have been content to give to the farmers a simple right to protect their crops, there were always a few who looked forward to the day when the Game Laws would be wholly abolished, and when the systematic preservation of game in England would be a confessed anachronism. Mr. P. A. Taylor, the present member for Leicester, is one of these. It is now over thirty years since Mr. Taylor devoted himself to an agitation for the repeal of the laws, and he has made the question in a special manner his own. He has attacked the system root and branch, never asking for a mere compromise, but unceasingly demanding, in and out of the House, the total abolition of the code. He has certainly done more than any living man to induce a mood of public opinion in which a Government Hares and Rabbits Bill has become possible; though we can scarcely suppose that Mr. Taylor will be satisfied with this very modest result of the movement which he has so sedulously encouraged. There is one reason, to mention only one, which must prevent any man who has demanded the repeal of the Game Laws from being put to silence by a mere sop given to the farmers. Since Mr. Bright's Committee sat and reported the grievance in regard to food it has rather diminished than increased. We have few or no "game farms" now of the sort described by Mr. Biddell in his "Suffolk Stud Book." At all events the Hares and Rabbits Bill hardly comes as the result of a steadily increasing intensity of grievance and complaint. But there are other evils and other demands for a remedy which have thus increased. During the six years, 1857-1862, there were 35,210 prosecutions under the Game Laws then existing, a yearly

average of 5,868. In the year 1870 the number in England and Wales alone, as recorded in a Parliamentary return, was 12,703. For the past few years the average number of convictions for offences against these laws in the United Kingdom has been something like 10,000. The notable expansion of this sorry list after the year 1862 was due chiefly to the Act passed in that year, which included rabbits in the game list, increased the number of offences, and made conviction more easy, and more a matter of course. Yet we see no marked disposition amongst the leading statesmen on either side to provide a remedy for this grievous and growing evil.

In 1872, Mr. Taylor united his efforts with those of other repealers in founding an Anti-Game-Law League; and the "Anti-Game-Law Circular," issued fortnightly during sixteen months, assembled together a vast number of facts, illustrations and arguments, for the express purpose of informing and agitating public opinion, in the hope of hastening the complete abolition of the code. The contention of the League was, and we believe still is, that the wiping out of the Game Laws would very soon (with more or less of a shock) produce a natural condition of things, in which, without the necessity of a more stringent trespass law, the farmers would have protection for their crops, landowners and sportsmen would retain a sufficient head of game for fair and reasonable sport, class jealousies would be greatly diminished, and the country would effect a saving of many thousand criminals every year. Candid men will have less difficulty in accepting the prognostication if they remember that the statutes in relation to game are an artificial superstructure upon the common law, which was never required in the interests of the nation, but was at almost every step the work of a class for the benefit of a few.

. It cannot be denied that the assault on the Game Laws has been a distinctly Radical movement throughout. The purely economical question engendered by the effects of excessive game-preservation on agriculture has occupied the tongues and pens, not only of Radicals, not only of agriculturists, but of reasonable men of all shades of politics. This is a side of the controversy which can easily be dealt with apart from any consideration of class privilege or prejudice. But the attack upon the Game Law system as a whole raises different issues, and demands a sterner kind of championship. It more directly impugns the sports, the habits, and even the motives of members of the wealthier classes; in order to be effective it is compelled to be harsh—in order to be truthful, it is constrained to be inculpatory, if not comminatory. An earnest opponent of the Game Laws can hardly avoid the tone of lively indignation; he may wish to

wear the velvet glove, but can rarely divest himself of the gauntlet of steel. He is, therefore, commonly regarded in a hostile spirit; and it may be that his own hostility has often displayed itself before that of the game preservers, whose privileges he has menaced. And he has been still further prejudiced by the odium attaching to those who are inevitably in some sense his clients—the poachers to wit. Poachers of the violent and unscrupulous kind, who are only not thieves because game is not legally a property, have done as much as anything else to prevent the question of the Game Laws from being discussed in an amicable manner; and yet it is bare justice to say that the logical cause of their violence is not their own greed, but rather the action of the preservers themselves.

The second Select Committee of the House of Commons, nominated in 1872, presented its Report in 1873. It examined seventy-four witnesses, of whom twenty-six were tenant farmers and eighteen were landowners. There were, besides, game valuers and game dealers, so that something like two-thirds of the witnesses were summoned or accepted with a view to the agricultural branch of the inquiry. The Report ultimately adopted made the whole question turn on the pivot of the ground game, or, rather, of the destructiveness of rabbits. The moral and legal issues were very lightly touched; the winged game was almost acquitted of damaging the farmers' crops; and it was maintained that the abandonment of rabbits to the occupier would practically get rid of the main grievances which had been urged before the Committee.

As the Hares and Rabbits Bill of the present Government is professedly based upon the recommendations of the Select Committee in 1873, it may be worth while to see what was the precise wording of those recommendations so far as they applied to ground game, in order that we may judge to what extent the framers of the Bill have ventured to follow the advice of the Committee. The Report recommended as follows:—

“(1) That the protection given to rabbits by the Game Laws should be withdrawn, except in warrens or similar enclosed spaces. (2) That, saving rights under existing leases, the law of Scotland be assimilated to that of England, as regards the right to game when land is let, so as to give the tenant that right in the absence of reservation by the landlord. (3) That the law of England be assimilated to that of Scotland, so as, in the absence of agreement to the contrary, to give a right of action to tenants in case of the increase of game during their term of occupancy where it is reserved. (4) That in both countries an easy and summary mode of obtaining redress by arbitration, in respect of game, be given to tenants. (5) That all cases of compensation for damage done by game, if not settled out of court, should be referred to

the County Court Judges in England, and to the sheriffs in Scotland, against whose decision there should be no appeal. (6) That when the shooting is let, and proceedings are taken by a tenant against the landlord for game damage, the law should be that the latter may compel the shooting tenant to come in and take his place as the defendant. (7) That the occupier of game preserves should be made liable to the occupiers of adjacent farms belonging to other proprietors for damage done by the ground game harboured in the preserves."

The measure of relief proposed by Mr. Gladstone's Government falls short of these recommendations in several respects, though it goes beyond them in at least one important particular. Its object being "the better protection of occupiers of land against injury to their crops from hares and rabbits," it suggests, or suggested when originally introduced, the following provisions:—(1) The occupier is to have an "inseparable" right to kill ground game, by himself and his agents, concurrently with his landlord; (2) where an occupier is entitled "otherwise than in pursuance of this Act" (as by common law in the absence of a reservation clause), it "shall not be lawful for him wholly to part with or divest himself of such right;" (3) every "agreement, condition, or arrangement," purporting to divest or alienate the right of the occupier under the Act shall be void; (4) the occupier and his agents shall not need a game license to kill, take or sell ground game; (5) existing reservation clauses and contracts must run their course before the occupier can profit by the Act; (6) the "agents" must be members of the occupier's household, or persons in his service on the land, or "*bonâ fide* employed by him for reward for the taking and destruction of ground game; (7) 1 & 2 Will. 4, c. 32, s. 12, inflicting a penalty on the occupier for killing or taking game in violation of contract is to be repealed in so far as it is inconsistent with this Act.

Such is the Bill as introduced, and it is manifest at once that its most valuable principle resides in the restriction of the freedom of contract. A similar principle is recognized in the Shipping Acts, the Truck Acts, and others, wherein the law has barred contracts by which the weaker party might have been induced "voluntarily" to bind himself to specially injurious engagements. The interference is both justifiable and commendable, needing no argument to defend it; and in this interference a notable advance is made upon the Committee's proposals. The only approach to such a relaxation of existing laws contemplated in the Report of 1873 was a recommendation, beyond those which are quoted above, that the farming tenant "should not be criminally liable for the destruction of game" upon his farm.

Admitting to the fullest extent the vast theoretical value of the "inseparable right" conferred upon occupiers by the Bill, let

us now see in what respects the Government offers the farmer less than he would receive under the Report of Mr. Ward Hunt's Committee. (1) The protection given to rabbits (and hares) by the Game Laws, and especially by the Act of 1862, is not withdrawn, so that, in point of fact, all the laws affecting ground game will be aggravated towards their transgressor by the multiplication of potential preservers. The "petty Nimrods" are not likely to be diminished in number by the Act, and the farmers will receive their boon at the expense of greater harshness toward poachers and suspected persons. (3) Tenants secure no right of action for the increase of game during their leases, and will thus have no remedy against the incursion of rabbits and hares into their farms from contiguous plantations and covers belonging to their landlords. (7) They secure no right of action against the occupiers or proprietors of adjacent game preserves. They might fortify their frontiers, man their ditches and hedges, and repel the invasions of their enemy, but they cannot recover damages from the man who fosters hares and rabbits on the other side of the hedge or ditch. It is as though your neighbour were at liberty to pollute the stream flowing into your land, and you had the right to filter the water, but not to restrain him from polluting. The relief afforded by the Bill is strictly limited to the bestowal of a right to kill. The Select Committee would have given the farmer more than this. It would not only have indemnified him for incursions of vermin from adjacent preserves, but it would have checked the multiplication of rabbits by a modification of the entire game-preserving system. Many moderate reformers have suggested more effectual provisions for the relief of the occupier; and one can hardly comprehend the timidity of those who framed the Government Bill in not at least excluding hares and rabbits from the schedules of game. This omission, and the omission to provide compensation in the cases above mentioned, must go far to counteract the advantage actually derived from the measure. It is right that the burden of self-defence should be thrown upon the farmers, but it cannot be right that the evil against which he is to defend himself should be perpetuated or increased. There is indeed only too much reason to fear that the zeal of preservation will, in many instances, be rather quickened than quenched by this partial curtailment of sporting privileges. The game-preserving landlord, encountering revivals on his agricultural farms, will feel a natural temptation to foster both furred and feathered game on the lands in his own occupation; and, if he be of a vindictive turn, he will frequently have it in his power to trouble his tenants by his winged game alone, as he has hitherto troubled them by winged and ground game together.

It would be a consolation if we could think that the provisions



nominally giving the occupier an inalienable right to kill hares and rabbits would be thoroughly effectual; but any such conclusion is, to say the least of it, a sanguine one. It is idle to suppose that farmers will not frequently, through compliance, or indifference, or fear, or for a consideration which will elude the vigilance of the law, abandon to their landlords the rights nominally vested in them. Little as they may, in this case, deserve pity for their weakness or folly, they will continue to be injured in their business, and the nation will be injured through them. Any lawyer, any owner or holder of land, will be able to devise an "agreement, condition, or arrangement," which shall divest the occupier of his right; and it would demand too large a confidence in humanity to believe that the Ground Game Act will not be practically inoperative over many hundreds of thousands of acres. A more drastic remedy for the evil may one day be found in a measure securing greater fixity of tenure for the occupier of a farm. Until that has been done, and so long as the farmer is at the mercy of a six months' notice, it is vain to suppose that he will be able to brandish the weapon with which this Act would provide him.

To sum up the whole matter, it must be recognized with frankness and with gratitude that Mr. Gladstone's Government have been the first to deal with a difficulty from which every preceding Administration had shrunk with alarm. They have made a step in advance, though it is not a very great step; and their Bill is framed on lines on which it may be extended by themselves or their successors, until the claim for justice has been impartially and completely satisfied.

---

#### ART. VII.—STATE PAPERS : FOREIGN SERIES.

1. *Calendar of State Papers—Foreign Series—Preserved in Her Majesty's Public Record Office—Edward VI. and Mary, 1547-1558.* Edited by W. B. TURNBULL. 2 vols.
2. *Calendar of State Papers—Foreign Series—Elizabeth, 1558-1565.* Edited by the Rev. J. STEVENSON. 7 vols.
3. *Calendar of State Papers—Foreign Series—Elizabeth, 1566-1574.* Edited by ALLAN JAMES CROSBY. 3 vols. Longmans; Trübner and Co.

**T**HESSE Papers fully deserve the care and attention bestowed upon them by their accomplished editors. We have here laid out before us, as in a map, not only the external but also

the domestic affairs of various foreign countries during the whole of this important period. The correspondence of our ambassadors exhibits the negotiations that took place between England and France, Spain, Rome, and the Low Countries, and the events related are full of interest. The policy of Charles the Fifth of Germany, the luxury of the Court of Henry the Second of France, the power of Philip of Spain, the loss of Calais, the feuds between the Houses of Guise and Bourbon, the hostility of France towards Elizabeth, the rise of the Huguenots, Mary of Scotland and her subjects—all are here brought under review and illumined by the light peculiar to State Paper information.

The volume opens with the accession of Edward the Sixth. The reign of the boy-king was ushered in by ugly rumours of war. Francis the First had speedily followed to the grave bluff King Hal, his “very dear and well-beloved good brother, cousin and gossip, perpetual ally and perfect friend,” and had been succeeded on the throne by Henry the Second. The son had little sympathy with the views of his sire. Peace reigned between England and France, but it was a peace bought by terms which were galling and irritating in the extreme to a Frenchman. Wearied with a war from which he could gain little advantage, Francis had gladly concluded the treaty of Campes, the chief conditions of which were, that the English King should hold the town of Boulogne for eight years, or until the debt due by France should be paid. To Henry the Second, the sight of English soldiers garrisoning an important French town, and treating its inhabitants as a conquered people, aroused in his breast feelings of the deepest indignation. He made no secret of his hostility to England, and of his desire to rid his country from the presence of the invader. Completely under the influence of his fascinating mistress, Diana of Poitiers, and of the Guise family, he surrounded himself, to the exclusion of the tried friends whose guidance his dying father had urged him to follow, by advisers who hated, *la perfide Albion*, with the traditionary animosity of their country. The opportunity to provoke a war was considered favourable. There was little fear of a league between England and the Emperor of Germany, for Charles the Fifth, despite his enormous possessions, was fully occupied in holding his own in Germany. England, notwithstanding the immense sums she had derived from the dissolution of the Religious Houses, was suffering from a crippled revenue, intestine feuds, and an expensive war with Scotland. The lover of the fair Diana knew that should he declare hostilities against the Protectorate, which was then ruling our country during the minority of Edward the Sixth, such an act would at once command the support of every true Frenchman. He soon showed the course

he intended to adopt. Preparations for the recovery of Boulogne were now made upon a large scale, and England saw that if she was to retain possession of her conquest, it would be necessary for her to put forth all her energies and resources. From all quarters of France intelligence was brought to the Duke of Somerset of the design of Henry, and of the enthusiasm which his meditated enterprise aroused. Lord Grey, "Deputy of the King's Majesty's town and marches of Boulogne," writes that "the walled towns supply the King of France with 20,000 soldiers at their own charge for one year; these are ready to march at tuck of drum, he suspects, against this town. The clergy pay the fourth penny of their livings. The Parliament of Rouen has decreed that Normandy shall give the King 1,800,000 francs. The whole French troops are supplied for three months, and are ready to march at trumpet sound. The English merchants are ill-treated in France, therefore they mostly associate with Scots." Dr. Nicholas Wotton, Dean of Canterbury and York, and our ambassador at Paris, makes constant mention in his despatches of this one great object of the French Court. "The report is everywhere current," he writes, "that the French King is preparing to recover Boulogne." "Twelve persons," he informs the Council, "have been for the last fortnight living secretly in a house in Paris at the French King's charge, suspected to be the leaders of an intended enterprise on Boulogne or in the vicinity." "A friend of mine," he again writes to the Council, "has shown me a letter from one said to be worthy of credit, stating that M. de Chatillon is practising an enterprise upon Boulogne." "I hear," says the English envoy to the Duke of Lunenburg and to the Lord Protector, "that the French King will have to do with Boulogne this summer with a great company." Such advice was not to be disregarded, and the Council began to bestir themselves to defeat the designs of the enemy. There was every need of such energy, for from the Calais papers before us we see that Boulogne was utterly unfit to sustain a siege; it was feebly garrisoned, deficient in military stores, and its fortifications tumbling down from want of repairs. Lord Grey, conscious of the weakness of his position, wrote home for men and money; but the Council, busy with Somerset's expedition into Scotland, found all their resources exhausted, and were compelled to return a desponding answer to the Deputy's importunities. In this extremity the aid of diplomacy was called in. Since England with her Exchequer empty, and harassed by her foes north of the Tweed, was powerless to maintain the port she had wrested from France, might she not obtain the good offices of an ally to help her in her hour of pressure? Sir William Paget, one of the acutest advisers that the Council possessed

was sent into the Low Countries in the hope that the Emperor might be persuaded to take Boulogne under his protection. The envoy was not successful in his mission. He had to appeal four times before an interview was granted him, and then he soon saw that the Protectorate had little to expect from the generosity of the Emperor. Charles placed in the position of a man who declines to grant what is asked of him, yet wishes to avoid giving offence, was full of fair words. He regretted that he had been unable to see Sir William earlier, but "he had been much letted by matters of importance;" he disclaimed "all unkindness or indifference towards the King of England," but he did not wish to create a dispute between himself and France, and therefore "recommended England to look to their affairs *this* year, and thereafter to doubt not to have assistance of friends." Disappointed at the result of his embassy, Paget quitted the Low Countries in a huff and returned home, "by the long seas having need to purge himself well, being well farsed with Rhenish wines."

And now the long-talked-of attempt which had been the subject of gossip in every barrack from Brittany to Picardy was suddenly undertaken. French troops had been silently encamped at Mottreul, and there Henry reviewed his men and passed in person into the Boullonnois. The recovery of Boulogne united the feuds of the Court—Guises, Bourbons, Montmorencies, all agreed in the object of driving the English from their shores. The forts of Newhaven and Blanc Nez, owing to the treachery of the garison, were captured by the French without resistance, and it was expected that Boulogne would soon be invested by Henry in person. The Council again made a piteous appeal to the Emperor for troops and money. Sir Philip Hoby, our ambassador at Flanders, was instructed forthwith "to solicit from the Emperor the services of 2,000 horse and 4,000 foot of his own troops, and the loan of money sufficient to pay them for two months: this, or whatever aid else the Emperor may be inclined to give must be done out of hand." The appeal was ineffectual, and England had to meet her old enemy unaided. War was declared against France, but hostilities were conducted in the hollowest manner. With her exchequer empty, her credit gone, her people disaffected, England was fully occupied in looking after affairs at home without having a foreign enemy on her hands. The Protector Somerset had been overthrown, and his brother, the Earl of Warwick, reigned in his stead; money was wanted, and the new Minister entered into a treaty with the French for the sale of Boulogne. It was agreed that on the English evacuating Boulogne, leaving the fortifications intact and all the cannon and ammunition which had been found in the

town on its capture by Henry the Eighth, the French would pay down for it 400,000 crowns, and peace should continue between the two countries. Hostilities thus amicably settled, the French correspondence before us increases in interest; instead of dealing with political matters it confines itself to social topics. We are taken into the confidence of the gay Court of Henry the Second; we see the king hunting, hawking, and toying with his "dames;" we read of the balls, the tiltings, the masks, the processions that are constantly taking place; we are introduced to Catherine de Medici, and to her rival, the Duchess of Valentinois, née Diana of Poitiers—indeed the letters of Masone upon the sayings and doings of the courtiers, the Court scandal and the pageantry, throw as much light upon the domestic life of Henry the Second of France as do the pages of John Lord Harvey upon the domestic life of George the Second of England. Sir John Masone, a keen observer of manners, was our ambassador at Paris, and as the Sovereign to whom he was accredited was of a restless disposition, and was always wandering about from one palace to another, intent upon the one great aim of his life—to escape from *ennui*—the envoy had to fill his despatches with lighter details than diplomacy generally furnishes. Masone appears to have had the greatest difficulty in transacting the business with which he was entrusted, on account of the gaiety that surrounded him. The King was always "so much engaged in visiting, hunting, and amusement," that it was almost impossible ever to have an interview with him. Nor were his Ministers a whit more serious or diligent in the discharge of their duties; they followed their master in his sports, and passed their leisure in flirtation with the reigning beauties. "This Court is all set upon pastimes," sighs the diplomatist, mindful of the urgent requests contained in the instructions he is constantly receiving from the Council, which he has to defer from day to day, as no audience is ever granted him. Familiar as Masone had been with the splendour of the Court of Henry VIII. and Francis I., he has to confess that he "never saw a more godly or a richer sight" than the Court of Henry II. The beauty of the women struck him with amazement, and as for the ornaments worn by them at State balls and banquets, "a man would have thought that all the jewels in Christendom had been assembled together, so gorgeously were the dames beset with great numbers of them on both their heads and bodies." The French aristocracy kept up an animated rivalry one with another, each trying to excel his neighbour in magnificence of costume, splendour of retinue, liberality of hospitality, and in general prodigality. Life was passed in one continual succession of banquets, tournaments, and voluptuous festivities, where the *luxu effrenô* of unbridled pro-

fusion was the only order of the day. Amid these scenes, two women stood out in bold relief against the background of the courtly crowd—the Consort and the favourite. It is significant of the position which Catherine de Medicis held that she is scarcely ever mentioned by the English ambassador unless she is about to add to the Royal family. We never hear of any influence she may have exercised over the King, of the part she played in the business and pleasures of the Court, of the homage which was her due as Queen-Consort of France; she seems to have been regarded as one whose only purpose in life was to present legitimate offspring to her country. The only entries we have relating to her are as follows:—“On the 27th [June. 1550], between four and five in the morning, the Queen was delivered of a son, whom they call M. d’Angoulême; various surmises who shall be the godfathers; they who know much say that the Queen is desirous the King of England should be one of them, and for that purpose a gentleman will shortly be sent to England.” On the occasion of the birth of the prince, who afterwards ascended the throne as Henry III., we have a list of the plate presented by the King of England at the christening:—“One pair of flagons of gold, wrought according to the said pots, weighing  $165\frac{1}{2}$  ounces, and one bowl of gold, wrought with divers devices of astronomy, and ‘phismanyes,’ weighing 108 ounces—in all,  $438\frac{3}{4}$  ounces, which, at sixty shillings the ounce, amounts in money to 1,316*l.* 5*s.*” Two years after this event, and at the same time as the young King of England was lying on his sick bed at Greenwich, racked with his consumptive cough, Catherine, “after a long and perilous travail,” gave birth to a daughter. “After dinner we had audience of the King,” writes the ambassador from Poissy. “His Majesty stated that he had received intelligence of King Edward’s indisposition from Boisdaulphin, even about the same time that the Queen, his wife, was in so great peril and danger by travail of her late childbirth, as the surgeon was ready to cut her open, in case she should have died, for the saving of the child. Wherefore, being in a manner no less sorry for the one than for the other, it moved him upon her good escape and deliverance to send De l’Aubespine to visit the King, his good son and brother.” These are the only occasions when, in the volumes of Mr. Turbull, the name of Catherine de Medicis is introduced. But if the wife was ignored, the mistress was never forgotten. There is frequent mention in the despatches before us of the fair Diana; of the influence she exercised in politics; and of the subjection in which she held the King. “The Duchess of Valentinois ruleth the roast,” writes Masone bitterly, for he knew that the frail creature was no friend to England, and was the cause of

his ever-deferred audiences with the King. The amorous Henry, we learn from the correspondence of our ambassador, was always quitting Paris for Anet, "that wonderful fair and sumptuous house belonging to Madame Valentinois, which had been specially erected for her by De Lorme, and the 'commodities' of which, according to Sir John Masone, "were so sumptuous and princelike as ever I saw." Yet the empire of Diana over her lover was not wholly undivided, for we find from some sarcastic remarks of our envoy that a Lady Fleming had the honour of pleasing the faithless monarch. "Lady Fleming," he writes from Amboise, "departed hence with child by the French King, and it is thought that upon the arrival of the Queen-Dowager of Scotland she shall come again to fetch another." A few days later he mentions the result of the intimacy. "Lady Fleming is brought to bed of a man-child, whereat the women here do not much rejoice." Still, though the King was both faithless to his wife and mistress, it was the Diana who "ruled the roast," who was his trusted friend and adviser, and who was all to him what Caroline and Madame Walmoden together were to George II.

It was naturally to be expected that an ambassador accredited to the most extravagant Court in Europe, would have been amply furnished with the supplies necessary to maintain the dignity and hospitalities of his station. This, however, appears not to have been the case with Sir John Masone. Throughout his despatches there are constant murmurs against the pecuniary difficulties which surround him. He complains of the irregularity of the payment of his salary, of the inadequacy of his allowance to meet the expenses of his position, of the erratic life of the King, and of the dearness of living in such a country as France. His daily allowance was five marks a day, but he moans, his expenses are double that amount. Frequent are his petitions to the Council for an increase, but no notice seems to have been taken of them. England was impoverished and fast sinking in public estimation, whilst France was wealthy and a mighty Power in the family of nations. We are told that Henry's courtiers "had many unpleasant stories about the buying and selling of offices in England, the decaying of grammar schools and the Universities, with many other enormities, which they shew one another, printed in English books and set forth by English preachers." His resources exhausted and his country declining to pay heed to his requests, there was no alternative for Masone but to borrow. This he did at the rate of 40 per cent., besides interest in consequence of the depreciation of the currency. Yet even this aid was of no service to him,—it was but a drop in the ocean, and at once absorbed. The festivities of Christmas and New Year's tide had reduced him to the lowest,

ebb ; what with dinners at the Embassy, receptions, balls and presents to the beauties, he had drained his resources to the last crown. He writes home—surely ambassador was never so hardly treated !—that he has exhausted his credit in England, sold all his own plate, “and shall shortly be driven for very extremity to do the like with the King’s, if the realm be in that poverty that the King’s Ministers of honour, who were wont to be served with the first, cannot be paid six months after the day, God help !” When poverty appeals to poverty assistance is out of the question. England was in a terrible plight. In her commercial towns work was scanty ; in the country the small yeomen were turned out of their holdings ; food was at famine prices, and the Government was powerless to cope with the social difficulties that stared them in the face. “The Treasurer maketh none other answer,” sighs Masone, tormented by duns who filled the courtyard of his hotel, “but that he hath no money. I would to God I could be excused with the like answer to my steward here !” Worry and anxiety began to undermine his health ; he had an attack of the gout ; “his body so drooped that he feared he would never see the end of winter.” He earnestly begged to be recalled, “as he would gladly die, if it might be amongst Christian men.”

That the Council should have treated their representative with such shabbiness was not only undignified but short-sighted. An English Ambassador at the Court of France was the one Envoy, in the whole diplomatic service, who should have been kept free from those embarrassments which deaden the physical and intellectual capacities of man. It was his duty to watch, with a vigilance that never slept, the intrigues of the French Court with Spain and the Empire ; the plot of the Catholic party ; and, above all, the attachment that existed between France and Scotland. In the sixteenth century Scotland was to England what Ireland now is to her. Whenever south of the Tweed there were grave political complications, Scotland was ever ready to avail herself of the opportunity to harass and distress England. In spite of the difference of the characters of the two peoples—the one earnest, cautious, and austere, the other flippant, reckless, and gay—there had been, for centuries, a close alliance between France and Scotland. The interests of the two countries were identical ; marriages had frequently united the Courts of Edinburgh and Paris ; a Frenchman fought under the banner of the Stuarts, a Scotchman enlisted in a French regiment without either deeming that he was serving a foreigner ; and both nations felt themselves one in their hatred of England. A treaty of alliance, offensive and defensive, was entered into between the two countries. When England blockaded the ports of France, the Scots hurried over the Border, and laid waste our northern counties ; and, in like



turn, when England marched her troops across the Tweed, a French fleet, laden with arms and ammunition, anchored in the Firth of Forth or Firth of Clyde to offer assistance to her northern ally. It had been part of the policy of Henry VIII. to sever this alliance, and to bring about a union between England and Scotland, by the marriage of the young Queen Mary Stuart with his son Edward. We know what was the result of this scheme, which Henry did not live to carry out, but which was cordially adopted by his successor, the Protector. The marriage was detested by both parties in Scotland—by the Catholic party, headed by the Queen Dowager, Mary of Guise, because the proposed husband was a Protestant, and by the National party, because by such a union it was intended to destroy the independence of Scotland, and make her an appanage of the English Crown. The Protector determined to effect his plan, even at the point of the sword. He crossed the Tweed, and the battle of Pinkie ended in a disastrous defeat of the Scotch. The victory resulted in no important advantage to the English, and the Protector, finding himself unable to support his troops from the sterile character of the country around him, retreated south. The young Queen, no longer safe in her own dominions, was secretly carried to France, and the only purpose gained by the invasion was to increase the hatred of the Scots towards England, and cement still closer their union with France. The letters of Masone were now of great service to the Council. The ambassador was instructed to do all in his power to estrange France from our northern neighbour, and to report all he saw or heard, which led him to conclude that the interests of England were in danger from French assistance or Scottish retaliation. The Court at Blois was thronged with Scotchmen—"the Scots bear a fell rout in this Court, and be much made of all estates"; and Masone soon discovered that the merciless slaughter at Pinkie had failed to daunt the proud spirit of Scotland's sons. "In one point," he writes, alluding to the Scotch he talked with at Blois, "they all agree that the English, by their will, shall not have one foot more of ground in Scotland than they had before the war, unless they have the whole." Until the peace, consequent upon the purchase of Boulogne, had been signed, the Scotch in France used every effort to worry the English. Their ships of war were anchored in French ports, and issued forth "at every tide for the interrupting and spoiling of the English merchants who traffic that way, being supplied with all munitions of men, victuals, and ordnance when they need them." They invented an inflammable preparation—"a sort of Greek fire"—especially for the destruction of English shipping. They intrigued with Denmark to harass our mercantile fleet in the

North Seas. And had it not been for the peace, which the pressure of circumstances forced the Council to conclude, France had agreed to transport a large body of troops to Scotland, to revenge the disaster at Musselburgh. The treaty between Henry and the Council suspended further warfare, and compelled the Scotch to cease their vindictive operations.

This cessation of hostilities induced a distinguished visitor to land at Dieppe, whose appearance was watched with much anxiety by our impoverished, but still vigilant enemy. After the troubles and misfortunes of the past, Mary of Guise resolved upon passing a brief sojourn in the lovely country which had given her birth. The object of her mission was at once perceived; she wished to oust Arran from the Regency, and to foment the discord between England and France. Having obtained a passport from the English Government, she landed at Dieppe, and proceeded to Rouen, attended by a large escort of Scottish gentlemen, and amid signs of the most marked homage. At Court she bore "the whole swing," and was the leader, both of its festivities and its politics. England had scant reason to be indebted to her. "The Scottish Queen," writes Masone, "desireth as much our subversion, if it lay in her power, as she desireth the preservation of herself, whose service in Scotland is so highly taken here as she is in the Court made a goddess. Mons. de Guise, and M. d'Aumale, and the Cardinal of Lorraine, partly at her egging, and partly upon an ambitious desire to make their House great, be no hindrance of her malicious desire." We are informed that the King consulted her upon all State affairs, and declined to reply to any proposals that were laid before him until he had first consulted her opinion. So wily a woman was not slow to make the most of the influence she exercised. She pressed her claims upon the Court; she drew freely upon the Treasury for herself and friends, and seldom appeared except as a suppliant for further favours. Her constant importunities at last disgusted all whose lot it was to have business with her. "The Dowager of Scotland," writes Masone, "maketh all the Court weary of her, from the high to the low, such an importunate beggar as she is for herself and her chosen friends. The King would fain be rid of her, and she pretendeth would fain be gone." In spite, however, of various threats to depart, she continued in France for more than a year, and then, at the invitation of Edward, took England on her way on her return to Scotland. Escorted by ten French men-of-war, she landed at Portsmouth, and then proceeded on her journey, being entertained at the different country-houses of the great on her way to Guildford, where she "was met by Lord William Howard, with the nobility and gentry of Surrey," and conducted to

Hampton Court, where she stayed the night. The following day she went by water to London, and was lodged at the Bishop of London's palace. She was cordially welcomed by the King, and on her departure for the North, "took her leave of him with most hearty and earnest thanks for his kingly usage of her and hers."

She was the last visitor Edward entertained. The health of the King was now rapidly declining; he was attacked by a racking cough, and the expectorations by which it was accompanied showed that the lungs were extensively ulcerated. Early in the July of 1553 he breathed his last. On the failure of the plot of the Duke of Northumberland to raise his daughter-in-law to the throne, Mary was crowned Queen of England. The foreign policy of her reign is well known. Completely under the influence of her cold, calculating husband, she engaged England in a war with France to uphold the interests of Spain, which resulted in our loss of Calais. England was regarded by Philip as a convenient island to draw upon for money and troops, and when these were forthcoming, he ceased to trouble himself any further either with the country or its Sovereign. From the receipts and issues of the Exchequer we are made to see how dearly England paid for her alliance with Spain; the expenses of the navy, victualling department, the Queen's debt in Flanders, and other charges incident to the war in which Mary engaged, carried our national expenditure to an unprecedented height. Nor was Philip content with the large sums he openly obtained from England, for he also made heavy demands upon the private resources of the woman who loved him so warmly, and whom he treated so cruelly. In after-life Elizabeth accused Philip of being not only a bad and heartless husband to her sister, but a man who did not think it beneath himself to make constant encroachments upon his wife's income. When we remember Mary's simple mode of life and unostentatious habits, these items, to be met with in the State Papers, seem suspicious:—

Easter to Michaelmas.	1 Mary.	To Sir Edmond Peckham, Knight, High Treasurer of the Queen's Mint, for her private and necessary expenses . . . . .	£32,848	6	5
Michaelmas to Easter.	1 & 2 Mary (as above)		41,894	8	3
Easter to Michaelmas.	2 & 3 Mary (as above)		45,582	12	7

How were these large sums spent? especially when we remember that they are equivalent to six times the amount of our present money!

The Foreign State Papers during the reign of Mary, with the exception of the Calais Papers, which are very full and important, disappoint us by their meagreness and absence of new information. They do not omit any correspondence touching the great events of the period—the disturbed state of Italy; the quarrels of

Pope Paul the Fourth and Charles the Fifth, the abdication of Charles the Fifth, the embroilment of Henry the Second with the House of Austria, the battle of St. Quentin, and the like—but such correspondence furnishes us with nothing not to be found elsewhere. The letters from the English agents at Antwerp, Brussels, Paris, Rome, and Venice seldom give us intelligence which cannot be obtained from the pages of the historians and chroniclers of the period. We miss those little private details, the official gossip full of personalities, and the pleasant trivialities of daily life which our State Papers so frequently offer to the diligent seeker. The correspondence is dull, tedious, and confined to matters of a purely business-like nature. A few forms, with a blank left to be filled up with the sex of the infant, amongst these Papers, show how certain were the hopes of the neglected Queen that she was to become a mother: “Queen Mary to Pope Paul IV., informing his Holiness of her safe confinement of a Prince, and requesting his prayers and thanksgivings.” “Queen Mary to the Emperor Charles V., announcing her safe confinement.” [The sex of the child and date left blank.] Similar statements were drawn up to be sent to every Court in Europe, and signed by the Queen, when the happy event should have taken place. It was, however, not to be. Hated by her people, deserted by her husband, disappointed in the joys she had anticipated, the rest of the grave, since she feared not death, became more welcome to her every hour. On Nov. 12, 1558, she received extreme unction, and died at day-break on the morning of the 17th: “I have before me,” writes Mr. Stevenson, “a little Book of Prayers, which seems to have belonged to her. It opens, of its own accord, at a page which is blurred and stained more than any of the others of its well-worn leaves. There we may read the two secrets of her life, the two leading ideas of her existence. The one is a prayer for the unity of the Holy Catholic Church; the other is a prayer for the safe delivery of a woman with child. It pleased God that in neither case should the prayer of faith prevail; and however humble may have been her submission, disappointment was death.”

With the accession of Elizabeth the State Papers increase in volume, in importance, and in interest. The elevation of the young Queen to the throne took place at a most critical moment. England was at war with France and Scotland, and powerless to resist her foes. “When this famous Queen,” writes Professor Carleton, “first entered she found the State much afflicted and weakened. All the great States about her were enemies—friends none. The State was then much troubled and oppressed with great debt, contracted partly by Henry VIII., partly by Edward VI. in his minority, and partly by Queen Mary. The treasure

was exhausted, Calais was lost ; nothing seemed to be left to her but a weak and poor State, destitute of means and friends. The King of Denmark and the Protestants in France were not able to help her nor to help themselves within her means." Thus placed in this discouraging situation, it was the policy of Elizabeth to preserve the support of Philip, and free herself from a foreign war which, if persevered in, could only result in national bankruptcy. Nor were her enemies unwilling to meet her advances. France was exhausted by her struggle in Italy, Flanders, and Germany, whilst Philip had no wish to drain his exchequer by further hostilities. A conference was held at Cateau Cambresis, and it soon appeared that the chief difficulty of the hour was the restoration of Calais. The English would be content with nothing less than the surrender of Calais, whilst Frenchmen loudly declared that rather than give up what they had re-conquered they would strip themselves to their shirts. Such high-handed resolves could, it seems, be only decided by war. Philip assured his sister-in-law that he would keep faith with England in the matter of Calais. He would make no peace with France unless it met with her approval. But if hostilities were resumed what force could she bring into the field? Was she prepared to besiege Calais? War with France signified also war with Scotland. Was she strong enough to engage in this double conflict? To these cruelly practical questions Elizabeth was unable to give a satisfactory reply. She had no "money, men, armour, fortresses, practice in war, or good captains;" her realm was upon the brink of ruin. To the hard and selfish Philip such an ally was not worth supporting, and he resolved now to consider only his own interests, and to make the best terms he could. The treaty of Cateau Cambresis was signed, and England, in spite of all her threats and protestations, was compelled to submit to the terms imposed upon her by France. The Duke of Savoy had his Italian States; Sienna was surrendered to the Medici, and Corsica to the Genoese; France kept possession of Metz, Toul, and Verdun, and upon payment of 500,000 crowns secured her hold upon Calais. By the forced surrender of one of her most valued conquests England had obtained peace.

Still, in spite of the treaty, little cordiality existed between the two countries. In Paris Elizabeth was stigmatized as a usurper, and the Queen Dauphiness openly declared herself as the rightful occupant of the throne of England. In London Cecil knew how deep were the intrigues set on foot by the Duke of Guise and Cardinal Lorraine to support the claim of their niece, Mary of Scotland, and how hollow was the peace that had been signed. An event now occurred which brought matters to a crisis. At a tournament held in honour of the marriage of the Princess

Elizabeth of France to Philip of Spain, and of the betrothal of the Duke of Savoy to the sister of the King of France, Henry was mortally wounded by his antagonist. The broken shaft of the lance of the Count of Montgomery, "a tall and powerful young man," forced open the King's visor, and "gave him such a counter-buff as drove a splinter into his head right over his eye on the right side, the force of which stroke was so vehement, and the pain was so great, that he was much astonished." Henry declared that he had received his death-blow, and after a lingering through more than a week of agony, he became insensible and passed to his rest, July 10, 1559.

The death of Henry ushered in the power of the House of Guise. Francis the Second succeeded to the throne, and both he and his wife were completely under the influence of the Duke of Guise and the Cardinal of Lorraine. In the face of Europe the gauntlet was thrown down to Elizabeth. The claims of Mary Stuart were now revived with increased energy. The young Queen, in spite of the protestations of the English ambassadors, assumed the royal arms of England, and styled herself, in all the documents that issued from her chancery, as Queen of England and Ireland. Elizabeth was openly declared illegitimate, and the House of Guise resolved to make the attempt to place their niece upon the English throne. According to the old proverb that "he who would England win, must with Scotland first begin," small bodies of French troops, well armed and well-officered, were to be landed north of the Tweed, under the pretence of maintaining the authority of the absent Queen. Once in Scotland a dash was to be made at Berwick, and at the same time troops were to be landed in the Isle of Wight, and Portsmouth was to be seized. It was believed, in Paris, that this attempt would be the signal for a general rising of the English people, who were dissatisfied with the policy pursued by the Government. These designs did not escape the vigilant eye of Cecil. A meeting of the Privy Council was called, and it was carefully debated whether it would be better at once to assume an offensive attitude by openly aiding the Lords of the Congregation, who were anxious to throw off the yoke of France, or to await the threatened operations of the Guises, and then ask for the assistance of Spain. The former of the two alternatives was decided upon.

Scotland was then the victim of civil war. Animated by the fanaticism of John Knox, the leading Reformers had entered into a bond by the style of the Lords of the Congregation to suppress Popery, to drive the French troops from their shores, and to deprive Mary of Guise of the Regency. Though no friend to the Puritans, Elizabeth allied herself with the Lords of the Congre-

gation, and supported their cause. The Duke of Norfolk was appointed lieutenant-general, soldiers from every county in England were hurried north, and a strong naval force was fitted out with orders to sail for Leith. The result of the campaign is well known : the English fleet appeared in the Firth of Forth, the French army shut themselves up in Leith, and after a short siege were forced to capitulate. The Treaty of Edinburgh was signed, and it was there stipulated that the French should instantly evacuate Scotland, and that the King and Queen of Scotland should thenceforth abstain from bearing the arms of England, or of assuming the title of that kingdom. Shortly after this agreement had been entered into, the young King of France died, and Mary, who was bitterly disliked by Catherine de Medicis, had her stay in Paris made so disagreeable, that she resolved to retire to Scotland and take up her abode amongst her own people.

The death of Francis the Second was joyfully welcomed by those who had the interests of Protestantism at heart. The House of Bourbon was once more supreme, and the hated Guises were ousted from the power they had so selfishly usurped. Throckmorton, the English ambassador at Paris, saw, in the removal of the late Prince, a special sign of the Almighty's favour towards Elizabeth. "The Queen," he writes to his mistress, "has cause to thank God for so well providing for her surety and quietness, by taking away the late king and his father (redoubted of all the world), considering their intentions towards her." The former having made a universal peace and great alliances, like to continue, meant wholly to extend to her and her neighbours in the behalf of his son and daughter-in-law, which was no disguised matter ; the latter took in hand his father's enterprise to his uttermost, but partly impeached by his own affairs at home, but specially by her wise preventions the same could not take effect. "Now is the time," he cries, "for the Queen to follow, the good means offered to her to establish all things to her continual quiet, and to make a sure and larger seat for herself and her posterity for ever, to God's glory and her own unspeakable fame. So shall the world say that, like as God hath wrought miraculously for her, so has she well and duly embraced His goodness, and done more for herself and the charge given unto her governance, and that with greater facility than her predecessors could ever compass by all the best means they could imagine."

This advice Elizabeth was now to accept. On the death of Francis, the Queen Regent had formed the project of ruling both parties in France by playing one against the other. The animosity of faction was, however, too strong to be kept within bounds. The Constable Montmorenci allied himself with the

Duke of Guise; the King of Navarre embraced the same party, whilst Catherine, finding herself depressed by the combination, threw herself into the hands of Condé and the Huguenots. Civil war now ensued. The Huguenots took up arms; Guise and Montmorenci got possession of the King's person; armies were levied, and every province in France became the prey of intestine feuds. The Prince of Condé now applied to Elizabeth for assistance, and offered to put Havre into the hands of the English. The offer was accepted. The Papers before us are now of exceeding value, as they clearly exhibit the movements of Condé on the one hand, and the Duke of Guise on the other, and the part taken by Elizabeth and her Ministers in reference to this great political struggle. A large English force under the Earl of Warwick, supported by a well-selected Council of War, took possession of Havre, and declared their intention of holding that town as a security for the restitution of Calais. This high-handed resolve was, however, to be disappointed. The battle of Dreux was fought (a full account of which is given by Throckmorton, in his despatches to the Queen), Condé and Montmorenci were taken prisoners, and the Duke of Guise was shortly afterwards murdered by the hand of Poltrot de Mère. Thus fell the Royalists, and the Huguenots were anxious for peace. The wishes of Elizabeth were disregarded, and a treaty was concluded between Catherine de Medicis and the Condéians. Indignant at this treatment, the English Queen refused to surrender Havre, and gave orders to the Earl of Warwick to prepare himself against an attack from the French. The narrative of the siege is fully given in the State Papers. Havre was invested by the French, May 21, 1563, at which time the English possessed many advantages, not the least of which was the command of the Channel, by which "the navy shall keep the seas, and victual it in spite of the enemy's beard, and put in fresh aid at their pleasure." Soon, however, affairs changed for the worst. Early in June "a strange disease" appeared in the garrison, through which nine died very suddenly in one morning; two days afterwards, out of 600 labourers, one-half were sick and unable to serve. Before the end of the month the death-rate was sixty daily, and Warwick had to inform the Privy Council that the plague increased, and that the garrison was now reduced to 1,500 able men. In addition to this fell malady the English were wretchedly supplied with the means to resist a protracted siege. They wanted provisions, stores, and munitions of war; the "iron pieces sent from the Tower were old waste pieces unserviceable;" they wanted ash-tree sticks for cannons, wheels and wheelers; they were short of rods and ramrods; "many of the carpenters lately sent were unskilful and



altogether ignorant of their art ;" their shot was utterly decayed ; and although "archers would do great service upon any sally, they had no bowstrings nor arrows." It was soon evident that the place was untenable, and Warwick agreed to surrender the town. The result of the re-conquest of Havre by the French led to a peace being entered into between Elizabeth and the Queen-Regent.

Within the limits of a review it is impossible to do justice to the voluminous nature of the foreign documents of this reign. So far as the Papers have been calendared by their careful editors, not a fact relating to the relations between England and the different States on the Continent is omitted, and much new light is thrown upon the events of the time by the despatches of our envoys, in France, Spain, and the Low Countries. The Border Papers give us the whole history of Scottish affairs—the jealousy of Elizabeth, the connexion between Mary of Scotland and the House of Guise, the marriage of Lord Darnley, the rising of the Scottish malcontents, and those disturbances which led to the ruin of the young Queen. The letters of the English ambassadors at Paris furnish us with full details touching the war of religion that had again broken out between the Catholics and the Huguenots ; the battle of St. Denis and Jarnac ; the assistance lent to the Huguenots by Elizabeth ; the proposal of marriage between the Queen of England and the Duke of Anjou ; and the numerous intrigues that were constantly set on foot between London and Paris. In the Low Countries the despatches of our envoys exhibit the cruelties practised by Alva in the name of religion, the execution of Egmont and Horn, the protection accorded to the Flemish exiles by Elizabeth, and the whole of the tyrannical system adopted by the Spanish Government in Flanders. In short, the State Papers present a complete history of foreign affairs during the reign of Elizabeth, valuable to the antiquary, the historian, and the ecclesiastical writer. The earlier volumes have been edited by Mr. Stevenson, whilst the latter have been edited by the erudite Mr. Crosby, of the Record Office, with the care and scholarship we are accustomed to expect in these publications of the Master of the Rolls. As the Calendars advance we may be tempted again to take up the subject.

## INDEPENDENT SECTION.

*[Under the above title a limited portion of the "Westminster Review" is occasionally set apart for the reception of able Articles, which, though harmonising with the general spirit and aims of the Review, may contain opinions at variance with the particular ideas or measures it advocates. The object of the Editor, in introducing this department, is to facilitate the expression of opinion by men of high mental power and culture, who, while they are zealous friends of freedom and progress, yet differ widely on special points of great practical concern, both from the Editor and each other.]*

## A NEW VIEW OF THE INDIAN EXCHANGE DIFFICULTY.

**N**O one is at all likely to bestow a glance on the following pages who is not already aware that, during the sixteen years ending with 1878, the Indian Government has annually sustained a loss, always considerable and latterly enormous, by reason of its having to meet bills, equivalent in amount to many millions sterling, drawn annually by the Secretary of State for India in Council. These bills—Council Bills as they are called—which are necessary to provide the Council with the means of making corresponding sterling payments in England, are drawn in rupees, and as the exchange value\* of the rupee has during the same sixteen years fallen to various rates very much below the normal rate of 2s., the Council have been compelled to accept proportionately smaller sums in sterling for drafts upon the Government for any given sums in rupees, and consequently to draw for a proportionally larger total of rupees for the satisfaction of all their English requirements.

The following Table shows the amount of Council Bills, the average rate of exchange, and Government loss by exchange in each of the said sixteen years, and also the first two particulars for three earlier years :—

\* "Exchange value" is, perhaps, a somewhat ambiguous expression, but wherever used in this paper the reader is requested to understand by it simply and solely the value of the rupee, as measured by the price payable for bills of exchange drawn either by foreign countries on India or by India on foreign countries.

Year.	Amount of Council Bills.	Average Rate of Exchange.	Loss by Exchange.
	£	s.	£
1860-1	797	2	—
1861-2	1,193,729 (Besides £120,000 on London, purchased in India on Government Account.)	1·11 $\frac{7}{8}$	—
1862-3	6,641,576	1·11 $\frac{7}{8}$	—
1863-4	8,979,521	1·11 $\frac{7}{8}$	11,610
1864-5	6,789,473	1·11 $\frac{7}{8}$	42,700
1865-6	6,998,899	1·11 $\frac{3}{4}$	84,662
1866-7	5,613,746	1·11	165,223
1867-8	4,137,285	1·11 $\frac{1}{2}$	63,758
1868-9	3,705,741	1·11 $\frac{1}{2}$	132,139
1869-70	6,980,122	1·11 $\frac{1}{2}$	142,555
1870-1	8,443,509	1·10 $\frac{1}{2}$	554,623
1871-2	10,310,339	1·11 $\frac{3}{8}$	382,288
1872-3	13,939,095 (Besides £403,040 on London, purchased in India.)	1·10 $\frac{3}{4}$	750,318
1873-4	13,285,678	1·10 $\frac{3}{8}$	924,851
1874-5	10,814,615	1·10 $\frac{1}{8}$	863,995
1875-6	12,389,613	1·9 $\frac{5}{8}$	1,391,454
1876-7	12,695,800	1·8 $\frac{1}{2}$	2,129,962
1877-8	10,131,455	1·8 $\frac{1}{2}$	1,606,582
1878-9	13,948,565 (Besides £1,516,193 on London, purchased in India.)	1·7 $\frac{3}{4}$	2,963,796

It will be observed how immensely the loss by exchange has increased since 1872, and when it is considered that the price of silver began to fall in 1873 from its immediately previous and normal rate of 60*d.* per oz., and that in 1878 it averaged only 52 $\frac{3}{8}$ *d.*, the inference may at first seem irresistible that the intermediate increase of loss was mainly due to the depreciation of silver. Such, indeed, is the general and almost universal opinion, that of the late Mr. Bagehot and other equally eminent authorities included; and one novelty in the view about to be placed before the reader will consist in its treating this opinion as altogether erroneous, and in representing the depreciation of silver as not having as yet affected the Indian exchange in any appreciable degree.

So startling a paradox may not improbably be summarily dismissed as unworthy of serious examination, but to any one who will vouchsafe me a hearing I hope to be able to prove, and to prove, not by complex argumentation, but by the simple logic

of undisputed and indisputable facts, that, however apparently absurd, it is really almost literal truth.

The first fact to which I would invite attention is that, although the depreciation of silver did not commence until 1873, the exchange value of the rupee had, during the twelve years immediately preceding, fallen from 2s. at which it had stood in 1860, to 1s. 10 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. in 1872. So far, at all events, unless an antecedent can result from a subsequent, the fall in the value of silver cannot possibly have had anything to do with the fall in the exchange, which must plainly have been wholly due to other causes, whereof it may suffice to specify one, quite adequate of itself to account for the phenomenon. The amount of Council Bills (and of bills on London purchased in India) which had been only £797 in 1860, became more than two millions sterling in 1861, and reached to between fourteen and fifteen millions in 1872, the total during the twelve years ending with that one being more than eighty-four millions, and the annual average about seven millions. How so great and rapid a multiplication would operate is readily perceived. All English sellers of bills on India, finding themselves with an article on their hands which had become a comparative drug in the market, would be far more eager to sell than customers to buy, and would have to accept much less sterling money than before for paper representing any given sum in rupees; while Indian customers for bills on England, becoming conversely more anxious to buy than sellers to sell, would have to give many more rupees than before for paper representing any given amount of sterling. Now that this twofold operation was by far the principal, if not the exclusive, cause of the fall of the exchange during the twelve years ending with 1872, is admitted on all hands; but if that first fall from 2s. to 1s. 10 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. may so be sufficiently explained, a similar explanation might equally suffice for the further fall which took place during the six years immediately succeeding. In that second period, during which the exchange fell from 1s. 10 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. to 1s. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ d., the total amount of Council Bills, and of Bills on London purchased in India on Government account, was little short of seventy-five millions sterling, and the annual average twelve and a half millions, and whoever is aware in how very much more than mere rule-of-three proportion the price of any article is lowered by a considerably additional supply while demand remains the same, need have no difficulty in believing that if an average annual issue of seven millions of Council Bills had reduced the value of paper rupee money by five farthings in every two shillings, an annual issue of twelve and a half millions might well suffice to occasion a second reduction of twelve farthings. One thing at least is demonstrably certain. Whether

this second reduction was or was not exclusively due to the superabundance of Council Bills, and whatever other causes, if any, may have contributed, the depreciation of silver was not among the number—not at least as a direct material agency. What moral influence it may possibly have exerted indirectly will be adverted to hereafter, but of its absolute nullity in any more distinct sense, there is the following positive proof.

In order that the increased abundance and consequent cheapness of silver bullion on this side the globe should have affected the exchange value of the rupee, two things were indispensable; firstly, more silver than usual must have been exported from hence to India; and, secondly, the importation must have been followed by an increased coinage of rupees. Otherwise, the comparative abundance of silver in Europe and America, and its comparative scarcity in India, could not lower its price in India any more than superabundant wheat harvests in India could lower the price of wheat in England as long as the whole of the superabundance was retained in the land of its growth. In either case, no doubt, apprehension of importation, on the part of dealers in the commodity concerned, might produce some effect of the kind, but, as soon as it was discovered that the apprehended importation neither did nor was likely to take place, both the apprehension and its effect would vanish, and the price, whether of silver or of wheat, would revert to the point from which it had fallen. Again, even though silver had been imported into India in infinitely larger quantities than before, still the consequently increased cheapness of the raw material of the rupee could, unless accompanied by increased coinage, have no more lowered the value of the rupee than a fall in the price of silver-paper—the raw material of bank notes—could of itself lower the value of bank notes. For the purchasing power of rupees does not, any more than that of bank notes, depend upon the intrinsic value of the material of which it is composed: it depends upon the utility of the rupee as an instrument of exchange and upon the demand for it in that capacity. A rupee cannot, indeed, possibly become worth less than a piece of silver of the same weight and fineness, nor a bank note worth less than a scrap of paper of like size and quality; but either rupees or notes may, and inevitably will, become worth more, if their issue do not keep pace with the demand for them. Clearly then, however large might have been the importation of silver into India subsequently to 1872, the exchange value of the rupee could not have been affected in consequence, unless a greater coinage than usual of rupees had taken place simultaneously. Now in the three years next after 1872, both the imports of silver into India and the coinage of rupees there, instead of increasing, sensibly

decreased. During the four years ending with 1872, the imports had averaged £3,877,448, and the silver coinage £3,715,766, but during the next three years (1873-1875) the yearly average of silver imports was £2,897,794: that of silver coinage £3,272,369. It is thus clear that during at least three out of the six years under review, that is to say during 1873, 1874 and 1875, the Indian exchange was not affected by the depreciation of silver.

One thing indeed which these figures seem to indicate is that the depreciation had not in 1875 as yet extended to India at all, notwithstanding that it already represented in Europe and America a fall of price of from 60*d.* to 56½*d.* per oz., or not quite 5¼ per cent. For, inasmuch as in India the coinage is perfectly unrestricted, any one who pleases being entitled to take silver to the Mint and have it coined there, it is certain that, if silver had in any appreciable degree been worth less there in an uncoined than in a coined condition, it would at once have been coined in quantities sufficient to restore equilibrium between the two conditions. Unluckily as to this particular point only hearsay evidence is immediately accessible: still, in so far as such imperfect testimony can be relied upon, it is distinctly corroborative of the above stated inference; every one, with any pretension to acquaintance with the subject to whom I have referred, assuring me that to the best of his knowledge, the price per oz. of bar silver in India has not sensibly varied for several years.

The facts already adduced might perhaps suffice to prove my case, in so far as it applies to the period ending with 1875, but others may be cited in their support. In whatever degree, if any, the fall in the exchange value of the rupee may have been due to depreciation of the metal of which it is composed, general prices must necessarily have risen in India in the same proportion—not indeed as much as the price of bills on England has risen, for no one doubts that this latter rise is in part due to increased demand for bills on England—but as much as the price of such bills has been raised by depreciation of the silver composing the rupee. For a fall in the value of the rupee occasioned by depreciation of silver, and a rise of all prices expressed in rupees, are convertible terms. The one means the other and means nothing else: it means simply that a rupee will no longer exchange for the same quantity of commodities as before, because a quantity of silver equal to that contained in the rupee will no longer exchange for the same quantity. Did then Indian prices in general rise when silver became depreciated? Of some few articles, wheat for example, the price did for a while rise slightly; but, in every such instance, the

rise can be traced to variations of supply or demand or other circumstances affecting exclusively the particular article concerned ; while, with regard to the great majority of commodities, either prices have remained stationary, or if there has been any change, the movement has taken a downward more frequently than an upward direction. The one striking exception is that of bills on England, but if, while these have risen enormously in price, the price of almost everything else has remained comparatively unchanged, the inevitable inference is that the relation between them and rupees has been disturbed by some special cause or causes affecting themselves exclusively, not by any cause affecting rupees exclusively.

Unless the accuracy of our statistics be open to doubt, the inference drawn from them would seem to be as irresistible as it is obvious, but it must be admitted that one portion of the evidence is almost as startling as the opinion in behalf of which it is cited. How, it will naturally be asked, is it possible that silver should have been worth more than five per cent. more in Europe than in India, and not have been sent to India forthwith? or how, at any rate, is it possible that if—provided it were sent to India—it would there become worth more by being coined, it was not forthwith coined? To say in reply to the first of these questions that time was required for silver to find its level in all parts of the commercial world is merely to restate the difficulty, not to solve it. Why in this instance was so much time required? If at Bombay or Calcutta there were heaps of jute or hides, or seeds or sugar in store, the transfer of which to England would ensure a profit of five per cent. over and above the ordinary rate, the transfer would, instead of occupying three years, probably be completed in as many months. Why, then, should three years have been necessary for an article so much more easily portable as silver? With some hesitation I venture to suggest as a possible explanation that, profitable as it might have been to remit silver from England, it was still more profitable to remit bills. Merchants who, while silver was at 60*d.* per oz., might have had to give £100 for the quantity coinable into 1000 rupees, would, with the price at 56 $\frac{7}{8}$ *d.* per oz., have to give only £94 15*s.* 10*d.* for the like quantity ; but on the other hand, with the exchange at 1*s.* 10*d.* the rupee, the average rate of the three years ending with 1875, he could buy a 1000 rupee bill on India with only £91 13*s.* 4*d.*, a difference in favour of remittance by bill amply sufficient to cause that mode to be universally preferred. Besides, be this as it may, if there had been any extraordinary importation of silver into India, part of the extraordinary supply must inevitably have gone to the Mint to be coined, and

against that supposition at least the negative testimony of the Mint records is absolutely decisive.

Let us here pause for a moment to report progress, briefly restating the point already arrived at, and the path by which it has been reached. In the twelve years beginning with 1861 and ending with 1872, the exchange value of the rupee fell from 2s. to 1s. 10 $\frac{3}{4}$ d., but as the depreciation of silver did not commence until 1873, it can have had nothing to do with this first fall, which must therefore have resulted from quite different causes, whereof an increase of Council Bills was certainly the chief, if not the only one. During the three years immediately succeeding and ending with 1875, the exchange underwent a further fall to 1s. 9 $\frac{5}{8}$ d., for which the simultaneous increase of Council Bills from an annual average of seven, to one of twelve and a half millions, would perfectly account, and would no doubt have been universally supposed to account perfectly, if it had not been overlooked in the consternation produced by a fall in the value of silver from 60d. to 56 $\frac{3}{4}$ d., which also took place simultaneously, and to which the entire discredit of having lowered the exchange was immediately and generally transferred. But in order that the depreciation of silver should even co-operate in thus affecting the exchange, it was indispensable both that more silver should be imported into India than in previous years, and that more of the silver should be coined, whereas, in point of fact, between 1872 and the end of 1875, less was imported and less coined. It follows necessarily that depreciation of silver had no more to do with the fall of exchange during 1873-5, than it had with the previous fall during 1861 and 1872.

Unless some flaw, which altogether eludes my own jealous scrutiny, can be detected in the reasoning thus summarized, my case thus far ought, I think, to be admitted, but I am far from flattering myself with the hope of readily obtaining such an admission. That silver should fall in value by 5 $\frac{1}{4}$  per cent. in three years throughout the greater part of the commercial world, without sensibly lowering the exchange in every country in which silver money is the sole legal tender, and where coinage is absolutely unrestricted, is so contrary both to all experience and to that indolent opiniativeness which is apt to be complacently confounded with common sense, that the reader may probably be tempted to exclaim "the thing's impossible and cannot be," and to add that only by some juggle of words and figures can it have been made to appear to be. Neither can it be denied that except in very peculiar and extraordinary circumstances the thing would be as impossible as it seems: but then, in the particular case with which we are at



present dealing, the circumstances are most peculiar, if not unexampled; their peculiarity consisting in the fatal obligation under which India groans of having to make annually to England remittances—economically of the nature of tribute—of many millions sterling, for which she gets no return. How disastrously this obligation affects India's commercial position will be seen if we consider what that position would be without it. India's imports from and her exports to England would presumably then about balance each other, as would likewise the bills annually drawn by one country on the other; and as long as the relative intrinsic values of the metals respectively composing the sovereign and the rupee remained without alteration, the exchange between the two countries would be pretty constant at par. If, however, the relative values of the precious metals became seriously deranged, or to put the case as it has actually occurred, if silver became greatly depreciated, its price in the first instance becoming much lower in Europe and America than elsewhere, then, indeed, other circumstances remaining as above supposed, silver would assuredly pour into India: large coinage of rupees would immediately ensue; and all prices whatsoever would rise in consequence, the price of bills on England of course rising among the rest, though neither more nor less than prices in general. The fall in the exchange value of the rupee which the rise in the price of Bills of Exchange would constitute, would then be permanent—would last as long as the depreciation of silver lasted—inasmuch as, so long as the rupee remained shorn of part of its previous purchasing power, while the sovereign retained all its previous purchasing power, more rupees would obviously be needed to purchase a bill representing a given number of sovereigns, while fewer sovereigns would suffice to purchase a bill representing a given number of rupees. • But, although so long as the rate of exchange continued to fall, dealers might be much inconvenienced by the increased difficulty of estimating the eventual sale proceeds of their wares, and might be entrapped into unexpected losses—compensated, however, quite possibly, by equally unexpected gains—the inconvenience would be only temporary, and would cease whenever the rate of exchange reached the lowest point marked out for it by the depreciation of silver. At that point, whatever it might be, the exchange would remain constant, unless or until silver recovered part of its former intrinsic value, and merchants would base their calculations upon it, and arrange their prices accordingly, making neither more nor less profit than before by reason of the lowness of the rate. For it is, I submit, a complete mistake to suppose that reduction of the exchange value of the rupee,

when caused by depreciation of silver, can either stimulate India's export or check her import trade.

In saying this I am, I am aware, advancing a second novelty, and am moreover directly at variance with economists of no less mark than the late Mr. Bagehot and Mr. Goschen; but, with all respect, I submit that the reasoning of those eminent authorities on this point is fatally vitiated by a very singular oversight. Mr. Bagehot begins by pointing out that, with the exchange value of the rupee considerably below par, a merchant sending foreign goods to India and selling them there at the same prices as prevailed before the exchange fell, and consequently obtaining for them only the same number of rupees as before, would have to give many more of those rupees for a £1,000 bill upon England, and would therefore find his eventual profit on the transaction proportionately reduced; while on the other hand, a merchant sending Indian goods to England would, with the sovereigns obtained by him as their sale proceeds, be able to buy a bill on India for many more rupees than formerly, so that his total profit would be proportionately augmented. In thus speaking, however, they assume that Indian prices remain stationary, unaccountably overlooking the utter impossibility of their so remaining while the exchange was falling *by reason of depreciation of the rupee due to depreciation of the metal composing it*. Mr. Bagehot did, indeed, perceive clearly that, in such circumstances, Indian prices must sooner or later rise, but, throughout his book, he assumes that—at the time he wrote, they had not as yet fallen; and Mr. Goschen's language distinctly treats "depreciation of silver in India," and a consequent "depreciation of the Indian exchange," unaccompanied by a rise of Indian prices, not "simply as a possible contingency, but as an actually existing fact."\* But surely the co-existence of a depreciated currency and of stationary prices is a flat contradiction in terms. Depreciation of silver currency, in a country in which silver is the sole legal tender, signifies a rise of prices and signifies nothing else. It is a rise of prices alone which indicates it; nay rather, which constitutes its essence. The quantity of silver contained in a given number of rupees has ceased to be worth the same quantity of miscellaneous commodities as before; so, more rupees than before are needed to purchase the same quantities of commodities; in other words, general prices have risen. In whatever measure, great or small, depreciation of silver has contributed, or may hereafter contribute, to lower the exchange value of the rupee, in

---

\* See Evidence before the Silver Committee, Question 1371. From Question 1377, it would seem that the fallacy here alluded to did not escape the sharp eyes of Professor Fawcett.

precisely that same measure must Indian prices in general have simultaneously risen already, or hereafter rise simultaneously. The necessity of the case forbids one moment's interval between the two events. It does not suffice to say that prices must sooner or later rise in virtue of the depreciation; if they have not risen already the depreciation has not yet commenced. Although, therefore, the importer into India of English goods, if buying bills of exchange on England with depreciated rupees, would have to pay more rupees for them, he would, in the increased number of those rupees obtained by him in payment for his goods, have acquired the means of doing so without incurring any diminution of his previous rate of profit; while, on the other hand, the exporter to England of Indian goods, although able with the sale proceeds of those goods to buy bills on India representing more rupees than before, would find those rupees worth no more in India than the smaller quantity were formerly, and would not therefore find his trade more profitable than of yore. There would thus be no increase of profit to stimulate India's export trade, nor any diminution of profit to check her import trade; the amounts of the two would retain their old proportions, and so too would the amount of bills drawn by one country on the other, on purely commercial account. If all this be true, and it is not so much demonstrable truth as a string of palpable truisms, it follows that Mr. Bagehot was mistaken in supposing that a fall of the exchange resulting from depreciation of silver could ever "cure itself," or that "the ordinary laws which govern foreign exchanges" could correct a fall proceeding from that cause. Both import and export trade and everything connected with them, would follow the same routine as before without other change than this, that inasmuch as the Indian currency had become depreciated, all Indian prices would rise, and notably the price of foreign bills of exchange payable in gold. The natural tendency of the so-called "laws which govern foreign exchanges" is to place exchange at par; par of exchange signifying that rate at which the bullion contained in any given number of the coins of one country will exchange for a quantity of foreign coin containing an equivalent quantity of bullion. But between two countries like England and India, one using silver and the other gold money, the rate representing par must needs change if silver becomes depreciated, so that if, after the Indian rate of exchange had fallen in consequence, the laws which govern foreign exchange should restore it to its previous height, the results would be not parity, but imparity, of exchange.

Returning from this short and indispensable digression, in

which we have examined the purely hypothetical case of an India exempt from tribute, but with a silver currency depreciated by reason of a decrease in the intrinsic value of the metal composing it, let us now turn to the actually existing case of an India saddled with enormous tribute obligations. Between 1861 and 1873, previously to which latter year silver had undergone no depreciation, the progressive increase of Council Bills had reduced the exchange value of the rupee by five farthings. During the next three years, 1873-5, the annual average amount of Council Bills was further increased, and was not, indeed, very much less than doubled, and the exchange value of the rupee underwent simultaneously a further fall of three farthings or of twopence in all. Is it possible that this second fall can have been exclusively due to the same cause as the first, and that the reduction by one-twentieth of the value of silver bullion had nothing to do with it? Assuredly, if India had been exempt from tribute, it would have been impossible for silver to be worth more by  $5\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. in Europe and America than in India, without pouring into India in quantities sufficient to produce equilibrium between its price there and elsewhere; and it would have been similarly impossible that the influx should not have been accompanied by an increased coinage of rupees sufficient to establish equality in India between the value of uncoined and coined silver. How then can it be, that the existence of the tribute has prevented all this from actually happening? In reply I can only repeat my former conjecture that the progressive increase of the tribute, represented as it was by a corresponding multiplication of Council Bills, lowered the exchange to a point at which it was still more profitable to remit bills than to remit silver to India; but this answer ought, I submit, to suffice, confirmed as it is by the fact that the imports of silver and likewise the coinage of rupees, instead of increasing, decreased between 1872 and the end of 1875, and that, as a further consequence, notwithstanding the depreciation of bar silver in Europe, the silver currency of India underwent no depreciation during the period mentioned.

Now at length, perhaps, I may fairly claim to have proved that down to the end of 1875 at all events, the depreciation of silver had not appreciably contributed to reduce the exchange value of the rupee, the low rate of which was mainly, if not exclusively, due to the excessive issue of Council Bills. But though this be true down to the date mentioned, what about the three years that have since intervened, and what about the future? In respect to the immediate past, we have some new and curiously instructive particulars. Whatever may have

been the causes which, in spite of the extreme cheapness of silver in Europe, checked for a while its importation into India, those causes ceased to operate immediately after 1875. The net imports, which, having been £6,552,375 in 1871, fell to £715,144 in 1872, and after rising to £2,495,824 in 1873, and to £4,642,203 in 1874, fell again to £1,555,355 in 1875, sprang suddenly to £7,198,870 in 1876, and by another and still more surprising bound to £14,676,334 in 1877; while the coinage of rupees, which in the four years ending with 1872 had averaged annually £3,715,706, but only £3,272,369 in the next three years, became £6,271,122 in 1866, and in 1877 reached the unprecedented height of £16,180,326. In 1878 it was £8,176,373. A comparison of these figures with some of those in the tabular statement entered on the first page of this article will afford a striking confirmation of the soundness of the views here set forth. In 1877, when the importation of silver was by far the greatest that had taken place for more than twenty years, and the silver coinage by far the greatest ever known, the rate of exchange, instead of falling, rose by one farthing above that of the previous year, for the amount of Council Bills was less by two millions and a half than that of 1876. In 1878 the imports fell from about  $14\frac{1}{2}$  to about  $5\frac{1}{2}$  millions and the coinage from about 16 to about 8 millions, yet the rate of exchange fell four farthings, for the amount of Council Bills rose by nearly  $2\frac{1}{2}$  millions above that of 1877. Now, seeing that the enormous additions made to both imports and coinage in 1877 did not affect the price of bills of exchange, we may rest satisfied that they did not affect the prices of things in general; we may fairly conclude that India's appetite for silver—her *argenti sacra fames*—whetted by the short diet of the four preceding years, was keen enough to allow of her absorbing even those enormous additions without showing any symptoms of surfeit, and we may still more be strengthened in this conclusion on observing that when, in 1878, the amount of Council Bills became half as much again as in the preceding year, a decrease of about one-half in both silver imports and silver coinage did not prevent the exchange from suffering almost the severest fall it had ever experienced within an equal space of time. Can more decisive proof be desired that the cause of the fall in 1878 was the same as in all previous years—a great increase, namely, in the issue of Council Bills, unaccompanied by any increase in the demand for them; and that consequently, down to this moment, the depreciation of silver has not sensibly contributed towards the fall?

Next as to the future. Undoubtedly if silver continue to be as at present very much cheaper in England than in India,

silver must sooner or later flow from hence into India, perhaps in a continuous stream, perhaps only by fits and starts, but in one way or the other, sufficiently to bring its prices in India and England to virtual equilibrium, and in whatever degree silver may in consequence become depreciated in India, the Indian currency must needs be depreciated likewise, and the Indian exchange be affected accordingly. The degree, however, in which these effects will exhibit themselves will obviously depend on the price of silver in England and Europe generally, and there are strong grounds for believing that that price will speedily recover from its present depression, inasmuch as all the causes which have hitherto contributed to depress it may be confidently expected to become shortly inoperative.

Some readers may perhaps be surprised to be told that among those causes, the discovery of new and extraordinarily productive mines in the United States of America occupies only a very subordinate place. It may be true, though there is much reason for believing the figures to be greatly exaggerated, that whereas the North American out-turn of silver had ten years before been scarcely worth mentioning, it was nearly six millions sterling in 1872, more than seven millions in both 1873 and 1874, and nine millions in 1875,\* and has since shown but slight symptoms of diminution, being stated at £3,400,000 for the first six months of the present year. But however abundant the new supply from this source, one thing certain is that none of it has found its way to Europe, for the total exports from the United States, instead of increasing, fell off after 1872, having averaged £3,414,440 annually during the four years ending with July of that year, and only £3,346,198 in the next six and a half years. It is plain then that the supply from the United States cannot be regarded as a material factor in the fall of the gold price of silver, "except in so far as the apprehension excited by the discovery of the new mines may have affected a market already in an exceedingly perturbed and sensitive condition."

A factor of real efficacy was Germany's demonetization of silver and monetization of gold, which has acted in three-fold wise — to wit, by throwing on the market fifteen millions sterling worth of silver coin withdrawn from circulation, by stopping the demand for that silver which had previously been required to maintain the German silver currency at a proper complement and by creating a larger new demand for gold, and thereby enhancing the absolute value of that metal at the same time that its value relatively to silver was being increased by reason of the independent depreciation of the latter. The combined effect of this triple

action might nevertheless have been almost unfelt but for the suicidal perversity of France and the other members of the Latin Monetary (and Bi-metallic) Union, which taking alarm at Germany's procedure, resolved, and publicly announced their resolution, to restrict within the narrowest possible bounds their own silver coinage, and thereby did their best to increase the very depreciation at which they had taken fright. By this step the Union were abandoning the fundamental principles of their association, and the step was not more dastardly than disastrous. If they had remained true to their bi-metallic faith, and, continuing to manifest by their conduct the courage of their opinions, had trusted bi-metallism to take care of itself, bi-metallism would have shown itself equal to the occasion, and able to bear with perfect ease the new strain to which it was being subjected. Of course silver would then have been taken in larger quantities to the various Mints of the Union, and the consequent issues of silver coin would have proportionately displaced gold money, and possibly, though most improbably, might have caused the latter to disappear entirely from circulation. But even in this extreme case, what then? The public inconvenience that might otherwise have resulted from the substitution of less portable for more portable metallic money, could easily have been obviated by a more general adoption of bank notes or other paper for large or distant payments; and although the Union Mints might have been somewhat severely tasked in order to meet the extraordinary demand for silver coin, with the prospect, too, of having to perform a converse task whenever the tide should turn, and gold be demanded at the Mint in substitution for silver, they might have abundantly compensated themselves for the extra trouble by the pecuniary gain they would have made, if, in anticipation of the action of individuals, they had themselves bought up depreciated silver with the gold they had in stock, and then reissued it with the additional value it would have derived from being coined. If this course had been pursued, the depreciation of silver would have been arrested almost as soon as it commenced; the extraordinary supply, such as it was, by which the metal was temporarily cheapened, would have been met by a corresponding demand which would presently have restored the price to nearly, if not quite, its previous height, and things would have gone on much as before. For the one solitary physical factor then remaining would have been Germany's addition to the previous supply, and it was only a very limited amount which Germany was capable of supplying. Its exact amount may be unknown, or known only to initiated bureaucrats, but according to a recent and very careful analysis of official

data,\* cannot have much exceeded four millions sterling, and whatever the total, Germany would have been careful, for her own sake, not to flood the market with it, nor to offer it for sale in portions much larger than those actually adopted, or, on the average, about seven millions yearly. But, seeing that India alone has been able to absorb nearly sixteen millions in a single twelvemonth without apparent discomposure, we cannot suppose that the annual distribution during some half-dozen years over the whole commercial world of less than half that quantity annually could have occasioned any sensible disturbance. It is now indeed well understood that the past action of Germany and of the Latin Union combined, has been much rather indirect than direct. It was far less what they did than uncertainty as to what they might either do or leave undone, that occasioned those violent fluctuations in the price of silver which are but faintly indicated by the average rates stated some pages back. This it was, together with the occasional panics occasioned by the wildly exaggerated rumours frequently arriving from the American mines, that by leaving bullion dealers without any firm data for calculation, often induced them to sell at heavy loss rather than risk heavier loss by waiting, and deterred them from purchasing except for immediate purposes. Thus it was that the price of silver fell once to 46*d.* per oz., the lowest price ever known, and this, too, is by far the principal, if not the sole reason why the price is at this moment little higher than 52*d.*

It is all but certain, however, that neither the present depression nor anything like it can endure much longer, and would indeed be quite certain but for the doubt hanging over the American mines. It is of course conceivable that these may more than realize the wildest prophecies uttered regarding them. True, instead of an imaginary annual average of twenty to thirty millions, they have never yet yielded more than nine millions in any one year, and they may possibly be approaching exhaustion. Yet who can say what the unexplored bowels of the earth may have in store? But on the other hand when was there a time at which any one could say any better than he can now? The possibilities on either side are quite as evenly balanced as they ever were before, and there is no more reason now than there has always been why they should cause uneasiness or be taken at all into account: while, apart from these, there is solid ground for assurance that all assignable causes for the depreciation of silver must soon cease to operate. "Germany," according to

\* "Notice Historique sur la Réforme Monétaire en Allemagne," par Jules Malou. Bruxelles, 1879.



a report made a few months back by Lord Odo Russell to Lord Salisbury, "has at last found out that she is herself a loser by her sales of silver, and has in consequence decided to suspend them, and is, moreover, generally believed by financial men to be preparing to introduce and adopt the double standard as in France," while France and the other Latin confederates must likewise discover very shortly the error of their ways, or at all events must act as if they had become aware of it. In 1886 at latest, according to a recent agreement between them, they must inevitably remove all restriction from the coinage of silver, but they will scarcely wait until then: they can scarcely fail very much earlier to perceive that they will ultimately have no choice between returning to unqualified bi-metallism and completely demonetizing silver and monometallizing gold—an enterprise which, in view of the enormous rise in the price of gold that would result from their attempting it, would, without some such extraordinary aid as Germany in like circumstances derived from her war indemnity, be utterly beyond their resources. But every assignable cause for depreciation having thus been withdrawn, silver must presumably recover its old value, and the Indian Government which, as we have seen, has hitherto remained unharmed by the depreciation, may assure itself that it has no more to dread in future from that quarter than it has actually suffered during the past.

Repeating then, by implication, the assertion with which I started, I can see but one reason for even slightly modifying it. Just as the monetary policy of Germany and of the Latin Union has, so to speak, acted rather morally than materially, so the vague apprehensions created by the depreciation of silver may have aided to produce effects of which the depreciation itself was utterly guiltless. Although the depreciation has not as yet diminished the purchasing power of the rupee in respect to any thing except bills of exchange, people engaged in Indian commerce have from time to time very naturally assumed that it must almost immediately raise Indian prices generally; and seeing the price of silver bullion drop from 60*d.*, to 59*d.*, 58*d.*, 56*d.*, 54*d.*, and 52*d.*, successively, and at one time sinking as low as 46½*d.*, they never, when tendering for Council Bills, could do more than guess what those bills would be worth when they reached India, and they may probably enough have reduced their tenders accordingly a good deal below the rates which they would otherwise have been content to pay. The close coincidence in point of time between the lowest price to which silver and the lowest rate to which the exchange ever fell, must be admitted to be all in favour of this supposition, for it was precisely when the former dropped suddenly to 46½*d.* that the

latter dropped with equal suddenness to 1s. 6d. Nevertheless, a comprehensive comparison of all the statistics will show how exceedingly fitful and transient in its operation must have been any indirect, moral influence justly attributable to silver's depreciation, and how very inconsiderable an auxiliary it must have been of the constant and potent agency which, I maintain, to have been the true cause of the depression of the exchange.

The Indian Government, if persuaded to accept the views set forth above, may perhaps be disposed somewhat over-hastily to congratulate itself on the altered aspect of affairs. Justly enough it may confess to itself that it has hitherto been occasionally panic-stricken by what, so far as India alone was concerned, was little more than a bugbear, and seeing that it has no evils to apprehend from the depreciation of silver, it may without any extraordinary magnanimity persist in the resolution, announced on its behalf in the last session of parliament, to face those evils manfully. Some relief it may derive, too, from perceiving that, in the actual circumstances of the case, alterations of its Currency Laws will not serve the turn, and that it may therefore cease to perplex itself with any of the currency schemes devised by Colonel Smith and others—schemes of which, let me say in passing, that, being myself the author of one of them, I am by no means disposed to speak disparagingly. But let it not therefore too hurriedly take heart of grace. Proceed they whence they may, the fall of the exchange, and Government's loss in consequence, are none the less dire realities; and if ascribable, not to depreciation of silver but to excessive issue of Council Bills, they are due to a cause with which it may be even more difficult to deal. One true ground of consolation the Government may at first sight appear to have. One important difference between the present depression of the exchange, if due to depreciation of silver, and if due to superabundance of bills of exchange, deserves particular attention. In the one case, the depression would, for reasons already stated, last as long as the depreciation, and so too would any loss to Government resulting from it; but the Government would be the only permanent sufferer. Creditors would incur more or less loss, and debtors obtain more or less gain, but both loss and gain would be only temporary, and might too, in a national sense, be regarded as counterbalancing each other; and all fresh mercantile transactions would adapt themselves to the new monetary values; but a Government dependent as that of India is, for the greater part of its revenue, on contributions of predetermined sums of rupees, would necessarily remain at a disadvantage as long as the rupee remained depreciated, unless it could venture, as the Government of India

cannot, to supplement its diminished revenue by additional taxation. In the other, and, as I contend, the actual case, the exchange may really be trusted to right itself, in a certain sense, by a process nearly identical with the one indicated by Mr. Bagehot. For whereas, in the former case, all Indian prices would rise in much about the same proportion as that in which the price of Indian bills on foreign countries rose, and in which the price of foreign bills on India fell, in the latter, all prices would remain for awhile unaffected, with the exception of those of bills of exchange, the prices of these being raised in India and lowered elsewhere by variations in the proportion between supply and demand, applying to them only and not extending to any other commodity. In these circumstances, an English merchant, procuring for £100 a bill on India for, say, 1110 rupees, instead of only 1000 as formerly, will with that £100 have acquired purchasing power over Indian produce greater by one-tenth than before, and his profit, by bringing to England the goods therewith purchased, will be proportionately increased, while an Indian merchant, obtaining for 1000 rupees a bill on England for only £92 instead of £100, will exercise over English goods little more than nine-tenths of his previous purchasing power, and his profit by transferring his English purchases to India will be proportionately diminished. India's import trade will thus really be stimulated and her export trade checked until, by reason of the gradually increasing dearness of English goods in India, and the gradually increasing cheapness of Indian goods in England, the profit to be made by trade between England and India in either mode becomes the same. While this is going on, the amount of foreign bills on India will gradually diminish, and that of Indian bills on England increase, the exchange value of the rupee creeping up simultaneously until the two amounts become equal, and the Indian exchange stands again at par. According to Mr. Bagehot the evil will then have cured itself, since Government, receiving in full tale its accustomed due of rupees, will be able to obtain in exchange for those rupees gold for its English payments on as advantageous terms as ever, and the prime cause of its financial distress will thus be removed. Perhaps so, but if Mr. Bagehot had inquired at what cost to the people of India this cure will have been effected, he would have discovered that the remedy will be many times worse than the disease. He might almost as well have talked of a patient being cured of his complaint by the atrophy that killed him. For an obvious effect of the augmentation of India's export and the diminution of her import trade will be to make all Indian produce proportionably cheaper abroad than before, and all foreign

produce dearer in India than before—in other words, to compel India to accept a proportionately smaller quantity of foreign produce in return for any given quantity of Indian goods. If the excess of Bills on India, over and above those drawn on commercial account, be taken at its present amount of fourteen millions sterling, it will, in order that the Indian exchange should be restored to par by the process described, be necessary for India to barter for less than her present total of foreign imports a quantity of her own produce which, at the prices of the present day, would be worth more than those imports by fourteen millions. Thereupon, the profits of all Indian producers will of course be reduced in corresponding ratio. Capital, if not withdrawn from productive industry, will at least be discouraged from resorting to it, and production, if not thrown back, will be prevented from advancing. To such fatally disastrous results, the risk of the Indian taxpayer being disabled from meeting his fiscal engagements in full, is by comparison a very insignificant addition. Now this is really what, if things are allowed to go on as at present, India has to look forward to, and the prospect is not one to be contemplated with equanimity. It plainly will not do, then, for India to be kept waiting until the “laws that govern foreign exchange” shall have obviated the exchange difficulty. Her Government, if sincerely resolved to face that trouble manfully, must also resolve that the issue of Council Bills shall, by some means or other, be materially lessened. Yet by what means? The problem is of the hardest, but where there is a will, there is generally a way.

Experience, as usual, deferring until too late her captious counsels, at last teaches us clearly enough how serious an oversight there has been in an important branch of the domestic policy instituted by the Government of India some five-and-twenty years ago, and steadily pursued ever since. Every one could see that railways which had so marvellously developed the resources of Europe, were equally desirable for India; but neither did it occur to any practical administrator to inquire, nor did any theoretical economist volunteer to point out, how greatly the investment of British capital on Indian Public Works must, by necessitating the remittance to England of annual interest or profit on the investment, derange the Indian exchange, nor how grievous would be the effects of the derangement. Railways are good; irrigation is good; but neither one nor the other good enough to compensate for the opening and continual widening of a drain which has tapped India's very heart's blood, and is drying up the mainsprings of her industrial energy. So grievous an error of the past having been at length, however tardily, detected, will scarcely be per-

severed in, and we may reasonably assume, therefore, that there will be no more guaranteeing of private British enterprise, nor any more raising in Europe of Public Works Loans on any pretext whatever: while as for foreign loans for less plausible purposes, to denounce *them* would be superfluous. There is for India just now no other public work half so urgent as the restoration of equilibrium between income and expenditure, and all the rest should be imperatively required to wait until there shall be surplus revenue applicable to them, unless, perchance, the requisite funds can be intermediately borrowed from local capitalists content to receive their interest on the spot. Precautions like these, however, can but help to prevent the exchange difficulty from becoming aggravated, and a question that will not brook delay is by what means it can be abated. For this purpose, mere economy, economy in the abstract, will not suffice; not only must the aggregate and general expenditure of Government be brought within more moderate limits, but expenditure in England—home expenditure, as it is officially termed—that expenditure which insists upon exhausting remittances from India and necessitates the drawing of Council Bills, must in especial be reduced to a minimum. How then is this indispensable reduction to be effected? The problem, as I said, is of the hardest, “but where there’s a will there’s a way,” and I should myself be tempted to suggest several paths all tending in the right direction, if certain personal considerations, in addition to want of space, did not forbid my entering into detail upon this part of the subject. Here, then, I bring my story to a close by drawing from it the pregnant moral that it is India’s tribute which is so balefully weighing down the Indian exchange, and that the same burden threatens, unless speedily and materially lightened, to break the Indian camel’s back—miracle of endurance though the animal be. To the Indian Government, if persuaded of the truth of these propositions, and of its consequent obligation to modify its past policy in some essential respects, it belongs to determine, with its own abundant light and knowledge and with the aid of the numerous accomplished experts at its disposal, what precise line of action it shall henceforth pursue. Certainly it cannot be too expeditious in acting upon Mr. Fawcett’s advice, and commencing an entirely “new departure in Indian finance.”

W. T. THORNTON.

Our readers will be sorry to learn that the distinguished author of the foregoing Article died on the 17th ult., from the effects of a severe cold.—ED. of *W. R.*

## INDIA AND OUR COLONIAL EMPIRE.

---

**T**HE NAGA WAR AND RAMPA REBELLION.—The operations against the Angami Nagas of Konomā and some neighbouring villages who alone, it would seem, were concerned in the murder of Mr. Damant and the subsequent outrages, were brought to a not very satisfactory close in April. The insurgents gave up their arms, and their fortifications were occupied and destroyed. But it does not appear that any adequate guarantee for future good behaviour or satisfaction for past offences has been exacted. If we except the defence and relief of Kohima, there is hardly an incident of the little campaign which we can recall with complacency. The attack on Konomā was so badly planned that Government pointedly omitted to thank the "successful" commander. The Nagas withdrew quietly and established themselves behind stockades higher up, whence, within sight of our men, they sent down parties to cut off convoys or raid into the plains. And the European planters, for whose protection alone our posts had been pushed forward into the hills, grumbled because—as an absolutely necessary measure, of which no native landholder would complain—elephants and other carriage were impressed for the use of the troops. Hardly less unsatisfactory has been the course of events in the Rampa country. The premature withdrawal of the troops was followed by the reappearance of insurgent bands, and the vacillating Government of Madras had again to make preparations for the military occupation of the disturbed districts.

*In Cashmere* the prospects of the harvest justify the hope that the remnant of the population have no acute distress to fear. But the cry for British intervention, of which we spoke last October (p. 51), is still as loud as ever. The Maharaja is accused not only of oppressing his subjects, but of being disloyal to the paramount Power. It is said—with what truth, we do not know—that he has had treacherous correspondence with Cabul, and even Russia. Lord Lytton was said to contemplate active measures, and a meeting with the Maharaja was understood to be arranged. Meanwhile, the Maharaja, like most

suspected princes whose misfortunes have not deprived them of their revenues, does not lack apologists, even in the Anglo-Indian Press.

*The Retrocession of Mysore.*—Our preparations for making over Mysore—which, for more than a generation, has been practically a British Province—to the rule of the young prince, who, after a long minority, is, next year, to sit on the masnad of his “ancestors by adoption,” ought certainly to reassure any native rulers who are nervous about annexation. Some grave practical difficulties have arisen. The new Civil Service is to be wholly native; but as it has to administer the English “scientific” system, and Mysore does not offer the appropriate material, it has to be sought elsewhere, to the great dissatisfaction of the average Mysorean, who prefers an alien Englishman to an alien Madrasi. Then there is the difficulty of protecting the European planters, whose enterprise has done so much to develop the province. Our military cantonment at Bangalore—the best and healthiest in India—can hardly be abandoned. But the worst feature in the situation is that whereas most native rulers find, after a long minority, that English administration has filled the coffers of the State, the young Prince of Mysore succeeds to a treasury impoverished by the drain of successive years of famine.

*Burmah.*—While the mission from King Thibau was still waiting at Thayetmo, news reached Rangoon, from Mandalay, that small-pox had broken out there, and had found its victims even in the palace. To appease the offended Spirits, the King, it was said, contemplated a great sacrifice of human beings, selected, in accordance with the suggestions of the wise men, from various classes of the population. The Thayetmo delegate hastened to assure the British authorities that the story was a malicious invention; but there is reason to believe that the propitiatory sacrifice was really planned. Meanwhile the people, dismayed by the pestilence and impoverished by the lotteries, seemed ripe for revolt. Crowds of refugees streamed into the British province, and our police complained that crimes on the border were frequent. One of the two refugee princes, who have so long been kept under friendly restraint in Calcutta, seems to have escaped to British Burmah. There, within our frontier, he organized an insurrectionary band. But before it reached Menhla, the first stronghold on the Irrawaddy, it encountered the Royal troops and was dispersed. Our authorities disarmed the fugitives as they crossed the frontier. Before this, however, as it was found that the treaty which at length the Envoy had been authorized to propose, contained no provision for the removal of our grievances, he was again told that he had better return. In June he seems at last to have discovered that mere pertinacity would not avail, and

returned to his master. A steamer of the Irrawaddy Company was detained by the local governors at one of the stations on the river, on the plea that there was war between the English and the King of Ava. Explanations were demanded, and the Mandalay Government is said to have apologized. But while the policy of non-intervention hitherto pursued is generally approved, it is felt that our rights under the existing treaty—wholly favourable as it is to Burmah—should be insisted on.

*The Change of Government.*—The mass of the people of India are wholly absorbed in the personal cares of their every-day life. Ordinary natives of fortune or culture—whose ideas outside of the Presidency towns make up “Public Opinion”—have little real appreciation of political questions. They have sufficiently definite beliefs as to whether a tax is oppressive, or whether local administration is efficient. They are profoundly affected by the vague intelligence they get of the external policy of the Government. But of the details of great questions they know little, and have little means of knowing. With the class of “educated” natives—that is, of natives who more or less profoundly have been affected by English ideas, through the mediums of English literature and Journalism—it is otherwise. These are numerous among all classes in the Presidency towns, and in official posts everywhere. They have powerful and able organs in the Press. They have acquired the art of “meetings.” They alone, in fact, have the gift of articulate political speech. They are the improving and improvable class. The future they think, rightly perhaps, is theirs. Now these men have aspirations—legitimate enough, but still, in no unworthy sense, selfish. They want, for instance, to get appointments, now reserved for Europeans; to have the permanent settlement made general; to have the present system of spending public money on the higher education maintained. On these matters their opinions do not agree with that of any Anglo-Indian Administrators, Whig, Radical, or Tory. They have fared no better under a Liberal than under a Conservative Viceroy. But in the discussions of the last few years they have found themselves condemning much which the English Liberals condemned. Liberal statesmen have shown a disposition to listen favourably to all or any complaints against a wicked Conservative Viceroy. And so the Indian Liberals have seen a chance of committing English Liberalism to their whole programme. When the Dissolution was announced, the Indian Association sent a representative to this country. Other associations sent fervent proclamations of sympathy, combined judiciously with catalogues of grievances which Liberals were to redress. News of the Liberal victory was



received with transports of delight. Addresses of congratulation were transmitted and—a more practical proof of appreciation—a subscription was successfully started to pay the expenses of Mr. Fawcett's election at Hackney. It is, however, right to add, that many of the noblemen who subscribed expressly said they did so on personal, not political grounds. The Radical impetus can hardly extend itself to the details of Indian Administration, and the educated natives will no doubt find that Lord Ripon—if in manner more conciliatory—will view their proposals in much the same light as Lord Lytton.

We need not here review the acts of Lord Lytton's administration. How far his policy was his own, and how far he was the reluctant agent of the Home Government, his contemporaries cannot tell. That he had exceptional difficulties to deal with in every branch of the administration, no candid critic will deny. But he seems to us to have increased them, by an irritating reliance on the virtue of mere phrasing and display. In the early part of his career at any rate he *created* difficulties by preferring the dictates of his poetic instinct and "broad human sympathy," to the suggestions of mature Indian experience. What the fruits of his "diplomacy" were the Afghan Blue Book attests. As to the policy of appointing a Roman Catholic to such an office as that of Viceroy, we have nothing here to say. The appointment will, at least, satisfy natives that the Government of India is of no religion. But why, they will ask, has the Bishop of Calcutta an official position?

*Finance and War.*—This time last year we gave an account of Sir John Strachey's Budget proposals for 1879-80, and of certain discussions regarding the financial and economical condition of India, which had an important effect on practical policy. The public and the Finance Minister were in a thoroughly pessimistic mood, and the budget was a budget of despair. Even before the regular budget statement for this year was made public, Government was able to announce that these melancholy forecasts had not been fulfilled. What the precise figures are we shall explain hereafter, but the general impression produced on the public mind was, that Indian finance was in so flourishing a condition that not only could the ordinary charges of the years 1879-80 and 1880-81, be defrayed from revenue, but after paying the cost of the Afghan war, there would still be a surplus. The disclosure was peculiarly welcome to the Ministry, who were on the eve of appealing to the constituencies, and against whose Afghan policy, one of the most effective criticisms was, that it laid intolerable burdens on the already inadequate revenue of India. It enabled them, too, to strengthen their argument that India *ought* to pay for the

war by evidence that she could pay. Let us see how far the figures justified this inference. We need not, of course, repeat the general explanations we gave last July. According to the regular estimates for 1879-80, the revenue would amount to more than 67,500,000*l.* sterling—that is to say 3,500,000*l.* more than was estimated in the budget of last year. After defraying all charges (except, of course, the capital expenditure on productive public works) there would be a surplus of 119,000*l.* And so for 1880-81 it was estimated that a revenue of more than 66,500,000*l.* would provide a surplus of nearly 500,000*l.* Further, the completed accounts of 1878-9 showed a surplus of over two millions. So that in each of the three years there had been a surplus, though the expenses of the war and of the construction of the frontier railways towards the Khaibar, and from Sakkar towards Candahar, had been met from revenue. The war expenses, actual or estimated, were thus set down:—1878-79, over 500,000*l.*; 1879-80, over 3,000,000*l.*; 1880-81, over 2,000,000*l.* The total net war expenditure, to the end of 1880-81, was estimated at 5,750,000*l.*, and the total net expenditure on railways at 3,000,000*l.* Thus, had there been no war, there would have been a surplus, on the three years, of over 12,000,000*l.* Sir John Strachey further showed that, taking the whole expenditure (including that from loans) of the past ten years, it exceeded the revenue by only 36,500,000*l.*, and of this sum 24,500,000*l.* were expended on public works in the strictest financial sense “remunerative,” while the rest—11,00,000*l.*—were spent in works regarding which some doubt exists as to whether they will yield profits sufficient to cover the interest on the capital outlay. But as, in future, care will be taken to limit expenditure from public works loans to works certainly remunerative, it may be conceded that the prospect of Indian finance, viewed in the light of the past, is certainly not gloomy. Had Sir John Strachey frankly announced that the war expenditure was so much, and that it would be defrayed from loans, repayable from the surpluses of a certain limited period of years, no judicious person would have drawn any unfavourable inference regarding the permanent condition of the finances. But the despatches show that he was anxious to produce a budget which would be superficially as well as substantially reassuring.

His budget was, in only one sense, a “Prosperity” budget. It showed a fair excess of ordinary revenue over ordinary expenditure. Compared with his dismal estimates the year before, it was, of course, exhilarating. Opium was “better” by nearly two millions. But this is a feature which, from year to year, cannot be reckoned on. The

decline in exchange had been arrested, and, under this head, there was an improvement of over a million. Half a million "saved" under public works only showed that the country had been deprived of advantages which, to the people of the country—though not directly to the Treasury—would have been worth double that amount, and will certainly have to be again conferred at the cost of fresh unnecessary outlay. The improvement of less than a million, under land revenue and salt, indicated that the people were really recovering from the effects of the continuous famine and depression. Then, it must be remembered, that the improved finance of the past three years is due to new imposts amounting to over a million, which—whatever may be said of their expediency—are beyond question unpopular and vexatious, and the removal of which would be a distinct political advantage. In a perfectly candid statement all these things would have been noted, and attention would have been drawn to the fact that there *ought* to be, by Sir John Strachey's own showing and general admission, a normal surplus, in ordinary years, of two millions to make finance safe. Sir John Strachey says now, that this surplus was intended to meet the war "among other things." No one would have inferred this from his statement, when he introduced the proposals for the special taxation. The objects then noted were famine and general improvements. In non-famine years Government was, in effect, to borrow for productive public works, from the surplus instead of from the open market, and in famine years to pay itself back the sum thus borrowed, from the product of loans which, had there been no famine surplus, would have been contracted year by year for public works. So that the Finance Minister ought, in honesty, to have said that, a great part of the cost of the war was provided, not from revenue, but by a loan from the standard surplus. (WESTMINSTER REVIEW, July, 1879, p. 291).

But Sir John Strachey was anxious to avoid the very name of loan. The Parliamentary Committee appointed two years ago to inquire as to public works policy, agreed that it would be financially safe to borrow *in India*, on an average two and a half millions yearly for productive public works, plus the sum necessary for the purchase of the East Indian Railways, and similar works. Now if we assume that it was right of Sir John Strachey to lend part of his standard surplus for war, he ought clearly to have borrowed for public works. But he frankly acknowledges that he was so anxious to give pleasing evidence of the sound state of the finances, that he preferred, instead, to reduce the cash balances to a sum which every one admits is dangerously low. But he expressly reserved power to borrow.

Military critics—any one, indeed, who took the trouble to compare the figures of the first Afghan war with those of the present operations—received the estimate of the cost of the war with incredulous surprise. Even before the English elections were over, telegrams from Calcutta reached the India Office begging that drawings on India should be greatly reduced, and soon it appeared that the cost of the war was four millions, at least, more than had been estimated. The immediate pressure was met by a loan of over three millions. Opinion in England, always credulous and sensitive, jumped to the opinion that because the war cost what many judicious persons thought it would cost, the whole financial position was desperate. Ludicrous proposals were made to send some English financier to put things straight—*i.e.*, in a few weeks to master every intricacy of Indian Administration. The blunder is a grave, and possibly a disgraceful one. But it is rash to infer that because the Finance Minister accepted, without due examination and criticism, the estimates framed in the Military Department, that all his other figures and inferences are wrong. The Military Department has accepted the full responsibility, and the only question is whether, according to official practice, the Finance Minister is bound to go behind their returns. He said, expressly, that they were “purely speculative,” and in fact gave them for “what they were worth.” The unforeseen causes to which the Military Department attributes the miscalculation are the purchase, instead of hire, of transport, the accumulation of supplies for six months, and the enormous increase in the price of grain and all other supplies both at the base and in Afghanistan. Whether these could not have been fairly seen in February is a point on which general opinion decides against the Military Members of Council. As to other budget arrangements we may note that export duties on indigo and lac were removed, and that all incomes under 500 rupees were exempted from the license tax. Thus relief was given (at a cost of £340,000) to a very large class who felt its incidence most severely.

We may, too, say here that a Commission, composed of a large number of the most distinguished Anglo-Indian soldiers, under the presidency of Sir Ashley Eden, the Civilian Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, which had been inquiring and deliberating for many months, issued its Report about the time of the Budget statement. Its proposals were of the most radical and general kind, affecting organization, distribution, and pay. They purported to increase efficiency and at the same time save, every year, one million and a quarter. The absence, however, of several of the leading members (who were on

active duty in Afghanistan) deprives the Report of much of the authority it would otherwise have. The recommendations have been severely criticized, notably by the Commander-in-Chief in India.

*The Turkoman Expedition and Persia.*—Last year the Russians made the fatal mistake of collecting their troops at Chikislar before they had accumulated supplies and transport. This year they have taken so long in preliminary preparation that the troops had not begun to arrive from beyond the Caspian before the end of the cold weather. The hot weather has now come. The pools are drying up, the grass disappearing, and the sufferings of the soldiers in the desert they have to traverse, before reaching the fertile Tekke country, will be intense. But preparations for an advance are being pushed on. General Skobeloff has arrived to take command. Whatever the orders of the Shah may be, the Persian officials on the frontier allow the Russians to collect supplies and transport freely, and possibly an advance along the *Attrak* may be permitted. Nurverdi Khan, whose energy organized and whose spirit gave heart to the Tekke resistance, is dead. It is possible, then, that the Turcomans, who have in vain asked for the protection of Persia, may accede to the Russian terms; and Russia, it may be presumed, would, under present circumstances, be satisfied with a nominal submission, and with the establishment of a line of posts from Krasnovodsk through Kizil Arvat to Chikislar, to “keep the nomads in.” While the English are still at Cabul and Candahar, Russian statesmen would certainly regard it as “inopportune” to raise the question of Merv.

In Persia there is famine, and though the Shah made preparations for an advance on Herat, it is not probable, now that the negotiations with England have fallen through, that he will make any attempt to recover it.

*Russia and China.*—Russian writers attribute Celestial recalcitrance to the influence of the party hostile to the Foreigners, and on this ground have appealed for support to all European Powers. It is certainly the immediate interest of England to prevent a war which would severely interfere with her trade. But, in truth, the Kulja settlement was so manifestly favourable to Russia that no Government which felt conscious of its power to insist on better terms, could be expected to accept it. The Chinese have a large army, part of it excellent fighting material. They are elated by their success in recovering Kashgar. While a new Chinese ambassador is awaited at St. Petersburg, news comes from Central Asia that the Chinese have already entered, not only the part of Kulja they claim, but the Russian territory of Khokand. They have sent emissaries to incite the subject

people of Central Asia to revolt against Russian rule, and the expelled ruler of Khokand has been invited to return. On the other hand, within Kulja Russia has a large body of sympathizers, and she hopes to be able to raise the Mussulmans of Kashgar against their cruel Chinese conquerors. Russian touts have been despatched in haste to the frontier. The Pacific fleet has been strengthened, perhaps for a descent on the Chinese coast. But at Peking, too, there are vigorous preparations for war. Colonel Gordon, of the ever-victorious army, finding that his "turbulent disposition" disqualified him for the duties of private secretary to Lord Ripon, has hastened to his old friends, and though he hopes to persuade them to peace, it is more probable that he will command them in war.

*Afghanistan.*—Soon after Mr. Lepel Griffin's arrival at Cabul, Mustaufi Habibulla succeeded in overcoming the reluctance of the Sirdars and tribal leaders, who had made Ghazni their head-quarters, to trust themselves at Cabul. They sent in a deputation, to whom, with a judicious absence of deference, Mr. Griffin gave an account of our intentions. These had already been explained to the Sirdars, who have, from the first, been waiting on Providence and our good pleasure at Cabul. We purposed to allow Afghanistan to revert to its normal condition of fragmentary independence. Candahar was to be a separate Principality under Sirdar Shir Ali Khan. We did not intend to annex Cabul, or Herat, or Turkestan, and would remain at the capital only until some chief acceptable to the Afghans, strong enough to maintain his authority, and thoroughly friendly to us, should be installed. Yakub Khan was certainly not such a prince. At this time Abdurrahman had been received with acclamation in Turkestan. He was extremely popular with the Kohistanis; but it did not appear that out of Kohistan and Turkestan he was likely to receive much support. The proposed separation of Candahar offended some of our supporters; our utter rejection of Yakub Khan offended others. We may anticipate events by saying that, partly owing to the excitement about Abdurrahman, partly owing to the intrigues of the disappointed factions, and partly owing to local fanaticism there have been constant apprehensions of trouble in Kohistan, and several actual outbreaks along the line of communication. In a night attack on Fort Battye (near Gandamak), a brave young English officer was killed; another was murdered while out riding; there were several Mohmand gatherings; a successful raid was made on Government cattle at Jelalabad; and troops had to be sent thence to expel bands under local Mollahs from the adjacent districts. Fines were successfully levied on the offending clans, and the towers of the villages were destroyed. It was discovered

that the Mustaufi, who had never been quite trusted, had incited some of these outrages, and, like a good many other Afghan notables, he was "deported" to India.

It was absolutely necessary to withdraw the garrison of Bengal troops which had so long occupied Candahar, and it was decided that they should capture Ghazni and break up the combination there on its march back. The force—of about 6,000 men, one-third Europeans—marched in separate detachments, which joined beyond Khelat-i-Ghilzai. For some days a cloud of tribesmen had marched parallel with the force, and on the 19th of April, near Ahmed Khel, General Stewart found that the hills on the left of the road were occupied by the enemy. Preparations were being made for an assault, when a body of 3,000 swordsmen descended and threw themselves on our force. They fought with a desperate courage, of which, in previous encounters with Afghans, our men had had no experience. It was necessary to place every man of the reserve in the firing line. So fierce was the attack that our lines had to give way to let the fanatics surge through. Some almost got to the hillock on which General Stewart stood. But at last the withering fire and repeated charges of cavalry told. They fled, leaving several thousands of dead. These brave men were Ghilzai tribesmen of the various clans around, between Candahar and Ghazni. The total number of the enemy was about 15,000, but the greater part seem to have been mere spectators of the gallantry of the fanatics. Our troops pushing on, entered Ghazni without resistance. But a force had to be sent out to inflict a final blow on the remnants of the tribesmen who had again collected. This seems to have been the last effort of "The World's Perfume." Alone among Afghans his instinct seems one of pure patriotism, and he is at last convinced that the best way to get rid of the foreigners is to let them finish their work in peace. There is, indeed, ample evidence that not till now have the Afghans really given up the hope of overwhelming us as they did in 1841; and not till now have they really believed that we do not desire permanently to annex their country.

General Stewart having installed one of the Sirdars as Governor, marched on towards Cabul. A force had been despatched thence to meet him, and another sent to Charasiab to draw off opposition. But these forces were attacked by the local tribes, and the little band at Charasiab distinguished itself by a sturdy defence against tremendous odds. Arriving at Cabul, General Stewart took over supreme command from General Roberts, and henceforth interest concentrated itself on the negotiations with Abdurrahman. A mission of Afghan notables was despatched to sound him. He professed himself pleased

with our overtures and wrote most friendly letters. But it appeared, that his letters to prominent persons were couched in ambiguous and disquieting terms. He said he had come, after long exile, to establish order in Afghanistan. He was said to have recognized Mahommed Jan as Commander in Chief, and even professed himself the champion of (his rival) Yakub Khan. It was reported, too, that he was in constant communication with Tashkent. Probably he considered that he was inevitable, as ruler of Cabul, and was unwilling to enter into engagements by which he would waive his right to Candahar, or sacrifice his freedom of action. To be our nominee is a disadvantage which only specific pledges of material support could outweigh. Meanwhile the new Secretary of State for India has handicapped our political officers by declaring in the House of Commons that our main object is—first, to bring operations to a close; and, next, this apparently being a subsidiary object, suggested by humanity rather than policy, to leave a “settled Government” behind. The retention of Candahar and the points occupied under the treaty of Gandamak are declared to be open questions which Lord Ripon must decide.

Mahommed Jan, we may here say, did not appear at Cabul with the rest of the Ghazni party. He was engaged in conflict with the Hazaras, who are our friends just because they are hereditary enemies of our enemies the Wardaks.

As to Candahar, the Sirdar Shir Ali Khan was formally invested, before Lord Ripon's arrival, with the dignity of Wali—or Ruler. He agrees to accept an English Agent and an English force. Candahar would thus be a friendly base from which we could at any time strike with ease at Herat or Cabul. To retain this power of “striking” seems to us to be the best, and, under present circumstances, the cheapest mode of excluding Russian influence from those centres of disturbance. The railway from Sakkar will reach Candahar in 1882, and already the industry and trade of the district have wonderfully developed.

Yakub Khan is still at Herat, a puppet in the hands of his soldiery. Lately he tried to march on Candahar, but the jealousy between the Herati and Cabuli troops prevented them even from starting. The tribes in the Herat district and on the Candahar frontier have refused to respond to his appeal. The new Sovereign of Candahar has gone to Girishk, and it is very probable that before long he will make himself master of Herat. Why not of Cabul, if Abdurrahman prove impracticable? On this side of Afghanistan, indeed, the only unsatisfactory episode has been the turbulence among the Kakar Pathans. They killed Captain Showers, a distinguished officer of survey, who rashly trusted himself among them, and they



massacred the little garrison of a road post. With the garrison perished an English officer.

In the Kuram valley the attitude of the tribes has been impudently daring. The inaction of our force is all but inexplicable.

Much indignation has been expressed in India at the removal of Général Massey from his command, as a punishment for assumed blunders in the actions of December. The action of the Commander-in-Chief was clearly injudicious, and General Massey has been consoled with another command in India.

---

### THE COLONIES.

THIS last quarter has witnessed the election of the new House of Commons, and the consequent change of Government. It was a feature most remarked upon at the time that in their addresses to the electors few candidates omitted to notice the Colonies; and whensoever the Colonies were mentioned, the high national benefit of the continuance of their connection with the mother-county was invariably insisted upon. This is all practical evidence that communities which already absorb nearly one-half of the export trade of the United Kingdom, and by their rapid increase bid fair, year by year, to increase this percentage, are forcing themselves on public attention by the legitimate necessary and sure means of their material connection with the bulk of the people. The Liberal Ministry, since their accession to power, have been continually brought to task by reason of the fact that the responsibilities of office have forced them, in many cases, to forego the apparent promises of electioneering oratory. The great exception to this general rule has been in the province of Colonial Policy. In this the Ministry are at one with their predecessors and their promises. The maintenance of the union between all sections of the British race is acknowledged, in theory, what it is in fact, the sole guarantee that the prosperity of the past shall be continued in the future. Colonists over the sea, no less than stay-at-home Englishmen, are awakening to the fact that, whether for political, commercial, financial, or industrial reasons, the well-being of the nation depends intimately on the maintenance of this connection.

The new Government has taken one step that will give impetus to the commercial connection. The proposed alteration of the wine duties, by enabling wines, even up to an alcoholic strength of 34°, to enter at duties considerably under the prohibitive half-crown duty,

will enable Australian and South African wine-growers to find, in England, a market for their wines from which the half-crown duty has hitherto excluded them. It is well known that the bounty of Nature in these fertile Colonies is liberal to the degree of yielding few wines of less strength than the old 26° standard; and as this is a purely natural strength the wholesomeness of these full-bodied wines is assured, and under the new scale a large and increasing trade in them will probably arise. There would seem to be an opportunity, on the plea of this concession, for developing the idea that no community of the British race should impose duties of a Protectionist character against any other community of the same race. Hitherto the grant of self-government to Colonies has been merely qualified in this direction by the reservation for the consideration of the Crown of any Bill "imposing differential duties." It is matter of deep regret that from the first this saving clause was not worded—"any Bill imposing duties for purposes other than the raising of revenues." It is possible some such arrangement might be now made with the South African Colonies. The concession of these wine duties and the recent invaluable assistance against the natives are powerful levers in the hands of the Home authorities. And the enlightened example of South Africa might then be followed, hereafter, by our other self-governing Colonies, who even now disdain the very idea of Protectionist tendencies.

Another step of much importance taken by the new Government is the transference of the Administration of Cyprus from the Foreign to the Colonial Office. Our two years' government of that island has not been a success; it has, indeed, given a somewhat serious blow to the reputation of the English nation for superior administrative powers. The Administration hitherto, possibly because of its strong military element, has taken a high-handed and insular view of its duties; and what with want of knowledge of the native language, and want of sympathy with the associations of the people, it has pursued a policy of treatment which even Mr. Gladstone has described as "exceedingly foreign to the opinions and traditions of this country." There were, of course, great initial difficulties; the position of the island towards Turkey, and the relations of Turkey with the Great Powers, were not the least of these. But the Foreign Office has no administrative force or traditions, and everything may be hoped from the transference of the island to that Government department which has already won for the nation so signal a fame in developing and promoting the welfare of communities similarly circumstanced. The Colonial Office knows well how to obtain the services of men whose knowledge and experiences of economics and administration will inaugurate in Cyprus

a liberal and sound system of government, in true accord with the destinies, prospects, and characteristics of the inhabitants.

The continued high-pressure development of the resources of the *Canadian Dominion* feeds the persistent demands for improved communications with Europe. Coal has now been discovered and largely made use of among the northern feeders of Saskatchewan; a bed, twenty feet only below the surface, has recently been discovered in Manitoba; while the coalmasters of Nova Scotia are declaring their ability successfully to compete with Philadelphia coal in the French market. We find, too, that the normal sources of wealth of the older Canadian provinces have their counterpart in each new district opened up. Official estimates of the latest of these districts, that of Nipissing, tell of seven thousand million feet of timber ready for the lumberer and exporter. This is an important fact in connection with the present high prosperity of the timber trade; prices have advanced steadily, and the prospects are reported to be equal to those of the palmiest days of the trade.

Nor does it seem that technical ingenuity finds a less congenial atmosphere north than south of St. Lawrence. "Canning"—the ultimate result of which is to supply all food ready to hand in a cooked state—not content with exercising its energies on meat, game, poultry, fish, and fruit, has now taken under its wing vegetables, and even "porridge," properly cooked and ready for the plate. This is certainly a truly economic method of utilizing the surplus food products inevitable to so thinly-peopled and yet fertile a territory as that of the Dominion.

Meanwhile English capital is seeking, in Canada, to share in the profits of success. It is reported that no less than one hundred millions sterling of British capital is, at the present, invested in mortgages in Canada. No less than three-quarters of the landed property is thus, technically speaking, "encumbered," though in reality this term simply covers a method that has been proved the most convenient for investing capital in the soil.

More of this capital is to promote two railway systems of great importance. The one undertaking, the Hudson's Bay Railway and Navigation Company, is to tap the Canadian Pacific and Lake Winnipeg, and connect them with the new summer wheat-port at Port Nelson on Hudson's Bay; the other undertaking, the Canadian Pacific Railway, is now fairly started, after years of negotiation. Faith is to be kept at last with British Columbia, and the shortest through-communication with the Pacific, will be placed altogether in English

hands. Incidentally this railway passes through the new districts of the Canadian North-West; and its completion will facilitate, and be facilitated by, the more rapid opening up of these wealth-yielding districts. In British Columbia, the starting of industries connected with the advent of this railway has already interfered seriously with the labour and attention previously given to other industries. To this cause is directly attributable the falling off in the fishery returns for the past year, to the extent of £50,000 in value.

The Canadian tariff has this quarter aroused much notice. The great motive of this tariff was, of course, political. It was sought, by its means, to drive the United States to reciprocity at all events, if not to free commercial intercourse. The supporters of this policy in Canada always maintained their intention to interfere as little as possible with the importations of English manufactures. But while they claim fiscal liberty of action, free of control by the Imperial Government, they omit to notice that their peculiar assertion of this fiscal liberty interferes arbitrarily with the commercial liberty of Great Britain. They are at pains, indeed, to prove that this unintentional result is of small degree. The able High Commissioner for Canada has, indeed, published figures to prove that the new tariff has not interfered with British trade. He shows, concisely enough, that in the four months ending April 30th, of this year, as compared with the similar period of last year, there has been a very considerable increase of English imports into Canada. There is no doubt that the whole commercial world has made great strides upwards between these two dates, from a state of very serious depression. But it may be questioned whether these increased imports of English goods into Canada are not attributable to this commercial recovery rather than to the Canadian tariff. This year shows an income for the period named, of say £500,000. At least £300,000 of this is credited to iron alone, while nearly all the rest is the result of an increased consumption of cotton and woollen piece goods. The distinct falling off in the importations of refined sugar, is probably directly due to the tariff. Meanwhile a year of Protection produces the crop of facts that was to be expected. The Conservative papers record the new manufactures that are started. The papers of the opposite party enlarge upon the fact that the cost of living has increased 25 per cent; that wages do not rise in proportion; that people are beginning to find themselves out of employment, and that the Customs receipts are falling off. Canada is, however, a new country; the North-West will give cheap meat and wheat, and the Pacific Railway will soon absorb all unemployed labour. The community will thus be enabled to bear the burden

of Protection till such time as better counsels prevail, or the United States is forced by increase of its own population to take a more enlightened view of its commercial relations with other countries.

It is, perhaps, worthy of note that, in consequence of the enormous shipments to Europe, butchers' meat is rising in price in Canada. English farmers should make a note of this. It is quite certain that the very low prices at which meat must be supplied to balance the risks and costs of shipment cannot be much longer maintained at the ports of shipment. There are, no doubt, limitless prairies where meat can be grown; but when these are occupied for the purpose, population arrives, and at once sends up the value of the land, as well as the rates of transport. Thus the price of meat at the port of shipment, will steadily rise, even before that fully peopling-up of the country which must, in the long run, restore the command of the English market to the English farmer.

Among the *West Indian* Islands, Jamaica has attracted much attention. The Governor, Sir Anthony Musgrove, read a Paper on Jamaica recently, before the Royal Colonial Institute, which awakened wide-spread attention in England to West Indian prospects. It was shown in this Paper conclusively, that in Jamaica the Negro population, on attaining their freedom, have become squatters and settlers rather than labourers; and though they have thus attained to a very gratifying degree of social prosperity, the sugar planters, nevertheless, feel sorely the want of their labour. The remedy suggested is a vigorous Coolie immigration policy on the lines so successfully adopted in British Guiana and elsewhere. It will not injure the interests of Jamaica, or of the sugar planters, or of English manufacturers to have Jamaica largely peopled by a prosperous class of negroes living, it may be with little exertion, in comfort and competence on the natural fertility of the islands. But if these negroes refuse to do the labour for the sugar plantations, the planters will find it pay them to procure this necessary labour elsewhere.

*British Guiana* is, at the present, chiefly concerned with cultivating the opportunity afforded by the recent United States inquiry into the reported malpractices in regard to colouring sugar. The Report is altogether in favour of the Colonists, and they consequently hope for an increased trade with the States. In all other respects, in the carrying out of municipal and Government public works; in the social enterprise of race meetings and operas; in the more sober arena of State education, and the social benefits of village dispensaries, the com-

munity is exhibiting most gratifying signs of sagacious and energetic vitality.

The slackness of commercial affairs in *Ceylon* is gradually passing away. Among other satisfactory reports is that of the pearl fishery, which has this year quadrupled its estimated yield. Meanwhile there is every prospect, at present, of a fair coffee crop. English farmers may well take a leaf out of the book of *Ceylon* planters who, even in times of prosperity, continue vigorously to experiment with new crops. India-rubber, oil palms, cacao, and even the introduction of small birds to destroy injurious insect life, are among the innovations lately supported.

News from the *Pacific* is chiefly concerned with the course pursued there by foreign Governments. The investigation of affairs in New Caledonia has brought to light a system of convict discipline which, to say the least of it, is strangely at variance with English ideas. The punishment inflicted—such as the “crapaudine,” or hanging by the ankles and wrists suspended for a time—recall the days and doings of the Dutch at Amboyne. But the convicts, who, escaping or released from this treatment, land in our various colonies in that part of the world, are becoming a source of trouble; and some sort of collective action on the part of the various colonial authorities seems to be imminent.

It is most significant that the German Parliament has forbidden the German Government to set itself up in Samoa. It was sought to purchase the inheritance of Messrs. Godefroy, the great German South Sea traders. But the German Parliament refused to sanction such a policy; and the firm, resolving itself into a Company, will attempt to continue operations as a private concern. The German Parliament was quite correct in its opinion that the Samoa scheme had nothing in common with the plea of securing German Colonies as an outlet for German surplus energy. The islands themselves are insignificant in size, and only of importance as the central station for an extended local trade in native products.

The German has, however, now to face the keen and rapidly-growing English competition which has its centres in Sydney and the Fijis, and is now applying in the home market for English capital to organize and extend its operations. A Sydney Company has already proposed to invest 100,000*l.* in sugar-planting in Fiji. And this fast developing and powerful local energy will, no doubt, embody itself and win to the English flag a proportionate share of the lucrative South Sea trade.

Indeed, the large native population of New Guinea and the adjacent islands, estimated at millions, if it can be left to survive by the maintenance of its independence and its customs of life, will exchange for our cloths and our small hardware, enormous quantities of pearl-shell, tortoiseshell, copra, and other native products of high value in civilized communities.

In Fiji itself the prospect of a change of Governors is attracting attention. Sir Arthur Gordon, on the expiry of his term, will, it is supposed, take appointment in India. There are still white residents in Fiji, unreconciled to his treatment of them and their interests. And the missionaries, and the natives, and the traders of the islands will have no less cause to await with interest the nomination of a successor to Sir Arthur as Governor of Fiji and High Commissioner for the Pacific.

Among the *Australian Colonies* New South Wales is now calculating the results of the first International Exhibition held in Australia. And among the most noteworthy of these is the enormous number of persons recorded to have passed the turnstiles of the Sydney Exhibition in proportion to the size of the colony. The group of Colonies in Australia cover an area very nearly equalling that of Europe in size. The population of Europe is, roughly speaking, three hundred millions, that of Australia three millions. Yet, with all this density of population surrounding it, no International Exhibition in Europe ever attracted to itself numbers exceeding one-fifth the population of the State that held it until the last Paris Exhibition advanced beyond this limit so far as to attract numbers nearly equalling one-third of the population of France. The visitors to the New South Wales Exhibition, held in the midst of sparsely-populated countries, actually and considerably outnumbered the population of New South Wales. These figures prove the widespread well-being among Australian colonists which enables them freely to visit Exhibitions; but they also are evidence of the growing interest taken in the Colonies by manufacturers and merchants, and are an outcome of the rapidly-increasing trade and of the great stride recently taken in facilitating intercommunication.

The New South Wales Parliament is again at work on its own reform. And it is again the old story of the Upper House and Money Bills. The Constitution Act of New South Wales contains the clause that all Money Bills must originate in the Lower House—as the reproduction of the “Faithful Commons of England”—but there is no clause as to rejection and amendment by the Upper House. The insertion in the Act of the words “and the Upper House may

reject but not alter" would be following the practice and precedent of the Home Parliament. Such an alteration has, for the time, been rejected by the Upper House, though the Lower House is willing to accept it. And there is much truth in the contention that this clause in the Victoria Constitution Act has been at the bottom of the many deadlocks in that colony. The rash conduct of party violence in the Lower House in Victoria has, before now, brought about a deadlock by "tacking" to the Appropriation Bill some item involving a policy to which the Upper House was opposed, thus leaving the latter no alternative but to reject the Appropriation Bill, and so bring the Colony to a financial stoppage.

In *Victoria* the question of Reform is being actively pursued. The new Government, under the lead of Mr. Service has failed to carry a scheme which, in its way, is as Radical as Mr. Berry's. The proposals of the latter would have done away with an Upper House. Mr. Service's scheme would make the Upper House, the chief chamber of the two. He sought to lower the franchise and the qualifications of candidature for the Council, and to make it dissolvable in the event of disagreement with the Assembly. This is to rob it altogether of its character as an Upper House in a Parliament on the English model, and is certainly not following that Parliamentary precedent which the Colonial Office wisely points out to be the best course, and which is, indeed, the course most acceptable to the majority of the population.

In other respects, however, Mr. Service's programme is most commendable. He is setting himself vigorously to nip in the bud the tendency of late years to infuse the political element into the Civil Service and Government railway management. He will also reverse the policy of Mr. Berry in regard to the land question, and preserve to each industry connected with land its legitimate rights. Irrigation on a large scale is to be considered. And generally the intelligence and fairness of his programme exhibit a very welcome and marked change in the conduct of affairs.

It is to be hoped that the present Ministry will be able, perhaps, not to abolish, but to modify the present system of payment of members. The evils that it has brought on the Colony are generally acknowledged. The present system allows £300 per annum and a free railway pass to all members of Parliament. This is either too much or too little. It is much more than a mere reimbursement of the extra expenses of attending a session of Parliament. It is, in fact, sufficient to "keep" a member all the year round, and is thus a bribe to those who have failed in other walks to enter Parliament. No work is required, and



a position of much value is obtained in addition to competency. On the other hand, it is much too little to repay the devotion of talent and education to public affairs. It is probable that a modification which gave the free railway pass, and a guinea a day for attendance during session, would meet the case very well.

A farmer in Daylesford, in Victoria, obtained this year over sixty bushels of oats to the acre; but for this he was unable to obtain any offer above one shilling and threepence a bushel. This low price is only one result of the Protectionist policy, which cuts off Victoria from exchanging her products with her neighbours. Fresh evidence of the evils incident to this policy was seen in the recent promulgation of a Company for shipping foreign meat to England, an undertaking now regarded among the most hopeful in Australia. In the deed of association it was thought necessary to enter a special proviso that if the Victorian stock tax was not removed the Company should at once remove its operations to some other Colony. This is a practical comment on the public adoption of a crude theory. This same stock tax has enabled New South Wales to penetrate with her Railways to the Riverina and tap successfully its important "pastoral" trade, which is excluded from passing to the seaboard through Victoria by this "Protective" tax.

In *South Australia* has been recently published a most excellent step on the part of the Home Authorities. A commission in the Regular Army is to be granted, annually, to a student of each Colonial University. This is eminently a step in the right direction. The large establishment and world-wide experience of the British Army enables it to keep pace in every detail with the rapid advances of the science of warfare. It is consequently a school that is simply invaluable for the officers of the Colonial local forces. And this step will, again, connect this army directly with the Colonies. The army, however, should not, and does not offer very great pecuniary advantages, and officers that are in need of these will find no better use of their faculties than proceeding to Colonies to maintain in the local forces adequate scientific proficiency. It is to be hoped that Lord Carnarvon's Commission will suggest some plan whereby the Colonial defence forces may receive the crucial assistance of officers schooled in the Regular Army and distributed throughout the empire on five-year appointments, thereby ensuring, for the defence of the empire, the highest technical skill and remunerative work for a most useful class of men. New Zealand is ordering torpedo boats; Victoria has her turret ships. It will be good for the Colonies as well as for the Service if some similar scheme can be devised for sending naval officers

on like duty to our Colonies. Appointments for short terms will secure the provision of the latest knowledge; and the officers will be there to direct and not to supersede the local military spirit. They will, in short, fulfil the functions of the professional adjutant to Militia or Yeomanry in England at the present.

From *Western Australia* comes the news of more successful explorations under the capable lead of Alexander Forrest. The North-West corner of Australia has now been brought under dominion, and found to possess millions of acres of fertile grazing land. This discovery is of the most hopeful importance. It is the point of Australia nearest to India and to Europe. The wise men of Perth have long discovered, in Singapore, a profitable market for their worn-out "screws"; but they are now beginning to discover their proximity to the great Indian market for well-bred, well-conditioned horses. This trade has of old proved profitable, when carried on from the very distant ports of Sydney and Melbourne. Western Australia is now known to possess all the climatic and feeding advantages of the rest of Australia, but coupled with the immense advantage of being less than half the distance from India. And this advantage is enhanced by the fact that the voyage is, all the way, through trade winds and calm belts, and has no Australian Bight to cross, and no Cape Leeuwin to round. The advantages in respect of the character of the voyage that Western Australia enjoys over Victoria, in a voyage to India, are very much those enjoyed by Gibraltar over Leith, in a voyage to South America. And these are advantages of the utmost importance in the conveyance of horses.

Another trade that is likely to be developed, is that in butchers' meat, either alive or frozen. The Anglo-Indian struggles to procure even grain-fed mutton will thus be rendered unnecessary. In respect to live stock especially, Western Australia enjoys a great superiority in nearness to the Indian and European markets.

These facts add to the importance of the Chandernagore case. This vessel left France on a colonizing expedition. The promoters of this expedition desired to found a French Colony on the North-West coast of Australia; this right was promptly shown to be contrary to the already-asserted right of the English; and it is to be hoped we shall hear no more of these attempts of irresponsible and independent bodies of foreigners to form Settlements on the Coast of Australia. We hold the country for the benefit of all who choose to come and reside there; but they come under the protection of the English flag, and must conform, accordingly, to the regulations prevailing.

The chief news from *Queensland* relates to the immigration question, and the problem of developing the resources of tropical Australia. In

the northern territories manual labour, on the part of the European, is impossible : Asiatic labour must be substituted. And, whatever the profits of superintendence, enterprise and investment, this labour characteristic alters the whole constitutional complexion of the case. South Australia, too, has a large "Northern territory," where the "Indian Coolie immigration" and the "Chinese invasion" questions have reared their head. And the recently-discovered tracts of fertile country in the extreme north of Western Australia, are saddling that Colony, also, with the care of tropical territories where White labour is impracticable.

The troubles and difficulties of the management of these tropical districts is simply a burden on the Government resident in and presiding over more temperate areas. There is ample material cause for a movement in favour of establishing a new Australian division, and creating a Colony of North Australia, embracing all Australia north of the 20th or 22nd parallel of south latitude. Such a Settlement would relieve the Governments at Brisbane, Adelaide, and Perth, of arduous and unthankful duties, while they would enable an Administration to be set on foot which could confine its attention to the development of a purely tropical district. Separations of jurisdiction mark the growth of Australia. Such a separation could be no exception to the rule ; but it must be most easily accomplished before the concerns of the tropical district have become more closely interwoven with the administrative centres further south.

From *New Zealand* come reports of an excessively good harvest. In Canterbury some farmers have garnered a yield of from 50 to 55 bushels of wheat per acre. This is a satisfactory balance to the other accounts of the serious financial pressure that has developed during the last few years of trade depression. These matters are not mended in the immediate present by the fact that the New Zealand public debt amounts now to 30,000,000*l.* The colonists have for the present, indeed, to use every effort to pay the interest on this debt ; but they know it is not a debt of expense previously incurred by their ancestors, but rather a payment made by the present generation, in order that their descendants, if not themselves, may reap all the benefits of easy intercommunication. The Colony is thus, at the present, in the position of a man hard at work and pinching himself, at every turn, to develop a large business. Roads and railways are being laid down, land purchased and brought under cultivation, labour imported and capital invested ; but the "business" will soon commence to pay, and for him and for his children, good days of reward are in store. Signs of these good days are, indeed, already apparent. Wool and wheat are

being exported in increasing quantities. Coal and minerals are taking their place regularly in a market which knew them not before. Property of all kinds is rising in price, and money is becoming cheaper; the latter a sure sign that the young community is becoming more peopled-up, and arriving at that more mature stage of development at which the money invested will begin to yield proper returns.

The Maori difficulties are quietly subsiding; and with the confidence of his developing strength, the White man will be enabled to deal justly, and even generously, by the Maori, and thus stave off all disputes and troubles till the Maori quietly passes away to his "Happy Islands," improved off the face of the earth.

A welcome sign of the intellectual vigour of the colonists, is the appearance of the new *New Zealand Review*, which, following in the steps of the new *Victoria Review*, is to be worked on the lines of the English *Nineteenth Century*.

In regard to *South Africa* the new Government have finally declared their intention to carry out the policy of their predecessors in office. The Transvaal is, of course, to be retained; and the Government have strongly expressed their adhesion to the principle advocated in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW for January and for April, of non-extension of our responsibilities in South Africa. In his instructions to Sir George Colley Lord Kimberley especially emphasizes the fact that border frays and forays must not be exaggerated into international disputes. But throughout the recently published "Papers" and Report on South Africa the main argument is concerned with the Native question.

In the *Cape Colony* the Sprigg Ministry, by a triumphant majority, have vindicated their claim to confidence on the crucial test of a vote concerning their recent action in Basuto Land. And they have since, by a special vote of confidence, recouped themselves for the defeat of the Confederation scheme.

But the Cape Colonists find their hands full of the Native question; of the eight Bills introduced by Government no less than five are directly concerned with native affairs. And in regard to these native affairs the Home Government has very much more to say to the Cape Government than might be augured from their relative positions. The Transkei occupies a great space in the published Correspondence. Lord Kimberley, indeed, assumes that if letters-patent be granted at home for the annexation of that territory to the Cape, the Cape Government will then accept a special form of administration and law for the natives. And again, in regard to the Basutos, Lord Kimberley finds himself called upon to make very detailed suggestions; and in

regard to Pondo Land he expresses significant dissent from a course of action supposed to be in favour with the Cape Government.

In short, we are again forced to confine our attention to the Native question as being of paramount importance. A broad and statesman-like treatment is becoming impossible if matters be left altogether in the hands of the isolated and small white communities on the spot. In fact it is contrary to their best interests that these communities should be so burdened. The resources and energies of the Cape Colony have enough scope and to spare in the development of their own industries and enterprises; and to saddle such a community with an extensive native empire will tend neither to the advantage of the community nor of the natives. And the same argument applies, with still greater force, to the smaller communities of Natal, Griqualand West, and the Transvaal. There is thus every reason for considering the possibility of establishing a "Native Dominion for South Africa," which shall comprise all those territories "filled with masses of uncivilized natives," where white men are few and far between, and which shall be administered by an executive fed and controlled by the Imperial authorities, but paying its own way (as with the Indian Government), and in intimate and cordial connection, by means of confederation or otherwise, with the European communities of the Cape, Natal, Griqualand West, the Transvaal, and the Free State. Those familiar with South African affairs will readily acknowledge that such a Dominion can with ease be marked off in the areas intervening between the more settled districts, and at present nominally attached to one or other of the Governments above named. The appointment of Sir George Colley as High Commissioner for South Eastern Africa, with special jurisdiction over native affairs, is indeed a step in this direction.

In the coming question of Confederation no item is of such grave importance as this settling of the native question. The history of our occupation of South Africa bears witness to the fact that it is abuse of a consistent native policy that alone brings us into trouble. And, if we would profit by experience, we must acknowledge that a consistent and enlightened native policy must be one that is ordered, worked, and endowed by a powerful nation, and not that bastard system, usurping the name of policy, which is made up of measures that may, from time to time, seem expedient to small bands of Europeans, pushing their way among large populations of nations, but separated one from another, for all purposes of support or counsel, by vast tracts of territory. If we are wise we shall heed the history of the Hudson's Bay and East India Companies, and bear in mind that they came to their end in the Red River and the Mutiny.

## CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

### THEOLOGY.

**A** SCIENTIFIC treatment of religion is attempted in an "Introductory Treatise," by Dr. Caird<sup>1</sup>, who has read much, and reflected long on the subject. He commences with a vindication of the claims of natural or systematic thought, as the organ of religious knowledge, in opposition to the views of those who consider intuition or immediate instinctive sentiment as the ultimate basis of certitude. While he speaks tenderly of the "Revolt of Faith against Reason," and accounts for it, in part, by the felt inadequacy of logical forms to embody the emotions and experiences of the religious life, he yet insists on the corresponding inadequacy of intuition as a basis of certitude. With his exposure of the fallacious character of intuition or sentimental speculation, we are in general agreement. When he proceeds, however, to elaborate his own system, we hesitate to follow him. Courteously rejecting the doctrine of an eminent biologist, that all vital action may be said to be the result of the molecular forces of the protoplasm which displays it, nay, that "our thoughts are the expression of molecular changes in that matter of life which is the source of other vital phenomena," he contends that there is a fundamental fallacy in all such representations. Every fact or object, he argues, as it appears to an observing person, has mind or thought as an inseparable factor of it; force itself being a mental creation. Now it may be admitted that an object or a fact in nature, as it exists to us, exists in an idealized form, but this admission by no means implies that there is not an ultimate reality, or an ultimate process, which, "in the medium of thought" we recognize as protoplasm, molecular movement, &c. The "eminent biologist" sees as clearly as any man that there is an unbridged gulf between organization and thought, and the ingenious theologian ought to concede that there is no real evidence of the existence of an extra-biological or extra-organic agent. Dr. Caird appears to believe in that dream of the childhood of philosophy, an "organic unity," but at present there seems no reason for thinking that it will ever be possible to resolve all the uniformities in Nature into some one universal law. In his examination of the stock arguments for the existence of a God, Dr. Caird candidly expresses his dissatisfaction with them. The critical remarks in the fifth chapter of "An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion" may be read with

<sup>1</sup> "An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion." By John Caird, D.D., Principal and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Glasgow, &c. Glasgow: James Maclehose. 1880.

profit by those who are still satisfied with them. But is Dr. Caird's own ontological argument more valid than those arguments, the weakness of which he exposes? When he asserts that, as spiritual beings, our whole conscious life is based on a universal self-consciousness; an absolute spiritual life, which is not a mere subjective notion or conception, but which carries with it the proof of its necessary existence or reality, we can only smile at the acuteness which, while detecting the mote in the eye of his fellow logicians, is unable to perceive the beam in his own. Some of his strictures on Mr. Herbert Spencer's *a priori* construction of an incomprehensible Absolute, appear to us fair enough, and we are disposed to agree with him that the worship of the Unknowable implies a really impossible attitude of mind; but Mr. Spencer would have little difficulty in retaliating by a criticism on his absolute intelligence, or the ultimate unity of knowing and being, a unity which is borrowed from the metaphysical wardrobe of Hegel, whose cast-off clothes Dr. Caird does not disdain to wear.

Mr. Crozier follows in a somewhat similar track to that trodden by Dr. Caird. In the "Religion of the Future"<sup>2</sup> he offers us the essence of the old religion, purified and made credible, as he supposes, to the modern mind, in the hope that he may rally round it religious thinkers of all classes in a common stand against materialism and atheism. To the materialistic view he takes exception, like Dr. Caird. He complains that the materialist assumes the mind in every step which he has taken to explain the mind, and greatly admires Emerson, who "sees this absurdity and resigns all hope of explaining the mind." Possibly we shall never understand how sensation is accompanied by consciousness, but a proximate explanation may lie in the speculation of the "eminent biologist," and in the psychological investigations of James Mill, Spencer, and Bain, and thus we cannot join with Mr. Crozier in his admiration of Emerson's philosophical despair. In fact, while still retaining some of our youthful enthusiasm for the many beautiful thoughts and fancies, and the inspiring influence of the ethical teaching to be found in Emerson, *his* is about the last oracle we should think of consulting. Mr. Crozier, however, is not of our opinion. He sees in the writings of those exceptional thinkers, Carlyle and Emerson, the best embodiments of certain aspects of the world and man, which he wishes to enforce, and he brings out these aspects in two essays, in which he exhibits, with some power of exposition, the characteristic views, whims, and extravagances of the two American and English originals. Mr. Crozier surprises us by qualified recognition of the merits of Auguste Comte, while entirely dissenting from Comte's religious views. He has been fortunate enough to find a unity of plan in Nature, which he deplors that Comte could not find. In short, Mr. Crozier believes in a God who made and still directs this universe, and Comte did not. A gulf, therefore, exists between them which nothing

---

<sup>2</sup> "The Religion of the Future." By John Beattie Crozier, M.B. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1880.

can bridge. The longest essay in the book is directed, not against Comte, but against Herbert Spencer. To destroy the foundation of his system of philosophy has been Mr. Crozier's resolute endeavour; for the present he leaves to others "the task of assailing the imposing and magnificent superstructure which Mr. Spencer has erected upon it." We do not consider Mr. Spencer's any more than Comte's edifice unassailable, but we cannot admit that Mr. Crozier's attack is as effective as he flatters himself it is.

Passing from the speculative sphere to historical ground on M. P. Le Page Renouf's Hibbert Lectures on the Religion of Ancient Egypt,<sup>3</sup> we call attention first of all to the various corrections of popular views or individual opinions which he proposes or sanctions. To Mr. H. Spencer's hypothesis that the rudimentary form of all religions is the propitiation of dead ancestors, he objects that it is not confirmed by the study of Egyptian antiquities, and that in no case can it be proved that it preceded a belief in divinity of some other kind. To obviate this objection in part, however, Mr. Spencer has only to accept M. Renouf's own suggestion, that in the Age of the Pyramids the Egyptians had got beyond this elementary creed, though in part it would still remain unanswered, no historical evidence, as far as Egypt is concerned, being producible in favour of the hypothesis. Mr. McLennan's proffered testimony is also the subject of M. Renouf's animadversion. The signs of the zodiac, to which that writer ascribes a remote antiquity (B.C. 4000), our author declares are not Egyptian at all but are borrowed from the Greeks, and are not anterior to the Christian era or the Roman domination. "All Mr. McLennan's statements," he adds, "about the ancient nations are based on equally worthless authorities," with that of Dupuis and Fourier, whom he cites for his zodiacal chronology. Among the more general corrections we find corrections relating to the influence of Indian or Egyptian culture, and on the existence of caste. The Hindoo traditions about the Trimurti, supposed to contain reminiscences of Trinitarian doctrine, are not, as learned men not very long since asserted, of great antiquity, and instead of being referred to 1400 B.C. must now be assigned to 1400 A.D. proximately. The existence of caste is denied altogether; the son of a warrior might be a priest and a scribe—be eligible to any office, and marry the daughter of a man of any profession. Again, the supposed fixed dates of M. Brit and others, M. Renouf tells us must be given up, inasmuch as closer investigation has shown that the test of the Egyptian calendars does not record the risings but the transits of the stars. Further, the popular opinion that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch, must, says M. Renouf, be assuredly abandoned, and the time of the composition of the book of Exodus, cannot unfortunately be considered a fixed date. The worship

<sup>3</sup> "The Hibbert Lectures, 1879. Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion as Illustrated by the Religion of Ancient Egypt. Delivered in May and June, 1879." By P. Le Page Renouf. London: Williams & Norgate. 1880.



of animals is explained by our author, if we rightly understand him, as wholly symbolical; but this opinion we cannot regard as incontrovertible, if it implies that in its earliest origin it was so. We are more nearly in agreement with M. Renouf when he contends that the gods of Egyptian as well as of other mythologies, were powers of nature of irresistible might and of active intelligence. In some sense, too, we are disposed to allow that there was, in remoter antiquity, a germinal monotheistic conception in Egyptian theology, while holding with our author that the magnificent predicates of the one and only God, never in fact led to actual monotheism, Egyptian theology stopping short in pantheism. At a very early period we are told the Egyptians believed in a future state. The Beatification of the Departed is the main subject of every chapter in the famous *Book of the Dead*: a ritual, some parts of which "were as obscure to Egyptians living under the eleventh dynasty as they are to ourselves." The antiquity of Egyptian civilization is shown by M. Renouf to be very great. The Egyptian monarchy probably existed 2000 years before the book of Exodus was written. The date of the great pyramid cannot be more recent than 3000 B.C. The enormous lapse of prehistoric time during which the human race inhabited Egypt, is inferred with tolerable certainty, from subsoil investigations made by means of nearly a hundred shafts or borings over an extensive area of land. Such are some of the gleanings from the vast field of erudition enclosed within the covers of a small volume on the origin and growth of religion in Ancient Egypt. Of the six lectures which it contains, perhaps that which stands third in order, is the most original, and will prove the most attractive to the mythological student, but there is not a page in the book which has not its appropriate interest. The general certainty, as well as the progress of the art of interpretation and the science of language, in the study of hieroglyphics, is demonstrated convincingly, we think, in these pages.

We have noticed the alleged error of learned men about the Indian Trimurti. The blunder which sees in the Egyptian words *Nuk pu Nuk* the equivalent of the Hebrew expression, *I am that I am*, and derives from them the Mosaic conception of God, is no less remarkable. When the *Book of the Dead* is properly examined, the context shows that the sentence *Nuk pu Nuk* is not absolute, as is illustrated in the assertion: It is I who am—Osiris. Mr. James Legge, Professor of the Chinese Language and Literature in the University of Oxford,<sup>4</sup> gives other instances of the curious effect of the prepossession which disposes men to find in foreign religions or literatures the doctrines or ideas which they desire to find in them. Thus, Montucci, of Berlin, entertained no doubt that the Holy Trinity was revealed to the Chinese five centuries before the Christian era; while Rémusat, the Chinese

<sup>4</sup> "The Religions of China. Confucianism and Tâoism described and compared with Christianity." By James Legge, Professor of the Chinese Language and Literature in the University of Oxford. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1880.

scholar, found the Hebrew Jehovah in the three syllables, J, hf, Wei, to the surprise of Europe, and the satisfaction at first, of Mr. Legge, for in Mr. Legge's case the delusion did not last. On reading Julien's translation of Tao Teh Kung, he saw and acknowledged the error of Julien's professional predecessor. It must not be supposed, however, that Mr. Legge's rejection of these pseudo-testimonies to the truth of revealed religion imply any heterodox tendencies. On the contrary, Mr. Legge accepts literally the story of Adam and Eve; protests against the doctrine of universal restoration, and advocates that of everlasting punishment—a doctrine which, whether borrowed from Christianity or not, is discoverable in the teaching of Taoism, the name of a system of thought which is both a religion and a philosophy in China. Between this religion and Christianity, as also between Christianity and Confucianism, Mr. Legge institutes a detailed comparison. His volume, which is very well suited to the general reader, commences with a circumstantial account of the latter religion—for a religion in every sense of the word Mr. Legge pronounces Confucianism to be, although the formal organized worship is restricted to the Emperor. Mr. Legge has spent more than half his life in the study of Chinese literature, and in the endeavour to make converts to the Christian faith of the adherents of Confucianism and Taoism, yet we are inclined to question the soundness of the assertion that a belief in one supreme and only God was coeval with the fathers and the founders of the nation, and that it was the first and for a time probably the only worship. In proof of this assertion, however, Mr. Legge appeals to primitive written characters, and we must leave it to the philosophical Sinologist to confirm or refute it. If we understand him rightly, there was, about twenty-three centuries before Christ, a monotheistic worship in China, a cultus of spirits of the mountains and hills, the seas and four great rivers of the imperial domain, and a worship of ancestors. This latter form of worship does not seem to shock Mr. Legge, who contends that every nation should keep its benefactors in remembrance, and men everywhere should honour the names of all of every nation who have ministered by their example and instructions to the advance and amelioration of our race. Into this primitive religion Confucius did not introduce any change. According to our author at least, he sacrificed to spirits and to the dead, and prayed to "heaven" as a personal being. To him belongs the honour of formulating the Golden Rule, in a negative not in an affirmative sense. As to Taoism, it did not exist as a religion until a considerable time after the commencement of the Christian era. Taoism, ordinarily called Rationalism, was originally a mass of superstitions and sacrifices, but was developed, under the overmastering influence of Buddhism, into a system which appears to us to deserve the name of *Irrationalism*. Philosophical Taoism, it appears, can boast of an obscure metaphysic, a method of life, a purgatory, and a hell. It does not deny the existence of a God, but it inculcates no religion. Such, in brief, is the exposition of the Religions of China, given by the

Oxford Professor, who is perhaps better acquainted with the language of that country than with the philosophy of the ancient or modern world.

In the "Cradle Land of Arts and Creeds,"<sup>5</sup> Mr. Charles Stone derives the civilization of Egypt from the East, makes India the original seat of the Aryan race, discovers there a Trinity in Unity, and finds a Christian cultus and Christian speculation, usages or ideas borrowed from that nursery of the human race. The great object of his book seems to be to support this hypothesis, rather than to give an independent and systematic account of the industrial or intellectual development of Indian civilization. However interesting, therefore, many of his pages may be, or whatever acquaintance with the temples, altars, or mythical beliefs of India they may exhibit, the predominant purpose of the work colours and compromises his most accurate description. The expository subject-matter and the argument which he sustains are so implicated, that you cannot separate them; and when you would willingly read what he has to relate about the realities of Indian civilization, you find yourself perplexed and irritated by a disquisition on the practicability of placing the Eden of the human race in the garden-like tropical islands to the south of India, or by an attempt to show that the mind of Moses was imbued with ancient Aryan law. Mr. Stone, however, goes much further than this. He makes Krishna a prototype of Christ, and finds in the life of Jesus incidents borrowed from that of the Indian deity. He is content to follow his eccentric authority, Godfrey Higgins, in support of the wild hypothesis that Krishna and Christ are derivable from some Aryan word. He argues that, if under the circumstances related in the gospel narrative, Christ uttered no protest against the doctrine of metempsychosis which he supposes was held by the Jews, it must be *reasonably inferred* that he *admitted* it. He appears to think that Alexandria was the head-quarters of the philosophy of the East, and that Philo and others were the representatives of the alliance between Greek and Oriental thought. Indeed, he actually supposes that Philo was acquainted with Buddha, the Cramanas, and the Brahmins! He cites a great name to support the view that Eastern symbolism has crept into the Apocalypse, which he erroneously dates A.D. 96; and that the Lamb of God (*Agnus Dei*), who is also the Light of the New Jerusalem, has an affinity with the divine fire (*Agni*) on the old Aryan altar. We are unable to accept this view, or the still more daring view of his authority, M. E. Burnouf, that the Founder of Christianity intended to re-establish the ancient Aryan creed. Learned men formerly discovered the Trinity in the Hindoo traditions about Trimurti, but that doctrine, it appears, cannot be traced further back than A.D. 1400. The notion that Philo, Plotinus, and others, represented the

<sup>5</sup> "Cradle Land of Arts and Creeds; or, Nothing New under the Sun." By Charles J. Stone, Barrister-at-Law, Inner Temple, and late Advocate High Courts, Bombay. London: Sampson Low, Marston & Co. 1880.

marriage of Western and Eastern speculation, and that Alexandria was the chosen seat of this syncretism, has just as little basis—to borrow the words of M. Renouf—as the reign of Jupiter in Crete. Dr. Baur, of Tübingen, once indeed referred Gnostic and Manichæan ideas to Buddhism, but it has since been shown that their source lay in Greek philosophy. All attempts, says the philologist already quoted, to discover Buddhist influences in Jewish or Christian theologies will prove equally abortive. Alexandrian opinions have been sought in Eastern sources, but the search has proved unsuccessful and should be abandoned. No one denies the reality of Aryan civilization or its European influence; but the speculations of Mr. Stone are too precarious, too fanciful, too arbitrary, to meet with acceptance from more than the limited circle of interested inquirers.

The reader will not discover either Indian or Aryan myths in Hagenbach's "History of Christian Doctrines," a handbook once noticed, not without approval, by Dr. Baur.<sup>6</sup> It must not be supposed, however, that the theology of the Tübingen school is allowed to intrude into Hagenbach's orthodox domain. We observe in the present volume of a carefully revised translation briefly introduced by Dr. Plumtre, various indications of that propriety of statement which may be expected in a book included in the new series of Clark's Foreign Theological Library.

To confirm Christianity is the ambition of Mr. Thomas Stevenson,<sup>7</sup> and the confirmation is supposed to be supplied by citations from Jewish writers which show that their countrymen expected a Messiah, by passages from heathen historians or philosophers attesting facts or expressing aspirations, by quotations from the works of men like Keith and Hengstenberg, of pious sceptics or semi-believers like J. J. Rousseau, Parker, and Renan, and of savans like Balfour, Stewart, and Tait. To us it appears singular that Mr. Stevenson should think such a collection of passages can confirm Christianity in any but a vague and indeterminate sense, especially in the present day when some of the clergy have abandoned the old forms of theology, and leave simple men wondering what Christianity is.

Among the number of the more liberal Biblical critics we cannot enrol the editors and interpreters of "The Pulpit Commentary,"<sup>8</sup> who, faithful to the letter that killeth, walk in the safe paths of accepted tradition. The volume of the Commentary before us consists of a philological and historical exposition by Rev. George Rawlinson, and various

<sup>6</sup> "Clarke's Foreign Theological Library." New Series. Vol. I. "Hagenbach's History of Christian Doctrines." Vol. I. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1880.

<sup>7</sup> "Christianity Confirmed by Jewish and Heathen Testimony, and the Deductions from Physical Science, &c." By Thomas Stevenson, F.R.S.E., F.G.S., &c. Second Edition. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1879.

<sup>8</sup> "The Pulpit Commentary." Edited by the Rev. Canon H. D. M. Spencer, M.A., &c., and by the Rev. Joseph S. Exell. Exposition by Rev. George Rawlinson, M.A., Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford, and Canon of Canterbury, &c. &c. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1880.

“Homilies and Homiletics” by different clerical writers on the composite books of Ezra and Nehemiah, and the entertaining semi-fabulous book of Esther. Though we are far from satisfied with the contribution of the expositor, we must allow that he has discharged his task with some ability. The work, though intended for students generally, is, if we do not err, more particularly designed for lazy and ignorant clergymen and helpless one-ideaed preachers. The dull level of pious common-place and moral sententiousness is relieved by the jerky character of the writing, the profusion of capital letters, and occasional abortive attempts at sensational headings, such as “An Astounding Discovery! A Plot in the Palace! The Suggestion for the Hour!” Sometimes we are treated to a remark as profound as it is original, as when we are informed that “Simple tastes are the most attractive,” and the moral is adorned with what in old theme-days used to be called an Example: “Behold in a Queen who now reigns over the British Empire—an empire wider far than that of Persia—the power of simple tastes and habits.”

A very different appreciation must be accorded to the scholarly work on the “Prophecies of Isaiah,” by Rev. T. K. Cheyne.<sup>9</sup> Hebrew literature, as an expression of national life and thought, has claims on us analogous to those of Greek and Latin literature, and we look forward to the time when every book in the Old Testament will be studied in the same critical and enlightened spirit in which the writings of the historians, poets, and philosophers of Greece and Rome are now studied. It is rarely in England that any approach to such a standard is made in the critical treatment of Biblical literature, and therefore we gladly welcome such an instalment of Hebrew scholarship as we have before us, in Mr. Cheyne’s translation of Isaiah with the accompanying Commentary and Appendices. We have examined many of the renderings of difficult words and phrases in the translation, and can testify to their general accuracy and force. The translation, however, it must be remembered, is intended for students, and is, therefore, necessarily wanting in the cadence and finish, the poetic feeling and musical genius, which usually distinguish the received Version. Sometime we are inclined to take exception to an over-scrupulous literalness, as when we read of *No-gods* for *idols*, or to a fanciful ingenuity as when the Hebrew word for *man* is rendered the *earthborn*. In Isaiah i. 2, Mr. Cheyne has the sanction of Ewald for his translation, “sons have I made, great and high,” but we prefer the rendering of our own Version: “I have nourished and brought up children,” which is also that of Gesenius; and the more so because in chap. xxiii. ver. 4, Mr. Cheyne has rendered the same words, in nearly the same language. The many notes with which the translation is accompanied are clear, instructive, and often marked by a felicitous brevity. The treatment of difficult passages

<sup>9</sup> “The Prophecies of Isaiah. A new Translation, with Commentary and Appendices.” By the Rev. T. K. Cheyne, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of Balliol College, Oxford, &c. In two vols. Vol. I. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1880.

shows knowledge, candour, and on the whole fearlessness, which is always reverential : perhaps a little too much so. The discussion on the phrase *Jehovah Sabaoth*, in which Mr. Cheyne sees a reference to the stars, conceived as animated beings, implying a primitive worship, illustrates his method of exposition. Occasionally we find a praiseworthy fidelity to the local colouring and circumstances which characterize these "prophecies," as in the substitution of *mirage* for *parched ground*, *narcissus* for *rose* (xxxv.), *fennel flower* for *fitches* (xxxviii. 27), *eagle-owl* for *owl*, and *night-fairy* [goblin?], the Lamia of Hebrew mythology for *screech-owl*, xxxiv. 11-14. In chap. xli. a botanical argument for a late date of the concluding portion of Isaiah, is suggested by the Hebrew word for myrtle "for putting aside the prophecy, the myrtle is referred to only in books written after the captivity." Notwithstanding this intimation, however, Mr. Cheyne regards the problem of the date of the last twenty-seven chapters as unsettled. He concedes, indeed, that in the greater part of this section the prophet incontrovertibly occupies the standing ground of a Jewish exile in Babylon, but he refrains from drawing the conclusion, which to our mind is inevitable. So again he repudiates the identification of Jesus with the "deaf and blind servant," and allows that Israel is the servant so described; saving, however, his orthodoxy by a mystical refinement of interpretation, in which the conception of the Servant of Jehovah is compared to "a pyramid, of which the base is the people of Israel as a whole, the central part Israel, according to the spirit, and the summit the person of the mediator of salvation who arises out of Israel." In this way, while protesting against the intrusion of Christian elements into philological exegesis, he recognizes the justification of a distinctly Christian exegesis. We must not omit to give due prominence to the chronological corrections proposed by Mr. Cheyne, though we cannot specify them. These corrections are due to the information derived from the African and Egyptian inscriptions, which, in our author's opinion, have thrown great light on the historical references in Isaiah. We hope soon to welcome the publication of the second part of "The Prophecies of Isaiah," the present volume closing with the 47th chapter inclusive.

In a volume of sermons by a Nonconformist minister, displaying some power of thought, and more or less of what may be called the culture of the period, are included two discourses on the "Origin of Evil."<sup>10</sup> The solution of this perplexing problem the author discovers in the questionable position that the creation of being in themselves good, involves the tremendous risk of their becoming evil, inasmuch as some of them, at least, in virtue of their freewill, would assuredly rebel against their maker. If this result was "foreseen" it is not easy to comprehend how Mr. Cox's favourite doctrine of an absolute freewill can be vindicated. The abyss of determinism seems to open for its

<sup>10</sup> "The Genesis of Evil, and other Sermons, mainly Expository." By Samuel Cox. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1880.

reception. Nor do we see that the Calvinist or Theological Necessarian can possibly accept this solution, since the freewill doctrine is no part of his creed. The vindication, such as it is, appears to be undertaken with the intention of confuting Mr. J. S. Mill, whom he accuses of holding "the very creed of Cyrus," and in "reverting to the Persian hypothesis of two antagonistic powers of striving against the most settled conclusion of modern thought." We have not discovered this particular hypothesis in any of Mill's writings. He appears, indeed, to have believed in the eternity of matter and force, and in a creator, or rather constructor, working under the limitations of inexorable law, but this is a very different doctrine from that of the two personal powers of the theology of Cyrus.

A volume of sermons by Rev. William Horne, a Scottish minister and Examiner of Philosophy in the University of St. Andrew's, may be described in the same general terms as the volume just noticed.<sup>11</sup> Earnest in his fidelity to the Christian ideal, Mr. Horne finds in Goethe's works better interpretations of our sacred literature, than in those of any professed biblical critic, and maintains that no book on religious experience, as known to a pure and simple soul, can furnish matter so near to what is best in our gospels as his "Wilhelm Meister." Of a somewhat different character is the first part of a little work entitled "Illustrations of the Physiology of Religion," by Henry Lee,<sup>12</sup> a layman. The work is evidently *not* that of a professed Biblical critic, and the title seems scarcely justified by the contents, or, is the *physiology* associated with the model lesson of Mr. Lee's popular teacher who told his boys, "If you don't believe what I have been saying to you, you will go to hell—I assure you, you will;" or with the philosophy of his respected rector, who, when asked if he had a good schoolmistress, replied, "Oh, yes, she is a good mistress; I don't know that she teaches them much, but she whacks them if they don't learn."

"After Death"<sup>13</sup> is the title not of a volume of sermons, but of a learned treatise on the testimony of primitive times respecting the state of the faithful dead. It is not offensively dogmatic, and will be found attractive even to those who, like ourselves, have only that general interest in the inquiry which all may share to whom nothing human is reputed alien. Asserting the validity of the Vincentian test—"universality, antiquity, consent"—which we had supposed Dr. Newman, in his "Essay on Development," had made more than questionable, Mr. Luckcock concludes that, tried by this canon, the catholicity of the intercession of saints in paradise can be vindicated, but

<sup>11</sup> "Religious Life and Thought." By William Horne, M.A., &c. &c. London: Williams & Nugent. 1880.

<sup>12</sup> "Illustrations of the Physiology of Religion, in Sections adapted for the use of Schools." Part I. By Henry Lee, F.R.C.S., formerly Professor of Surgery, &c. &c. London: Trübner & Co. 1880.

<sup>13</sup> "After Death, &c." By Henry Mortimer Luckcock, D.D., Canon of Ely, &c. Second Edition. London, Oxford and Cambridge: Rivingtons. 1880.

not so their invocation. He rejects the doctrine of purgatory as taught by the Romish Church, but appears to favour an opinion held by Dr. Martensen, a Lutheran divine, "that the intermediate state in a purely spiritual sense must be a purgatory determined for the purifying of the soul." The belief in benefits derivable from the proximity of the graves of martyrs cannot be traced further back, he thinks, than the fourth century. St. Augustine appears to have been convinced of the advantages conferred on petitioners for favours to members of that glorious company. In his great work "*De Civitate Dei*," xxii. viii. 9, he relates how Florentius of Hippo, when he had lost his cloak and was too poor to replace it, prayed to twenty martyrs to assist him. "After his prayer, and, as St. Augustine implies, in answer to it, he discovered a fish cast upon the shore, in which, on its being cut up, was found a gold ring. It was put into his hands, says St. Augustine, with these words: 'See how the twenty martyrs have clothed you.'"

That the thoughts of men are widened with the process of the suns is illustrated by the "increasing purpose" which pervades our next volume, the production of twelve clergymen of the Scottish Church, whose general unanimity of opinion must, we presume, be taken for granted.<sup>14</sup> Less critical, less learned, less argumentative than the famous manifesto, if we may so call it, of the Liberal Church, which, under the name of "*Essays and Reviews*," so alarmed drowsy orthodox twenty years ago, the sermons comprised in this somewhat remarkable volume may be considered as a sort of counterpart or supplement on the part of the Presbyterian Church. Of the earnest feeling, the elevated sentiment and intellectual refinement displayed in these twenty-three discourses, no reflecting reader will entertain any doubt. The thoughts are clothed in appropriate language, and the style, if sometimes a little pedantic, is often graceful and eloquent. It is, however, with the peculiar character of the theology apparently recommended in the volume that we are chiefly concerned. We say apparently recommended, because often the opinions expounded are given as those of an advanced or advancing school, rather than those of the authors. In page 85, in a sermon on "*Law and Miracle*," by Rev. D. J. Ferguson, the writer indeed appears to speak for himself when he says, "to insist that no one who rejects the miracles of the New Testament may claim to be a Christian is intolerance which ought to be resisted." In page 155, on the "*Law of Moral Continuity*," the Rev. William Mackintosh again raises a voice, which gives no uncertain sound, when he disparages the idea of a day of judgment as an artificial conception, and dismisses the common doctrine of endless punishment as inherently incredible and unjust. In page 200, Rev. W. L. M'Farlan, in his sermon on "*Authority*," intimates his preference, in some cases, of the internal authority of reason and conscience to the authority of Scripture, and evidently does not regard

---

<sup>14</sup> "*Scotch Sermons*." London : Macmillan & Co. 1880.



the entire Bible as the Word of God. In other passages, through we may presume sympathy, the wording of the sentences is such that if we affirmed a positive identity of opinion, our affirmation might be set aside. In page 220, for instance, the descent of man from Adam, the fall of our first father, the consequent death of all men, the redemption in Christ of an election according to grace, and the eternal perdition of the unregenerate, are specified as dogmas specially untenable by that middle class of theologians which "includes within it many of the religious teachers in all the churches." In page 233, we are told of thoughtful and devout men who refuse to look on the Divine Being as "the Workman-God given us in the argument from Design," who reject the notion of creation out of nothingness and the supposition that matter and spirit are equally substantial and ultimately different, and adopt the conclusion that the material universe is the phenomenal manifestation of the only true substance of Him in whom all things consist. In short, "conclusions of the School divines, which the Reformers did not venture to question, are denied outright by the leaders of modern theological thought, and many Protestants of the nineteenth century reject theological dogmas of theirs which almost all Protestants of the sixteenth century unhesitatingly accepted." Men who put forth these novel views without protesting against them, and with an apparent predilection for them; men who announce a Second Reformation, which will start with a more sweeping principle than the First, and declare that we must be blind not to see that we are already in the midst of it, cannot complain if they are regarded as decided impugners of the Creed once held by all Christendom, and as the advocates of a rationalized Gospel which can hardly be identified with that once delivered to the saints. While we rejoice at the diffusion of wiser thought and humaner sentiment, we must express our conviction that such a Gospel is only to be realized by a one-sided eclecticism, an arrested and illogical criticism, and a philosophy which, while honestly professing allegiance to the Christian Faith, decisively, though unconsciously, undermines it.

There are still books in our custody which want of space unfortunately forbids our noticing in the present number of our REVIEW. Others may be at once dismissed with a few words of recognition. "Recollections of Ober-Ammergau in 1871,"<sup>15</sup> a reprint from the *Guardian*, is an opportune republication. Its author, Mr. H. N. Oxenham, is sanguine enough to indulge a hope that the influence of the *Passion Play*, which these *Recollections* elucidate, may counteract the corroding scepticism which, seeing in the ancient faith a beautiful romance, aspires to create an undogmatic Christianity—that is, a Christianity without Christ. In "The Catholic Church and Modern Society,"<sup>16</sup> Cardinal Manning complains that "the whole constituency

<sup>15</sup> "Recollections of Ober-Ammergau in 1871." By Henry Nutcombe Oxenham, M.A., &c. London, Oxford and Cambridge: Rivingtons. 1880.

<sup>16</sup> "The Catholic Church and Modern Society." By Henry Edward, Cardinal Manning, Archbishop of Westminster. London: Cecil Brooks & Co. 1880.

of England, Scotland, and Wales does not return a single Catholic to Parliament," deprecates the establishment of national education without Christianity, and bids us choose between the Revolution and the Church of God, warning us that if we choose the former we shall get the worst of it. A literary curiosity, in the shape of a prettily got up volume, entitled "*Corona Catholica*,"<sup>17</sup> may give half an hour's amusement to the semi-credulous. It opens with a brief account of St. Malachy, Primate of all Ireland in the twelfth century and a reputed prophet, though his prophetic reputation in a later period was principally grounded on visions and prophecies unheard of till four centuries and a half after his death. Among the "astounding coincidences" which they disclose are the *Rapax Aquila* prognostication, supposed to be fulfilled in the conquering eagle of Napoleon, and the *Cruce de Cruce* prevision, foreshadowing, it is said, the affliction brought to the heart of Pius IX. through the Cross on the shield of Savoy. This reputed prediction is the subject of an epigram translated into fifty languages and the poetic Polyglot, to which Professors Paley, Sayce, F. Max Müller, and M. P. Le Page Renouf, and other philological potentates have contributed, forms the "*Corona Catholica*," which Mr. Charles Kent, the editor, lays at the feet of the successor of St. Peter. The Hon. John Jay, in his "*Roman Catholic Question in the United States*,"<sup>18</sup> very naturally takes exception to a letter of Cardinal Antonelli (1870), denouncing the Governmental programme of Nicaragua, and declaring that freedom of education and worship are contrary to the laws of God, and indignantly protests against certain aggressions of the Roman hierarchy in America, which he illustrates by actual instances of conduct and policy. In "*Truthfulness and Ritualism*," by Mr. Orby Shipley,<sup>19</sup> controversialists will discover a tempestuous response to Dr. Littledale's Reply to the Abbé Martin. An "*Address on the Mercian Church and St. Chad*"<sup>20</sup> is a cross between an historical sketch and a sermon, for the subject-matter of which Dr. Bickersteth is principally indebted to the Venerable Bede and the Rev. Canon Bright, the learned Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford. We have already, twice at least, noticed "*The Gospel according to the Nineteenth Century*,"<sup>21</sup> and shall only notify here that it has attained the honour of a fourth edition.

<sup>17</sup> "*Corona Catholica*," &c. By Charles Kent. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1886.

<sup>18</sup> "*The Roman Catholic Question in the United States*." By the Rev. John Jay, late Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States at Vienna. Reprinted from the *International Review* for Feb. and March, 1880.

<sup>19</sup> "*Truthfulness and Ritualism*." By Orby Shipley, M.A. London: Burns & Oates. 1879.

<sup>20</sup> "*The Mercian Church and St. Chad*," &c. By Edward Bickersteth, D.D., Dean of Lichfield, &c. London: Rivingtons. 1880.

<sup>21</sup> "*The Gospel of the Nineteenth Century*." Fourth Edition. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1880.

## PHILOSOPHY.

THE feeling of most readers, on completing the perusal of Herr Hillebrand's Lectures,<sup>1</sup> will probably be one of regret, that the author did not see fit to favour the world with a more elaborate exposition of his subject. Should the reception accorded to this critical history of German thought fall short of the historian's expectations, the apparent indifference may not unreasonably be interpreted as a compliment rather than as positive disapproval. The wealth of material evidently held in reserve, and the perpetual effort to keep within the limits prescribed by the circumstances of the original composition, inevitably create a feeling of disappointment, and leave so much to the reader in the way of following out bare hints, and restoring the due proportion, that a large circle of admirers can hardly be hoped for. Our criticism will be easily understood when we mention that the author, with the love of thoroughness which distinguishes his nation, devotes two chapters to an introductory review of the European antecedents of the literary period it is his main object to characterize; while, by assigning a whole chapter to Herder, he leaves Kant, Goethe, Schiller, and the heterogeneous "Romantic School" to be disposed of in a couple of lectures. Our censure must not be understood to apply to the quality of the workmanship in itself. On the contrary, the first two chapters are among the most valuable in the book, and although the prominence assigned to Herder is more open to doubt, the insufficient recognition that writer has hitherto received may justifiably be pleaded as a reason for explaining his merits at greater length than is usually done. The intellectual industry of Germany has been so severe, that we find it hard to realize that her intellectual eminence has only been achieved within the last hundred and twenty years. The destructive influences let loose during the Thirty Years' War crushed out the seeds of promise, and in effect gave the rest of Europe a start of two centuries in the race of civilization. The Seven Years' War, on the other hand, was regenerating, and at its close Germany was already on the high road to intellectual greatness. Three generations sufficed her to attain the altitude of her companions, but they were generations which included such spiritual giants as Winckelmann, Kant, and Lessing, Herder, Goethe, and Schiller, the Humboldts, Schleiermacher, Niebuhr, and Schelling. The "thought-seeds" sown by these men are well described. Winckelmann's renewal of the spirit of antique beauty, Lessing's just æsthetic principles, Kant's development and correction of Rousseau's naturalism, Herder's doctrine of spontaneous evolution, &c. The estimate of this last is sufficiently lofty, albeit carefully qualified.

"Herder himself, the mighty representative of this age—he in whose work all the new ideas which have animated the intellectual world during fifty years

<sup>1</sup> "Six Lectures on the History of German Thought from the Seven Years' War to Goethe's Death." Delivered at the Royal Institution of Great Britain, May and June, 1879, by Karl Hillebrand. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

are in germ—Herder himself remained always a youth, ever unable to give a definite and artistically measured form to his thought. . . . He caught glimpses—I might almost say he had the visions of a genius, upon all subjects, mastering none completely; and thus, while able to give the architect the most valuable suggestions, he was himself utterly at a loss to construct the smallest edifice. No man ever scattered abroad a greater quantity of fruitful seeds than he; yet at the close of his career he found that he had not tilled a single corner of his own field according to rule. It is undeniable that his works are more remarkable for the variety than for the profundity of the learning they contain, as he himself was endowed with more imagination than good sense, with more ardour than thoroughness.

“It was precisely these defects, nevertheless, which determined his immense and immediate influence. He was certainly one of the greatest incentive powers the world has ever known.”

Herder, indeed, in these Lectures, is almost made to overshadow that other great force, which not only England, but his own country, has been accustomed to regard as the chief centre of Germany's spiritual influence, Goethe. Considering the scope of the book, the philosophers, Kant in particular, receive a fair share of attention. There is even a short summary of the “Critiques,” which is not uninteresting, so far as it goes. The author's own leanings in philosophy are evidently to *Criticism*, especially on the theoretical side. He betrays an inadequate sense of appreciation of the fertile mind of Schelling, and some will be found to complain that the originality of Hegel is insufficiently recognized.

Herr Hillebrand's account of the Romanticists is exceedingly to the point. He emphasizes their opportuneness as a protest against the excessive Rationalism and one-sided Classicism of their predecessors; and, at the same time, shows the evil influence of the school when their principles were not confined to the domains of literature and art, but carried into social and political life. Incidentally, and in the concluding pages, the author expresses his opinions concerning the Germany of to-day in her relation to the Germany of the past. In appearance she is at present recreant to the great idea which has made her the spirit of Individualism; but Herr Hillebrand believes that the prevalent tendency to exalt the State over the individual is destined to be transient, being chiefly due to extraneous influences, and that she will weary of political as she has wearied of religious strife, and will again take the lead in what the author very pardonably regards as the higher spheres of Science and Art. Herr Hillebrand has shown himself in these Lectures to be possessed of a fine historic sense, and that capacity for seizing many different points of view, so indispensable for the critic of a national literature. He need not deprecate criticisms on the score of being an alien both in speech and mental constitution. He certainly has achieved the art of writing very un-German English, and any lack of appreciation he may experience will be due to other causes than estrangement from the prevailing “intellectual atmosphere” of our country.

Two considerations have impelled the author of this new philosophic

Text-book<sup>2</sup> to undertake his present task—viz., the close connection between Philosophy and Religion, and the need of a systematic study of philosophy for thoroughly distinguishing the speculative chaff from the wheat. We are entirely at one with the author on both points. The attempts sometimes made to rear theology and philosophy on different foundations, are commonly confessions that the system with a non-rational basis has no real basis at all; and if philosophy be science, it can only be adequately studied as an organic whole. It is an excellent sign when we find a dignitary of the Church of England pleading, as the present author does, for an early and prolonged study of pure philosophy; and the liberal spirit in which the whole book is written is as welcome as it is rare. The great defect of the book arises from a very simple cause—viz., the impracticability of the author's plan. The work is too small for its subject. The Alphabet of Philosophy, as understood by the author, is no less than the whole of metaphysics, and this has to be compressed into a small octavo volume of about a hundred pages, a very large part of which are filled with illustrative notes and quotations. The author's method is as follows: He takes a hyacinth, and inquires what distinct kinds of facts are manifested in its flower. They appear to be three: concomitant, consecutive, and co-ordinated phenomena. Reflection on the first yields us the notion of MATTER, on the second that of MOTION, on the third that of MIND. Thing, Change, and Order these are Philosophy's A B C; and whoever has got so far in his spelling lesson, will have begun to understand somewhat of the language of the universe. A beginning indeed! What then are the other members of the alphabet? To the question, what is Matter? there are four replies, that of the Naturalist, the Idealist, the Sceptic and the Realist. Naturalism has its degrees, commencing with the identification of the thing and its image, and refining until it finds its last terms in "centre of force." The Idealist (Platonic Idealism), separates the thing-in-itself altogether from the object, and of course is no resolution of the mystery of appearance. Scepticism (including modern Idealism), is the position of the Subjectivist, but not advancing beyond self cannot of course explain not-self; and the Realist has to be waited for, who feels that Appearance necessitates a something that appears, a true object, which however, is non-material and non-describable. The problem of Motion does not detain our teacher so long. Most attempts at the explanation of motion are merely explanations of motion in terms of itself. The conclusion is, "There is an ever-active Life in these Things that are—a Life according to rhythm, reason, and law. But *what* this Life is, *how* it is, *whence* it is, we know not." Our author seems to be at once Gnostic and Agnostic. He affirms that "*things are*—behind all successive appearances, beyond all human ken. But *what they are, how they are, whence they are, it is not given to us to know,*"

<sup>2</sup> "The A B C. of Philosophy. A Text-book for Students." By Thomas Griffith, A.M., Prebendary of St. Paul's. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

and yet these unknowable things have an active life, and moreover a lawful one! whence this nation of "Life," if it be not an abstraction from the phenomena of Life? But Matter and Motion (whatever they essentially be), are not all. Nature is orderly; and order implies "Mind," wherefore there must be Mind both in Man and in the World beyond Man. As aqueous phenomena force us to assume a water-producing substance, Hydrogen, so mental phenomena compel our belief in "a corresponding 'elementary substance, Noerogen;'" an unfortunate analogy, for if our Noerogen could not evolve our mental world better than hydrogen can generate water, states of consciousness need have no fear of any dogmatic metaphysician displacing them from their supreme throne. But there is substantial Mind in Nature as well as in Man. An Anthropomorphic Deity is inevitable. "Thus, then, we find the noblest thinkers drawing their conclusions not from *à priori* fancies, but from *à posteriori* observation of facts in universal Nature; assuring themselves of a Mind in this Nature, orderly, beautiful, and beneficent, like the mind in man." Also disorderly, ugly, and benevolent? For these two have their place in the microcosm. The Notes occupy a considerable part of the volume, being in fact its most useful portion. They are drawn from a variety of sources, both ancient and modern, and indicate a very wide range of reading. To *bond fide* students wealth of annotation is always acceptable, but the general reader will probably be deterred by the scrappy appearance thereby given to the book. We observe the happy introduction of the word "presentment" for the ambiguous "ideas" or "perceptions" of our older thinkers. It is presumably an equivalent for the German *Vorstellung*, for which a good translation is still desiderated. *Présentation* or *representation* are too cumbrous, to say nothing of the misleading effect of the latter term. Mr. Griffith appears to be a diligent reader of Herbart. When will some one undertake to furnish the English public with a succinct and correct account of this remarkable, but too little known, thinker?

Mr. Baildon's Essays on "The Spirit of Nature" were originally delivered as popular lectures in the rooms of the Pharmaceutical Society in Edinburgh, and they exhibit at once the good and evil side of popular lectures. They have all the vivacity of spoken addresses, and are too liberally interspersed with observations which break the thread of the expositions. They are at once poetical and polemical. The first essay is on Christianity, then follow four chapters on Botany, an essay on Poetry and Science, and one on Nature's Cruelty completing the volume. The author is most at home in the organic world, apparently the vegetable half of it, and his description of the evolving forms of plant-life are often highly picturesque and suggestive. The author claims, however, to be more than a

<sup>3</sup> "The Spirit of Nature. Being a Series of Interpretative Essays on the History of Matter; from the Atom to the Flower." By Henry Bellyse Baildon, B.A. Cantab. London: J. & A. Churchill.

naturalist—a metaphysician (and theologian?); and he has conceived it to be his duty to show the inadequacy of the metaphysics of leading men of science. Professor Tyndall is speedily pronounced incompetent; but the main contention is with Mr. Darwin. The author's own position "is best expressed by saying that (he conceives) the teaching of physical phenomena to have been evolutionary as to mode, but miraculous or divine as to cause," which, being interpreted, means that, if a human being had been conscious through any historic period whatsoever, the world would have always presented the same appearance of a series of gradual changes, but the perceived process would not have been automatic or tentative, but the work of a supreme and eternal Power. There is nothing particularly novel in this creed, which has naturally to be supported by the argument from Design. The special form of this argument chosen by the writer is that from Beauty. It would have been well if the author, before making a transcendental application of the idea of Beauty, had first subjected the notion to analysis, or to a searching examination by comparing it with other primary ideas. We should also like Mr. Baildon to consider what bearing the fact of the wealth of extinct plant-life should have upon his view that the "category of beauty" exists in no being below man, and also on this design argument from beauty. We suppose the Essay on "Poetry and Science" was needed, although we think the author exaggerates the antipathy to Poetry in the scientifically-educated mind. Such minds have a very proper aversion for much that passes by the name of Poetry, and this aversion should be a very distinct warning to those who would set the world to music, that they must make larger demands upon themselves than (with few exceptions) they have yet seen to be needful, if they would win the ear of a race which is moving fast to higher planes of thought and feeling. In the chapter entitled "The Cruelty of Nature," Mr. Baildon endeavours to repel the charge of wanton infliction of suffering in the sub-human world. There is no evidence, he asserts, of more pain being inflicted than the struggle for existence necessitates. The energy of his defence is apparently motivated by his theistic assumptions, but we fail to see that anything is gained in this regard, by relieving lower Nature of a stain, which cannot be repudiated for higher Nature. As to the matter-of-fact dispute concerning the presence or absence of cruelty in the animals, we think he may be in the right, for the deliberate infliction of pain for the sake of self-pleasure would seem to require a faculty of representation doubtfully possessed by the brutes. As to the larger question of the utility of pain, our author, of course, adopts the ordinary optimistic strain, that pain is the educator of spiritual grandeur. Unfortunately, however, there is another side to the picture, and against the bright colouring of ennoblement by suffering may be set off the equally common dark hue of degradation by suffering. On the whole, we think this book would be better if the author were not always posing in the attitude of *defensor fidei* against supposed or real impugnors of the perfection of

the universe. We should seriously recommend him, also, before preparing a second edition, to read carefully Mr. Herbert Spencer's two volumes on the "Principles of Biology." He will do most wisely, however, in checking his metaphysical propensities, and giving the reins to his poetic instincts, with which he is fortunate in being so considerably endowed.

Mr. Wallace has done a good work in consenting to make more accessible his useful "Synopsis of the Aristotelian Philosophy."<sup>4</sup> It is not so long ago, it is true, that he would have been rebuked in no measured terms for presuming so considerably to lighten the labours of students of the most systematic expression of the wisdom of the ancients; but Mr. Wallace rightly comprehends the needs of the age in which he lives, when he mercifully "gives the cream" of Aristotle's works, prefaced at well-chosen intervals by English summaries, in a *brochure* of seventy pages. To students of these latter days, Aristotle is but one, whatever emphasis be given to the "one," of the illustrious many, of whom even the philosophic specialist is bound to have read something; and the time is not perhaps remote when what is here offered as a *minimum* may, except in very rare cases, be generally accepted as a *maximum*. The parts of Aristotle's writings from which the selections have been made are those deemed most important for the modern student. That most space should be granted to Moral and Political Philosophy, and a scarcely inferior attention be given to Logic and Metaphysics, indicates a due perception of the wants of readers. In his Preface, the editor has an appropriate word for Aristotle's Practical Philosophy, rendered presumably necessary by the utilitarian spirit which is abroad. We are of his opinion, that scientific ethics will hardly be delayed by a preliminary study of the first serious attempt at a coherent system of Moral Philosophy; and the inherent identity of ethics and politics is by no means an obsolete point of view, as, indeed, the editor's own confession shows. The same, of course, may be said of Formal Logic, and perhaps also of Metaphysics. As Mr. Wallace hints, we of the latter part of this nineteenth Christian century have not so much outgrown the ontological presuppositions of the great Greek thinker—nay, indeed, may even detect signs of a *rapprochement* of the ancient and modern mind which would hardly have been suspected twenty or thirty years ago. To exalt Aristotle it is not, however, necessary to depress John Stuart Mill, and Mr. Wallace's passing sneer at the modern thinker's logical opinions is not only superfluous, but based on a misconception. That man, as well as brute, often infers from particulars to particulars, surely no one will be found hardy enough to deny; and that where the inference is necessary, the particulars from which the conclusion is drawn must be capable of generalization, is as much an article of Mill's belief as of Aristotle's. The difference is, that Mill addresses himself to the question of fact as well as of probative force, Aristotle only to the latter, as the

<sup>4</sup> "Outlines of the Philosophy of Aristotle." Compiled by Edwin Wallace, M.A. Second and considerably enlarged edition. Oxford and London: James Parker & Co.



important consideration for Formal Logic. The English reader will shortly possess an ample statement of Aristotelianism in the forthcoming translation of that part of Zeller's "History of Greek Philosophy." The editor of this *brochure* considers that the publication of such translation will render superfluous any original production of like extent, an undertaking which he had himself at one time thought to attempt, and which had it been carried to completion would doubtless have been successful, judging from the tact with which he has managed his materials in the present instance.

---

### POLITICS, SOCIOLOGY, VOYAGES, AND TRAVELS.

IN an elaborate "Essay" of some 1,000 pages,<sup>1</sup> M. Legrelle, who has already published a work on the origin of the Franco-German War, now brings the contending parties before the bar of history, and attempts to point out its consequences, which he considers to both victors and vanquished have proved deplorable. The motto on the title-page, "Macht geht über Recht," which he attributes to Prince Bismarck—though it has recently been asserted that on the occasion referred to, seventeen years ago, it was used not by Bismarck but by the War Minister, von Roon—is sufficiently indicative of the spirit of the work :

magno se iudice quisque tuctur  
uictrix causa deis placuit sed uicta Catoni.

Such in effect is the burden of M. Legrelle as of M. Cohen in his "Etudes sur l'Empire d'Allemagne," which were viewed at length in a recent number, of M. Tissot, in his "Voyage au pays des Milliards," and of other recent writers, whose works we have nearly succeeded in forgetting. Indeed we cannot but think that controversial and recriminatory writing of this kind, however ingenious and acute, can serve no useful end, and may help to revive animosities of which it were better to leave the memory to the effacing hand of Time. In M. Legrelle's opinion, the result of that war has been, in Germany, the development of militarism and the suppression of both political and religious liberty; in France, democratic anarchy, promoted by Germany for her own ends, and threatening the country with the fate of Poland; on the Continent generally, preponderance of German influence, a consequent deterioration of diplomacy, an increasing tendency to disregard the sanctions of international law, and the prospect of a universal German Empire. Lugubrious indeed are M. Legrelle's vaticinations; and we can only hope that they will share the fate of those of Cassandra, and that the sceptics this time will have reason on their side. Given the *motif* of his book, we must admit that he has

<sup>1</sup> "La Prusse et la France devant l'histoire." Essai sur les conséquences de la guerre de 1870-1871. Par A. Legrelle. Paris: Cotillon, 1880. London: Trübner & Co.

done his work with care and industry, and many of his conclusions are just and worthy of consideration. At every point, however, we have to make allowances for the *animus* of the writer, and carefully check the evidence on which he bases what is in substance the impeachment of a nation. Thus we can scarcely trust the impartiality of a writer who seems to think that because many individual Germans were well treated in Paris under the Empire, Prussia should have abstained from accepting the challenge of the Emperor. That Herr von Sybel was allowed to study the public archives, while many of his compatriots made fortunes at Paris and were entertained at the Tuileries, can scarcely be regarded as a factor worthy to be seriously weighed in the diplomatic dispute which arose from the pretensions of a Hohenzollern to the Spanish throne. As to M. Legrelle's charge against the Germans, that during the occupation of France they transgressed the laws of war, as laid down by Bluntschli, it would be easy enough to "traverse the pleadings," especially as the evidence he produces is almost exclusively French; he himself indeed admits that had it not been for the almost incredible ignorance and gullibility of the French, they would not have fallen victims to the deceptions practised by their opponents. The charge of systematic disregard of the Geneva Convention is made on both sides, and supported by the assertion that ambulances, &c., were employed to cover military operations; the subject is a painful one, on which perhaps no certainty is attainable. That there were cases of plunder and pillage, that officers were not above taking their share in any "loot" that came across their path, that the requisitions on local authorities were often extortionate, and that private property was sometimes unjustifiably confiscated, is all probable enough, and simply proves, what everybody knows, that neither the writings of Bluntschli, nor those of any other publicist, will ever do away, however discipline may be theoretically perfect, with all the horrors of campaigns, and the sufferings which are caused to unoffending people by conquest and invasion. When M. Legrelle proceeds to speak of "Germany and Prussia at home," he follows much the same line as M. Cohen, and there is much in his exposition of the dangers of German politics and the unsatisfactory state of German society, of which all Liberal politicians should take careful note. Here too the writer relies on German evidence, and, though the tone of his criticisms is far from friendly, they are in substance more impartial than when he is dealing with Germans as victorious occupants of French soil. On the other hand, no part of the book is more questionable than that in which the author, apparently from a legitimist standpoint, makes the most unfavourable political deductions as to the prospects of the French Republic, the proclamation of which, in his view, aggravated the difficulties of the situation in 1870, while he thinks its continuance incompatible with the recovery by France of her proper consideration among the Powers of Europe.

The two inviting-looking volumes in which Mr. Wemyss Reid has

brought together his sketches of contemporary politicians<sup>2</sup> belong to that class of literature which it is the fashion to describe as "eminently readable;" if they display no trace of the higher critical spirit, and no great profundity of insight into character, they are at least conspicuously free from vulgarity of tone, and, in this respect, form an agreeable contrast to other recent efforts in the same direction. Mr. Reid writes in the fashion we should expect from a journalist of pronounced Liberal views, but at the same time not incapable of seeing that there are few questions which have not at least two sides. The book has probably during the last two or three months commanded a wide circle of readers among those anxious to know a little more than Hansard and Dod can tell them of the *personnel* of the new Administration. As a gallery of political portraits, though containing numerous examples, it has no pretensions to completeness; we miss, for instance, the well-known faces of Lord Granville, the Duke of Argyll, Lord Selborne, Lord Cairns, Lord Cranbrook, Lord Sherbrooke, Lord Rosebery, Mr. W. H. Smith, Mr. Whitbread, and Mr. Newdegate, all of whom, not to mention many minor celebrities, and those whose political career is practically finished, or scarcely yet developed, would furnish the political portrait-painter with interesting features for a sketch. Perhaps the author is contemplating a third volume; if not, some of the above-mentioned personages would seem to have had higher claims on his attention than Sir Robert Peel, Mr. Chaplin, or even Mr. Edward Jenkins. We think too that the essays on Prince Gortschakoff, Prince Bismarck, and M. Gambetta might as well have been omitted. The former contains some allusions in rather questionable taste; and it is really impossible to give an English reader, ignorant of foreign politics, a satisfactory idea of the characters and careers of the most eminent of continental statesmen within the limits of twenty pages of large type, while to those who are better instructed such cursory notices have still less value. Among the best of Mr. Reid's descriptions are those of Mr. Cowen and Mr. Burt, which contain a good deal of information which to most people will prove both novel and interesting; that of Sir W. Harcourt, on the other hand, strikes us as singularly ungracious and unsympathetic. His observations on Mr. Roebuck are not without interest, partly because his strictures on that politician's chequered career are written without that reserve which, had they been published a few weeks later, the delicacy of posthumous criticism would have imposed. We must add that Mr. Reid has adopted a somewhat invidious course in mentioning in the short biographical notices, which precede each essay, the University distinctions gained by some of his subjects, and leaving unrecorded those of others. This is a subject on which information is very easily attainable; and there can be no reason why the successes achieved in the schools by Mr. Gladstone and Lord Derby should be duly set out, while those of

---

<sup>2</sup>, "Politicians of To-Day." By T. Wemyss Reid. London: Griffith & Farran. 1880.

Sir Stafford Northcote, Sir W. Harcourt, Mr. Goschen, Sir C. Dilke, and Mr. Fawcett are ignored. The Postmaster-General, by the way, was "not educated at Trinity College;" he graduated, as a high wrangler, at Trinity Hall, of which Society he is still a Fellow.

Mr. W. P. Andrew, the chairman of the Scinde Railway Company, who has long been known as an advocate of the development and extension of our railway communications in the Punjab, and as far as the Bolan and Khyber Passes, and also as one of the principal supporters of the Euphrates Valley route, has published a small volume, in which he sets forth his views with special reference to the present position of the Afghan question.<sup>3</sup> The primitive character of our existing system of communications, with the Indus at Attock still unbridged, and Ferozepore, the principal arsenal of upper India, connected with the nearest railway station by thirty miles of country roads, is in itself sufficient to explain the extent of the transport difficulty in the recent campaign, and the extraordinary expenses which so deranged Sir J. Strachey's sanguine budget. Mr. Andrew strongly advocates, on both political and strategic grounds, the permanent retention of Candahar and the fortification of the Khyber Passes, while he would withdraw from Cabul and Herat, handing over the latter city, not to the Persians, but to a ruler chosen by the Afghan princes and sirdars. The present work also contains a short account of the modern history, geography, climate, produce, manufactures, and capacities of Afghanistan, together with a description of the Powindah class, or soldier-merchants of Afghan race, through whose agency the trade between India and Central Asia is carried on.

The anonymous author of "Egypt for the Egyptians"<sup>4</sup> has evolved a slovenly and ill-arranged compilation from sources of very varying value; but at the same time he is evidently in possession of a good deal of information, possibly supplied from influential quarters, as to the recent history and present condition, financial and economic, of Egyptian affairs. He has collected a large number of facts and theories, of which it is not always easy to see the drift. He will not despond of the future either of Turkey or Egypt, though he misses no opportunity for drawing a contrast between the position and prospects of the suzerain and those of the subject State, which is highly unfavourable to the former; he dreads the consequences of the interference of the Western Powers, and especially of rivalry between the representatives of England and France, while at the same time he is evidently too well acquainted with the disposition of Oriental administrators to entertain any real expectation of genuine reforms being carried out, unless under the influence of external pressure. The summary of the financial history of the reign of the late Khedive has a melancholy interest; corruption and oppression, duplicity and greed,

<sup>3</sup> "Our Scientific Frontier." By W. P. Andrew. London: W. H. Allen & Co. 1880.

<sup>4</sup> "Egypt for the Egyptians. A Retrospect and a Prospect." London: Brooks & Co. 1880.

extortion and chicane, all play their parts, simultaneously or in turn, from the accession to the flight of the profligate impostor who so long ground down the fellah, while he posed before Europe as an enlightened and philanthropic prince, imbued with all the latest ideas of Western civilization. Our author expresses a strong opinion that, by allowing Tewfik to succeed his father, at the instance of M. Waddington, a serious if not irretrievable blunder has been committed, and that the proper course would have been to secure the reversion to Prince Halim, who had probably a prior claim according to the ordinary Muhammadan succession-law, and who, he thinks, might have been trusted to carry out in power the liberal and enlightened principles which he professed in exile; indeed, a very little reading between the lines gives the impression that the book really amounts to little more than a brief for Prince Halim. We have a vivid description, based on apparently trustworthy reports received from Cairo, of the character of Cherif Pasha and other members of the *entourage* of Tewfik, whose personal nullity seems incontestable; neither is the view taken of Riaz Pasha, the present chief adviser of the Viceroy, much more encouraging. There can be little doubt that the attention of Mr. Gladstone's Government must sooner or later be seriously directed to the state of Egyptian affairs; and some of the facts and allegations contained in the present volume may serve as useful *data* for a fresh inquiry into the situation and resources of that misgoverned and over-governed country. The recent case of the capture of a caravan at Siout corroborates the author's assertions as to the extensive character of the illicit slave-trade which the native authorities take no step to check. The book unfortunately abounds in printer's errors, which sometimes make the writer say the reverse of what is obviously his meaning; the mention however among the various burdens of the cultivator, of an "Irritation" Tax, is rather a humorous blunder. We must also protest against the writer's regrettable habit of printing within inverted commas what appear to be lengthy extracts, without any mention of the source from which they are taken.

Thirteen years ago Mr. C. Anthony published a treatise on the "Social and Political Independence of Women," which appears from the copy we have received to have attained the honour of a fifth edition; he has now produced an essay on "Popular Sovereignty,"<sup>s</sup> which, like the former work, contains evidence of a conscientious study of the views of Mill, and may be found useful as a concise and fairly accurate exposition of the political programme of the advanced section of the Liberal party. It is hazardous to prophesy on such points, but we scarcely think that Mr. Anthony's last production is likely to command so prolonged a success as the former volume. Some of his remarks—those for instance which deal with Parliamentary obstruction and Liberal foreign policy—are already, more or less, *de*

<sup>s</sup> "Popular Sovereignty." By C. Anthony, junr. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1880.

*l'ancienne histoire.* In his discussion of the important topic of local self-government Mr. Anthony probably had in mind the theory advanced in Mill's "Representative Government" that the centralization of information and localization of responsibility is the ideal at which to aim; and some of his suggestions, though rather deficient in precision, are worth consideration. We wish that some of our theoretical reformers would endeavour to frame a practical scheme for the efficient local government of the metropolis, a measure for which the demand is at least equally urgent with that for the establishment of representative county boards. In advocating triennial Parliaments, we are not sure that the writer attaches sufficient weight to the circumstance, which he admits, that, even under the present law, the average duration of Parliaments is less than five years; to the fact that, as the constituencies are extended in size, the legitimate expenses of elections tend to increase proportionately, and that their biennial recurrence—for that is what it would amount to—whether defrayed, as at present, by the candidates, or by the ratepayers themselves, would entail very considerable hardship; and also to the serious difficulty of carrying on the work of government under the minute criticism of the present day, which, when we further take into consideration the unquestionable capriciousness and easily excited discontent of a democratic electorate, would render good administration almost impossible if, as soon as Parliament had fairly settled to its work, its energies were distracted and pre-occupied by a proximate dissolution. If we are to perform our business in life satisfactorily, the proverbial slave with his *memento mori* must not be too obtrusively before our eyes. Our space does not permit us to do more than throw out a hint that there is something to be said on the other side, and that the experience of some of our Continental neighbours, and still more of the United States, is far from favourable to very frequent popular elections. While however we may differ from Mr. Anthony on many points of detail, it is when he comes to deal in crudely concocted generalities that we find his book most unsatisfactory. The theory with which he starts, that no new laws, or amendments of existing laws, can be tolerated which deal only with the interests of particular sections of the population, would, if logically carried out, prove a bar to the most useful legislation of the day. The Burials Bill, for instance, or the measures which relate to the liability of employers for injuries to their workmen, and the regulation of merchant shipping, are all, in their immediate bearing, praiseworthy attempts to improve the position of a particular class. Of course, what the writer means is that enactments which confer special privileges and exemptions, in the interest of special classes, and to the detriment of the general public, are in principle objectionable; such a statement would be so obviously true as to be almost a truism; but Mr. Anthony should endeavour to express what he means with more of an approach to accuracy. Once more, we cannot accept without a protest his matter-of-course identification of Parliamentary representatives with popular delegates, the

puppets of their constituencies, not entitled to a will or an opinion of their own, an assumption which pervades the whole book, and is more than once expressly asserted. Lastly, we refuse to admit that Liberalism and Democracy are synonymous terms. That democracy is "the best interpretation of the words *force* and *people*" we altogether deny; the *πῶλις*, the *populus*, the people, are not to be confounded by either historian or statesman, with the *δῆμος*, the *plebs*, or the mob.

Between popular sovereignty and the supremacy of the Pope there is a great gulf fixed; and it is not without some misgivings that we make the leap. Cardinal Manning has thought it well to reprint a series of lectures on the temporal power of the Pope,<sup>6</sup> which first appeared twenty years ago, and which contain a good deal of matter now practically obsolete. The distinguished writer himself admits that the aggressive tone of some of his observations was mainly due to the peculiar circumstances of the period of original publication, and hints that if the essay were re-written it would be of a less polemical character. The value of the work would certainly have been enhanced by a more thorough revision. Thus, the statement still stands that "until two years ago marriage was indissoluble in England;" while the last lecture is devoted to a consideration of "the future glories of the Pontificate of Pius IX.," and contains the curious statement that "the natural life of one man has outlived the duration of the United States," an assertion which would scarcely have been correct even if the civil war had resulted in the disruption which the writer so confidently anticipated. Of the lectures in general we may say without disrespect that they are clearly addressed to the sympathetic ears of a Catholic audience, and contain no arguments likely to be convincing to the average heretic; certainly the answers of "the theological faculty of the University of Cagliari" to the propositions of the Sardinian Government will not be regarded as a very decisive authority. Some of the Cardinal's historical arguments are singularly unfortunate. Whatever may be the case with regard to Spain, the theory that in England the civil system of government was developed out of an antecedent ecclesiastical jurisdiction or creative spiritual power is entirely misleading. Again, with regard to the power enjoyed by the early Popes of emancipating slaves, it is notorious that as soon as its exercise became at all frequent, it was objected to by other sovereigns, and restricted within insignificant limits; its legitimate extent was indeed the subject of discussion at more than one Council. In dealing with the character of the Papal sovereignty, the notorious misgovernment of the States of the Church is scarcely adverted to; and the Cardinal has not availed himself of the opportunity afforded by a new edition to attempt to answer such in fact unanswerable charges as those contained in About's "Question Romaine." Lastly,

<sup>6</sup> "The Temporal Power of the Pope." By H. E. Manning, Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. London: Burns and Oates. 1880.

we must protest against the theory that the action of the Pope "upon the springs of national life, and upon the sources of imperial power"—whatever may be the precise meaning of the latter expression—scarcely, we suppose, that which Austin attaches to the word "source" in a similar connection—is based upon his temporal sovereignty; whatever influence the Papacy may have exerted in the past, or be destined to exert in the future, must surely depend upon the extent to which its spiritual authority may be able to appeal to the conscience or the imagination of other territorial sovereigns.

In a pamphlet on "the reactionary current of the present time," Herr Mises, of Vienna, treats the contemporary movements in the province of political economy towards Protectionist and Socialistic theories, with their attendant evils, in that of politics towards a Conservatism which threatens to play the part of Frankenstein's monster to those who have evoked it, and in that of moral philosophy towards a revival of pessimism, as interdependent phases of a momentary tendency in the pendulum of thought to swing round from the extreme of Radicalism on the one hand to that of the principle of authority on the other. Writing as a progressive Liberal and advocate of individual liberty, the author expresses a sanguine opinion that the *juste milieu* will soon be automatically regained. His remarks on the reactionary character of the prevalent "Antisemitismus" feeling may be compared with the observations which George Eliot makes on the same subject in the concluding essay of her latest volume; Mr. Gladstone however would certainly repudiate the view which Herr Mises attributes to him of the influence of the late Premier's Jewish origin on the course of the Eastern Question. The author's discriminating analysis of the distinguishing characteristics and comparative merits of the two great parties in English politics deserves a word of notice. In the French *Kulturkampf* and the English elections he discerns an *ex occidente lux*, and the best ground of encouragement for Continental Liberals.

The publication of the valuable studies, geographical, ethnographical, political, and economical, of the late Professor Oscar Peschel, of Leipsic, was unfortunately interrupted by his death in 1875. On the manuscripts which he left behind him, Herr Krümmel, one of his former pupils at the University, has based a comprehensive work on European State-lore,<sup>6</sup> which the first instalment has now been published. The basis of the work is physiological, but the influence of historical event and of social ideas, such as the doctrine of Nationalities, is also carefully investigated. The first part of the first

<sup>7</sup> "Ueber die reactionäre Strömung unserer Zeit. Von H. Mises. Wien; Rosner. 1880.

<sup>8</sup> "Europäische Staatenkunde." •Mit Benutzung der hinterlassenen Manuscripte Oscar Peschel's, nach den Originalquellen, bearbeitet von Otto Krümmel. Erster Band: erste Abtheilung. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. 1880. London: Trübner & Co.



ductory sketch of the physical and ethnographic condition of the European Continent, as a whole, comprises an elaborate description of the Russian Empire in Europe and Asia, of Sweden, Norway and Denmark, and of Great Britain with its dependencies in the four quarters of the globe. The second part, which it is hoped will appear next year, will embrace the remaining European States with the exception of Germany, together with a supplementary account of the United States of America; while the second volume is to be entirely devoted to the German Empire, with an index and comparative tables for the whole work. If Herr Krummel completes his extensive programme, the result of his labours cannot fail to prove of permanent value.

Few works on economic science have so deservedly acquired a high and permanent reputation as the "Histoire de l'Economie Politique en Europe" of the late Professor Blanqui. The author, who himself from 1846 to 1848 represented Bordeaux in the Chamber of Deputies, was an elder brother of the gentleman whose popularity with the constituencies as a "political martyr" has recently proved such a thorn in the side of the French Government. M. Blanqui's work, which traces the growth of economical principles, whether latent and automatic or consciously developed, from the earliest times, is historical in its scope, and where incidentally controversial the opinions expressed have since been accepted, in Europe at all events, by almost all writers of reputation, as axiomatic.\* Miss Leonard has doubtless performed good service in translating Professor Blanqui's work,<sup>9</sup> though, carefully as she seems to have executed her task, much is inevitably sacrificed to the exigencies of a language which, for scientific purposes, as a vehicle for the conveyance of thought, can bear no comparison with the original in lucidity and precision. Probably however in America the proportion of students of political economy, who are capable of following with facility a writer like Blanqui in his own tongue is not so great as in England; and the more his enlightened opinions are diffused on the other side the Atlantic, the better must be the prospects of the cause of commercial freedom. The book contains a useful introductory note from the pen of the Hon. David Wells, a high authority on this class of subjects.

A lecture on "Politics and Art,"<sup>10</sup> delivered at Liverpool by Mr. T. Hall Caine, contains within the compass of forty small pages of large type at least as many dogmatic assertions and hasty generalizations from inadequate premises, which we should like, if space permitted, to endeavour to refute. The writer starts so many theories that his limits prevent him from doing justice to any of them. He wishes to see artists—by which word he seems to mean painters and poets—take a "passive interest" in political life, and devote themselves to depicting its "inner significance," a task of which the intelligible execution on

<sup>9</sup> "History of Political Economy in Europe." By J. A. Blanqui. Translated by E. J. Leonard. New York: Putnam. 1880. London: Trübner & Co.

<sup>10</sup> "Politics and Art." By T. H. Hall Caine. Liverpool: Notes and Queries Society. 1880.

canvas would, we fancy, involve difficulties not contemplated by Mr. Caine. His remark that "the political life of a nation runs highest when the artistic instinct in its people is strongest" certainly seems to ignore some rather familiar historical facts; Mr. Caine mentions the synchronism of Pericles and Phidias, but is judiciously silent about the Roman Republic. And what does he mean by "the most profligate (*if that be possible*) of our Georges?" Speaking of the time of George IV., he treats the fame of Brougham as ephemeral in comparison with that of Keats, another proposition which strikes us as more than doubtful.

The publication of Mr. Balfour Browne's little book on "Water Supply"<sup>11</sup> is peculiarly timely. Mr. Browne discusses in a very complete and perspicuous manner the comparative merits of surface water, river water, and deep-well water, of hard and soft water, as well for dietetic and domestic as manufacturing purposes, of constant and intermittent pressure, of the ordinary gravel and sand filters and filtration by carbonized iron, of pipes of lead and pipes of galvanized iron, and all the other points connected with a subject the importance of which is daily obtaining more general recognition. The references to evidence given before Parliamentary Committees will also prove useful to those desirous of investigating more fully the present state of scientific opinion on the subject, though we fear that on scarcely one of the above-mentioned topics does there exist anything like a *consensus* of professional authority. With regard to the now urgent question of the metropolitan supply, it is important to remember how small a proportion of the water which a great city requires is used for dietetic purposes; no doubt the expense and complication of two parallel systems of distribution would be considerable, but as the only satisfactory alternative would seem to be a general supply of potable water, equal in purity to that now consumed by the fortunate district served by the Kent Water Company, we are under a strong impression that London will ultimately insist upon the adoption of some scheme more or less based on the same lines as those of the two Bills unsuccessfully promoted in 1878 by the Board of Works. Mr. Browne's book contains an interesting examination of the causes of typhoidal and cholera poisoning, though his conclusion that we can only wait for a "fuller revelation which may be reached through long bills of mortality in time to come" is hardly encouraging. Meanwhile much may be learnt from a study of the history and ascertained causes of such outbreaks as occurred at Caterham and Lausen.

The colony of New Zealand is certainly entitled to take a legitimate pride in the care and completeness with which its official publications are compiled; we have received two recent Blue-Books,<sup>12</sup> printed at

<sup>11</sup> "Water Supply." By J. H. Balfour Browne. London: Macmillan & Co. 1880.

<sup>12</sup> "Results of a Census of the Colony of New Zealand, March 3rd, 1878." Wellington: Didsbury, Government Printer. 1880.

"Statistics of the Colony of New Zealand for the year 1878. Wellington: Didsbury.

Wellington, which would do no discredit to Messrs. Eyre and Spottiswoode. The first contains the results of a Census taken two years ago, with the Registrar-General's accompanying Report. In the four years from 1874 to 1878 the population increased in round numbers from 300,000 to 415,000, or more than 38 per cent.; in the preceding four years the increase had been at the rate of less than 17 per cent. The density of population, exclusive of Maoris, is now about four persons to the square mile. The statistics of elementary education appear to be highly satisfactory. The portion of the Report which deals with the occupations of the people shows a specially large increase, amounting to nearly 50 per cent., in the number of persons engaged in mercantile pursuits. The decrease in the Maori population still continues, although, so far as the returns upon this head, which are peculiarly difficult to obtain, can be relied on, the diminution in the interval of four years between the last two enumerations was comparatively slight. The vital statistics contained in the second Blue-Book seem highly satisfactory; thus the number of illegitimate births registered in 1878 was only 2.41 per cent., and the death-rate less than 11 per cent. of the population. On the whole these publications appear to indicate that the colony is in a flourishing and steadily progressive condition, although the balance between revenue and expenditure is unfortunately rather on the wrong side.

The very elaborate Report of the Minister of Education on the various classes of schools in the province of Ontario,<sup>13</sup> which includes a general statistical abstract of educational progress in that district, is of more exclusively local interest. We observe that Ontario possesses some 1,500 free libraries, containing nearly 300,000 volumes.

Recurring to the subject of New Zealand, we may advert to a book by Mr. J. C. Crawford,<sup>14</sup> than whom few persons can be entitled to write with more authority on the subject of travel in the Antipodes. Mr. Crawford first crossed over from New South Wales to New Zealand more than forty years ago, before the establishment of the British sovereignty, when the only settlers were a few whalers. After being for some years a member of the Legislative Council, and for twelve years resident magistrate at Wellington, of which city he witnessed the foundation, Mr. Crawford has lived to see New Zealand a prosperous and highly civilized community, enjoying responsible government and possessing a greater railway mileage in proportion to population than any other country in the world. His account of the squabble between some of the emigrants first sent out by the New Zealand Company and the captain of a trading vessel, which led to the assumption of authority and hoisting of the British flag by Governor Hobson, is curious reading. We regret our inability to speak very highly of the literary

<sup>13</sup> "Annual Report for 1878 of the Minister of Education on the Schools of the Province of Ontario. Toronto: Robinson. 1880.

<sup>14</sup> "Recollections of Travel in New Zealand and Australia." By J. C. Crawford, F.G.S. London: Trübner & Co. 1880.

merits of Mr. Crawford's work. The trifling details and trivial incidents of excursions in what we may call the primitive period, by land and sea, are set out at tedious length, and the volume would have greatly benefited by judicious condensation. The book has too much of the character of a diary reprinted with no selective discrimination. Few readers can care to learn how, in 1846, the writer did ample justice to "a magnificent cold pie" at Pitone, how, on his way home, he was inveigled by a touter into an inferior pot-house at Ostend, or how he once heard a party of Frenchmen ask in vain for roast beef and plum-pudding at an hotel in Cockspur Street. Probably however many of the author's reminiscences may prove not devoid of interest to colonists of a later period. The chapter on the Maori race, the characteristics and origin of which have, however, been recently the subject of a more authoritative examination at the hands of Mr. Wallace, the sketch of the principal questions in New Zealand contemporary politics—which contains a severe, though temperately worded, censure on the proceedings of Sir G. Grey's Ministry—and the account of the agricultural and arboricultural capacities of the island, will perhaps be generally regarded as the most interesting features of the work.

From the official reports of one of our own Colonies the transition is natural to some further publications which have come to hand from the statistical department of the Italian Ministry of Agriculture, Industry, and Commerce, prepared, as far as we are able to judge, with their usual accuracy and completeness. First we have the Navigation Statistics for 1878, containing an account of the number and tonnage of the vessels engaged in commerce or in the deep-sea fisheries, arriving at or leaving the various ports of the kingdom, together with comparative tables for former years.<sup>15</sup> Next we have similar reports on Population and Emigration for the same period.<sup>16</sup> Of more general interest are the two volumes of Statistical Year Books for 1880,<sup>17</sup> which afford a fresh proof of the intelligent interest taken by the department in comparative demography. Among other contents we notice an epitome by Professor Morselli of his essay on Suicide, a study of comparative morality from the standpoint of the statistician which procures some curious results. Following the calculations of Oettingen and Wagner, the Professor shows that, as regards European races, the tendency to suicide is greatest among those of German and least among those of Slavonic origin, the middle place in the scale being occupied by those of Latin, or, as he would prefer to call it, of Kelto-Romanic descent, the percentage among those of Italico-

<sup>15</sup> *“Movimento della Navigazione nei porti del Regno, 1878.”* Roma: Tip. Elzeviriana. 1879.

<sup>16</sup> *“Popolazione-Movimento dello stato civile, 1878.”* Roma: Tip. Cenniniana. 1880.

<sup>17</sup> *“Annali di Statistica.”* Serie 2<sup>a</sup>, Vol. xi. xii., 1880. Roma: Tip. Eredi Botta. 1880.

Romanic origin being, we are surprised to learn, even less than among the Slavs. He accounts for the circumstance that the proportion among the "Anglo-Saxons" is much less than among the Germans and Scandinavians through our admixture of blood with the Kelts, the ancient inhabitants of Britain. The essay contains some interesting remarks on the moral value and bearing of investigations of this kind, with special reference to their influence on the doctrine of free will. We also observe a bibliographic summary of a statistical survey by Mr. Ravenstein of the Keltic languages in the British Isles; abstracts of German official works on posts and telegraphs, on popular elections in Austria, and on the influence of crops on the price of grain in the principal European States from 1846 to 1875; an abridgment of a Washington publication, based on the reports of American consuls in the several States of Europe, on the rate of wages and condition of labour; a memoir on the arrangements for the approaching census of the German Empire; and reports on mendicity and public charity in the United States, Austria, and Norway, in continuance of others previously published dealing with the state of the same question in England, Switzerland, and Germany. These reports are being collected and edited by the Italian Government—the subject being one the urgency of which its domestic experience should particularly qualify it to appreciate—in pursuance of an arrangement made at the International Statistical Congresses of the Hague in 1869, and St. Petersburg in 1872; and their results, when completed, will doubtless be highly valuable. We have also before us the original report on the subject made by the Norwegian authorities, compiled in French, and published at the Roman Government Press.<sup>18</sup> This is divided into an examination of the general system of public charitable organization, and an account of the various pious institutions and beneficent establishments, destined to aid a somewhat higher social class, which exist in Norway. Lastly, we have to acknowledge a highly scientific compilation, based on an examination of the statistics of illness and the frequency and duration of the different maladies among members of the various societies of mutual aid.<sup>19</sup> Some of the results arrived at are expressed in mathematical symbols of considerable complexity.

Very different to and in some respects much more arduous than the task of Gaius or Tribonian is that which Mr. Nasmith has undertaken in endeavouring to classify under the orderly form of "Institutes" the leading principles of English public and private law.<sup>20</sup> The book is certainly a praiseworthy attempt in the right direction, though in introducing his subject by an imaginative description of the sensa-

<sup>18</sup> "De l'assistance publique et des établissements de charité et institutions pieuses on Norvège." Rome: Botta. 1880.

<sup>19</sup> "Statistica della Morbosità presso i soci delle Società di Mutuo Soccorso." Roma: Tip. Cenniniana. 1880.

<sup>20</sup> "The Institutes of English Law." By D. Nasmith. 4 vols. London: Butterworths. 1873-1879.

tions experienced by Adam and Eve, in and out of Eden, the writer follows too closely the precedent set by the poet who, before recounting the events of the Trojan war, thought it necessary to enter into details as to the incubation of Leda's egg. We do not think that Mr. Nasmith's labours are likely to find much favour with the "general practitioner," who takes much more interest in an *obiter dictum* of Lord Justice Bramwell, a decision of the Master of the Rolls, or the last new Rule under the Judicature Act, than in all the theories which all the "jurists," from Bracton to Blackstone, and from Austin to Sir H. Maine or Sir J. Stephen, have successively developed; but to the student of law, at the Universities and the Inns of Court, who would obtain some insight into principles before he begins to grope his way through the technicalities of practice and procedure, Mr. Nasmith may prove a servicable, if not always an entirely trustworthy, guide. His system of classification of course affords plenty of scope for criticism. To the phrase *jus publicum* very different meanings have been attached by different writers; in the present work it is made to embrace not only international law, which Austin would exclude, relegating it altogether to the sphere of positive morality, constitutional law, with which the same writer regards it as substantially identical, and criminal law, which was what it usually meant in the Roman institutional writers, but also such apparently disconnected subjects as the law of bankruptcy, patents, and copyrights. The unsatisfactory character of the division of private law, adopted by Mr. Nasmith, into that of persons and things, has been repeatedly pointed out. He has now completed his work by a volume on adjective law, in which such subjects as legal fictions, which are dealt with in a very meagre and scrappy fashion, presumptions and estoppel are included. It may perhaps be found useful to compare the sections on the law of evidence with the excellent digest of that important branch of the law of procedure which we owe to the professorial labours of Mr. Justice Stephen; while in dealing with the law of damages Mr. Nasmith has of course availed himself of the comprehensive treatise of Mr. T. D. Mayne, who has succeeded the learned judge in his post of Professor at the Inns of Court.

The Hindu law of succession is a subject to which, since the importance of the application of the comparative method to the study of institutions has been generally recognized, much attention has been directed, affording as it does many invaluable hints as to the conditions of Aryan family life in one of its earlier stages of development. The Muhammadan system of inheritance is also, as Sir H. Maine has pointed out, of considerable interest to the sociologist, and Mr. Rumsey, who some years since published a "Chart of Family Inheritance" according to Muhammadan law, and who has now produced a much more elaborate work on the same subject,<sup>21</sup> has done good service to

<sup>21</sup> "Moohummudan Law of Inheritance." By A. Rumsey. London: Allen & Co. 1880.

the student by presenting him with a carefully executed digest of a highly complicated system. To the Indian civilian and the English lawyer engaged in Privy Council Appeals, his treatise should also prove highly useful. The *Sirájíyyah*, on which that portion of the work which relates directly to the law of inheritance is chiefly based, and the *Hedaya*, from which Mr. Rumsey derives most of his information on the collateral subjects of testamentary dispositions, and the effects on property of marriage and the law of dower, are both Arabic treatises, compiled by doctors of the Hanifite sect of Sunnis, whose doctrines prevail in India, while those of the three other Sunni sects are recognized among the Muhammadans of Northern Africa; those of the Malikites, we gather, in those curious courts of the Mufti and Kadi, of which the traveller will remember observing the procedure at Algiers. The *Sirájíyyah* and the *Hedaya* were both translated by order of Warren Hastings into Persian, and English versions were afterwards executed by Mr. Hamilton and Sir W. Jones. As Mr. Rumsey suggests, a new English translation from the original Arabic of these and other authoritative treatises on Muhammadan law is much to be desired.

We think that Mr. Oswald Crawford has been well advised in revising and publishing in volume form his notes on Portugal, old and new, which have already appeared in some of the magazines.<sup>22</sup> Portugal is an interesting country, of which, notwithstanding the cordial connection which has always subsisted between it and England, most people know nothing, or next to nothing, more than the bare facts relating to its history and policy as a European State. Yet Camoens, as we have all been recently reminded by the celebration of his tercentenary, is an admirable poet; and Mr. Crawford has shown that the ballads and love-songs of the people—for which, as well as for the serenade and the guitar, he will surprise some readers by claiming an Arabic or Saraccenic origin—are also worthy of study. The viticulture of Portugal is moreover, for obvious reasons, a pursuit on the success of which the felicity of a large though probably a decreasing, section of our own population depends; and since British creditors of the Portuguese Government are very numerous, we naturally desire to be well-informed as to the capacities and resources of the kingdom. On these points much might be learnt from the perusal of a series of very able letters which appeared some months ago in the leading journal, and which we suppose we shall be violating no secret if we attribute to the practised pen of Mr. Gallenga; and those whose interest in such questions has been rather stimulated than satisfied will do well to turn their attention to Mr. Crawford's volume. As he remarks himself, he has given us a sort of *olla podrida*, with light as well as more substantial fare, and containing something for nearly every taste. The description of the rise of the

<sup>22</sup> "Portugal, Old and New." By Oswald Crawford, British Consul at Oporto. London C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1880.

Portuguese kingdom, and of the exploits of Alfonso Henriquez against the Spaniards on the one side and the Saracens on the other, though perhaps condensed within rather too narrow limits, will be found by the historical student a serviceable *résumé* of an unfamiliar period; the lover of poetry will turn with interest to the sketch of the Portuguese Renaissance; and the observer of popular manners and customs will find in other chapters congenial pabulum. By the Renaissance Mr. Crawford means that revolution in taste and foundation of a genuine national literature, in the place of those Provençal and Moorish influences which had previously been prominent, which is to be attributed to Sá de Miranda—who seems, however, to have himself been more successful as a composer in Spanish than in his native tongue—and to his successor, Ferreira, “the Portuguese Horace,” with a style more polished and artificial than Miranda’s. The description of Ferreira’s famous tragedy of “Castro” is one of the best pieces of criticism in Mr. Crawford’s book, though we must join issue, if only in the name of the shade of Thirlwall, with the idea which he seems to entertain of the meaning of the Greek word “irony.” Mr. Crawford devotes an interesting chapter to Portuguese agriculture, a subject on which he speaks with the authority of a practical farmer. Some of the illustrations, especially that of the cloisters of the Belem Convent, a really beautiful little “bit,” make us regret that the author has not devoted more of his space to the architectural history of the Renaissance period. We should like, if space permitted, to accompany him in his excursions to the Arrabida range, the Bay of Setubal, and the ruins of Catania. We can only say that a perusal of his “notes” ought to convince the tourist who may be desirous of getting a little out of the beaten track that there is plenty of amusement and interest to be derived from a holiday in Portugal. He must provide himself, Mr. Crawford says, with a copy of “Murray’s Guide,” a recommendation which is all the more generous as the editor of that indispensable hand-book has, it appears, been rude enough to hint that our author’s acquaintance with the writings of Livy is not as profound as it might be, an impeachment which he candidly admits. We should ourselves recommend the traveller to pack up the present volume as a companion to Murray; he will find in it some useful suggestions as to Portuguese inn accommodation, which is at all events no worse, we gather, than in other parts of the Peninsula, and it will enable him to form an idea beforehand of the exact extent to which, if he wanders from the great cities, he must be prepared to “rough it.”

The Marchioness of Westminster’s description of a tour which, as Lady Belgrave, accompanied by her late husband, she made in 1827, in Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Russia,<sup>23</sup> is interesting both on account of the celebrities of the past with whom she was brought into

<sup>23</sup> “Diary of a Tour in Sweden, Norway, and Russia.” By the Marchioness of Westminster. London: Hurst & Blackett. 1879.



contact, and also through the vivid idea which the reader obtains of the difficulties by which travelling in those countries was attended half a century ago. • In those days the adventurous tourist was obliged to provide himself not only with a carriage—which frequently had to be taken off its wheels, and occasionally parted from its wheels through private reasons of its own—but also with beds and bedding, and, if he were wise, provisions as well. With regard to the latter however just as in England and Germany we can generally rely upon bread and cheese and beer, in Spain on bread and chocolate, and rough but wholesome wine with a well-cooked omelette at the poorest *auberge* in France, so in Norway, then as now, the supply of eggs, cream, and strawberries might be safely reckoned on, while in Russia the samovar did not fail. Travelling was by slow and not always easy stages; thus from St. Petersburg to Berlin is described as “a sweet little journey of eighteen days.” Lord and Lady Belgrave may be considered adventurous explorers, for they penetrated as far as Nijni Novgorod, and must have been among the first English spectators of the now world-famous fair. The writer seems to have taken a very enthusiastic view of Russia, and she certainly saw the country under the most favourable auspices. The streets, houses, and horses of St. Petersburg, and the people in their Oriental costumes, were all equally delightful; the apples were beyond criticism, and the green-gages “divine,” so we trust that Lady Westminster, with regard to this latter edible, was more fortunate than Dr. Johnson. Every now and then however we meet with a touch which reminds us of the Russia of to-day; the passport difficulty, notwithstanding the distinguished rank and introductions of the travellers, was of constant recurrence; and Lord Belgrave once produced a most unpleasant sensation when, dining with Count Nesselrode, by an ingenuous inquiry as to the proceedings at a recent trial of certain “conspirators.” We have a very pleasing description of the *vie intime* of the Russian Imperial family and of Charles XIV. of Sweden, better known as Bernadotte, and his much *dépaysé* consort. The Norwegian nobility are described as extremely hospitable, but certainly “not made for show”; and the advocates of the rights of women would be horrified with Lady Westminster’s account of “the first lady in Norway,” constantly occupied with her *ménage*, and never opening a book. No such thing as a book, indeed, was to be procured in all Stockholm, nor even, what was much more distressing, “a decent evening cap,” nor in fact very much of anything, except deer-skin gloves, the useful being evidently preferred to the ornamental by the good folks of the Swedish capital. The book is composed of Lady Westminster’s diary, together with letters written at the time to friends in England, a plan which unfortunately involves a large amount of nearly *verbatim* repetition, especially as the manuscript does not appear to have been in any way revised, with the exception of the addition of a few almost superfluous explanatory foot-notes. Such sentences as “got up at eight; had very good bread and butter

for breakfast," seem scarcely worth preserving after the lapse of more than fifty years. The fashion, doubtless when the journal was written nearly universal, of interlarding almost every sentence with phrases of occasionally rather dubious French, is to the sounder taste of the present day a little trying. Thus, on page 119, within seven lines we find four French words or phrases of which three were equally expressible and the fourth had already been equally expressed in English; and on the next page the same number occurs within four lines. The authoress has the usual feminine contempt for orthodox notions as to the relation between pronouns and antecedents; and the results of her freedom from such pedantic trammels are sometimes rather singular. Thus, after referring to the Russian Imperial family, she goes on to say, "There are 40,000 men under arms; we shall be presented in due time to them all," which must have been a somewhat fatiguing ordeal. Putting aside these trifling criticisms, the book is decidedly pleasant reading.

We know by experience that whatever Miss Séguin writes is sure to be readable; and while the publication of her book on "The Country of the Passion Play"<sup>24</sup> is highly opportune, it evidently has not been hastily got up for the mere satisfaction of a temporary requirement. The motto on the title-page happily indicates the spirit in which such an exhibition as the *Passionsspiel* should be regarded. It seems probable that owing to the great demand for tickets many visitors to Ober-Ammergau will be detained some days in the neighbourhood before they are able to fulfil the principal object of their expedition, and in that case they can scarcely employ their time better than by taking Miss Séguin as a guide to the numerous points of interest which the Bavarian Highlands present both to the lover of the picturesque and the student of the manners and customs of primitive people. The hint to choose as head-quarters Pastenkirchen, a pretty place with good accommodation and within two hours' drive of Ober-Ammergau, may also prove serviceable to many travellers. In our wanderings among the orange groves of Blidah and the valleys of the Schwarzwald, we have before now learnt to value the companionship of Miss Séguin; and if her descriptions sometimes strike us as a little too enthusiastic, and her word-paintings as somewhat highly coloured, perhaps the explanation is simply that her imagination is more vivid and her sympathies more catholic than those of the dull people whose business it is to review books instead of writing them.

Though Mr. Anthony Trollope, the late Charles Kingsley, and other writers have already provided us with lively and picturesque sketches of the Antilles, among other tropical countries of the Western hemisphere, there was still ample room for the description by a practised

---

<sup>24</sup> "The Country of the Passion-Play." By L. G. Séguin. London: Strahan & Co. 1880.

naturalist and energetic explorer of those more recondite characteristics which the passing traveller can scarcely note. We accordingly extend a cordial welcome to Mr. Ober's well-written and well-illustrated narrative of his camping out among the Caribees.<sup>25</sup> He is evidently a close and indefatigable observer, and his volume contains much which should prove of value to the botanist, and more particularly to the ornithologist; we find in an appendix a catalogue of the birds of the Lesser Antilles, together with a detailed description of several species first discovered by Mr. Ober, and sent by him to the National Museum at Washington. For the benefit of the general reader the book contains an abundant store of varied information; whether the writer is exploring the boiling sulphur-lake of Dominica, or studying in their native haunts the social life, language, and manners and customs of the curious Carib race of Dominica and St. Vincent—a type somewhat resembling the Mongolian, which appears likely shortly to disappear through changes produced by intermarriage with other tribes—or hunting monkeys on the mountains, or camping on the brink of a crater, he is always readable and frequently instructive. In addition to his other qualifications, he is clearly a skilled photographer, and the value of the book is much enhanced by the use he has made of his camera. We may mention that Mr. Ober identifies the scene of the adventures of Robinson Crusoe with the island of Tobago, and considers that Defoe's Man Friday, like Shakspeare's Caliban, was undoubtedly a Carib. The hero of Locksley Hall would have found in the writer's Marie a dusky companion eminently calculated to meet his views. Where so much is excellent, it would be ungracious to criticize a few scattered peculiarities of idiom and orthography, which in no way interfere with the fresh and agreeable style of the narrative as a whole.

“Mr. Maurice Farrar, M.A. Oxon., late J.P., Minnesota,” who has published a book about farming in that State,<sup>26</sup> furnishes a striking instance of the obscurity which in England notoriously attends the most successful literary career. He speaks of himself as “an old paper-stainer,” and as “on his way back to take his old place in the ranks of literature in the busy world of London life;” and he also tells us, in a menacing sort of way, that on his return from the inspiring influences of the social atmosphere of the West “the pen of the journalist will run with a freer play.” Whether Mr. Farrar has resumed his old place and his old habit of paper-staining, and whether his pen runs more freely than ever, we are really unable to say, never in point of fact before we came across this volume having been aware of Mr. Farrar's pen, or his place, or indeed of Mr. Farrar (M.A. Oxon., and late J.P.,

<sup>25</sup> “Camps in the Caribees.” By F. A. Ober. Edinburgh: Douglas. 1880.

<sup>26</sup> “Five Years in Minnesota.” By Maurice Farrar. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1880.

Minnesota) himself. In his present work he supplies, especially in the appendix, some practical hints for intending emigrants; but the bulk of the book consists of padding of the most patent kind, and such information as it contains might well have been compressed within the limits of an average magazine article. But the truth is there is a very distinct smack of the penny-a-liner about Mr. Farrar's journalistic pen. The following, for instance, is rather a "tall" specimen:—"Can it be," he asks, "that the great Minister who gave 'peace with honour' to his country, and raised himself to the ermined purple of a peer, has anticipated the dissolution of Parliament, with the accession of the People's William, and, disappearing from the gilded chamber he adorned so much, has joined, in the remote wilds of the Far West, the Semitic race from which he sprang?" The "ermined purple of a peer" is distinctly a happy stroke on the part of the veteran paper-stainer, and the identification of the Chippewa Indians with the Semitic race an almost unrivalled effort of the journalistic imagination. Probably this kind of stuff, like the *unus liber* of one of George Elliot's characters, would be "much tasted in a Cherokee translation, where the jokes are rendered with all the serious eloquence characteristic of the Red races." In another passage Mr. Farrar says:—"I saw a look of incredulity in his face when I told him that among that game-law beridden people (the English) a Government tax of three guineas a year is levied for the privilege of carrying a gun at all." The incredulity was creditable to the good sense of his companion, but the attempt to perpetrate so daring a hoax was perhaps scarcely worthy of the practised journalist. Having been appointed agent for the promotion of immigration by the State Board of Minnesota, Mr. Farrar's views of the conditions and prospects of agriculture in that country are perhaps naturally *un peu trop couleur de rose*, but we have no reason to doubt that they are substantially correct. It seems that the writer's time and energies are not at present entirely absorbed by the staining of paper and the endeavour to satisfy the demands for "copy" of the London press, since he states that he is prepared to make "engagements for lectures in country districts on the subject of emigration to Minnesota."

We have conscientiously perused, from the first page to the last, Mr. Browning's narrative of his experiences in South Africa,<sup>27</sup> beginning with his failure to make a fortune out of that peculiarly disagreeable bird the ostrich—whose habits and idiosyncrasies are fully described for the benefit of those who, undeterred by the writer's misfortunes, may have a fancy for putting their money into ostrich-farming—and ending with his failure, as a member of the Cape Mounted Yeomanry, to capture the almost impregnable stronghold known as Moirosi's Mountain. In the interval Mr. Browning had employed himself in cultivating mealies and 'melons, trapping civet-

---

<sup>27</sup> "Fighting and Farming in South Africa." By F. C. Browning. London: Remington. 1880.

cats, catching remarkable two-legged serpents, and scouring the country with Carington's Frontier Horse. We cannot say that we have been repaid for our trouble; but as the volume contains neither table of contents nor index we doggedly read on with a stupid Micawberian idea that sooner or later something of interest must certainly turn up. Mr. Browning disarms criticism by candidly admitting that his production has no pretension to "literary skill," a fact which the reader, whose hypothetical existence the author with creditable modesty somewhat doubtfully assumes, might almost have been left to ascertain for himself; and we can only add that there is nothing whatever in the matter of the narrative to compensate for its defects of style and arrangement. It is to be hoped that if we are to be flooded with any more accounts of South African travel, they may at least contain something more valuable than the bald and disjointed diary of the commonplace adventures of a not overwise young man in search of something to do. To his immediate circle of aunts and cousins such matter may no doubt have a personal interest; but there is really no pretext for every brainless boy who has been shipped out to the Cape to inflict his experiences on a book-ridden public.

Accompanied by an adventurous French naturalist, a couple of natives recruited by chance, and an intelligent cur, found wandering in the streets of Calcutta, Mr. Lawson informs us that some twelve years ago he found his way across the Himalayas, wandered about in Thibet, and returned over the same range into Nepal.<sup>28</sup> Of adventure he certainly enjoyed his share; attacked by divers bears and more tigers than we can count, bitten by venomous snakes, treacherously assailed by robber inn-keepers, tumbling into inaccessible pits, stumbling along the brink of unfathomable precipices, losing his way in the trackless forest, in peril of hunger oft, and almost incessantly athirst, he was, indeed, fortunate in having survived to tell the tale of what must, according to his own showing, have been the most foolhardy expedition ever undertaken by mortal man. Though the writer has apparently followed the Horatian rule, and enjoyed for at least nine years the opportunity of revising his manuscript, we fancy that he must rather have employed his time in cultivating his imagination than in improving his style. What does he mean, for instance, by an "imposable" mountain? "We were now," he says, "in full view of Mount Everest, the highest mountain in the world; but I was not so much struck with its appearance as I had anticipated, perhaps because my imagination had led me to picture to my mind an *imposable* mountain. However, its great magnitude, height and grandeur were certainly *imposing*, not to mention the novelty of viewing a mountain which, after giving *due prominence* to Arthur's Seat, Edinburgh, is the most remarkable in the world." We have endeavoured by the use of italics to give "due prominence" to some of the peculiarities of this highly peculiar para-

---

<sup>28</sup> "The Wandering Naturalists." By J. A. Lawson. London: Remington & Co. 1880.

graph. As we can scarcely doubt that Mr. Lawson's "imagination has led him to picture to his mind," and that of his readers, a considerable number of impossible things, we must suppose that "imposable" is a mere misprint for "impossible," but the whole sentence is a little mixed. What has Arthur's Seat, Edinburgh, to do with the highest mountain in the world? What is Hecuba to him, or he to Hecuba? And how could the traveller in the Himalayas "give due prominence" to that picturesque elevation? However, a climb up the side of Mount Everest seems to have had a remarkable effect on what the writer would probably be pleased to call his mind; for he made the ascent, with strange to say only very partial success—most of his "imposable" feats succeeded perfectly—"holding the doctrines of an Atheist; but came down from that mountain a firm believer in a Supreme Being." At what precise point this remarkable change in his opinions took place he does not specify; but as he ingenuously adds that at the time he was "a very young man, not gifted with much wisdom," it would probably be rash to infer that a similar pilgrimage would produce a similar result in the case of sceptics endowed with a more robust intelligence. Mr. Lawson's remarkable experiences might have been less difficult to follow if he had headed his chapters, and if his topographical descriptions were a little more precise. He says that his companion was a M. Paulet, "who had been deputed by a French scientific society to collect specimens and study animated nature amongst the Himalaya mountains." As he missed a fine opportunity of killing off M. Paulet by the aid of an unscientific tiger, we should very much like to be informed where that gentleman's report to his scientific society is to be found and how far it corroborates Mr. Lawson's astounding tales. If Baron Munchausen were still alive he would have to look to his laurels.

We continue to receive pamphlets containing more or less valuable suggestions for the reform of the land laws, elicited partly no doubt by the publication of the Reports of Mr. Osborne Morgan's Committee on Land Title and Transfer, and partly by the conviction that the question is one which the new Government is certain at no distant date to make a vigorous attempt to put on a satisfactory footing. Lord Selborne has indeed already given an intimation of such intention in the House of Lords. A good deal that has recently been written may be dismissed as electioneering literature which has probably served its purpose, and which, at all events, is the production of persons too scantily acquainted with the very complicated subject of which they treat for their lucubrations to be of material use to the reformer. Mr. Hopkinson, of Manchester, sends us some observations which, at all events, possess the double merit of brevity and clearness.<sup>29</sup> He thinks that if entails were abolished, the power of settlement further restricted, real property on the owner's decease vested in his personal represen-

<sup>29</sup> "Definite Reform in English Land Law." By A. Hopkinson. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co. 1880.

tative, and the form of mortgage deeds conformed to their real object, it might be possible to introduce a general system of registration of titles in local registries. The proposal that on the death of any registered owner his land should vest in the registrar, whose title, in the event of no representative of the deceased claiming to be admitted within three years, should become indefeasible, is certainly somewhat startling, by whatever safeguards against injustice it might be accompanied. The author of "Half-an-Hour with the English Land Laws"<sup>30</sup> possesses about that modicum of acquaintance with the subject which we should expect a layman of ordinary intelligence to acquire in the time he specifies. He makes up however for ignorance of facts by a corresponding recklessness of assertion. We commend, for instance, to any moderately well-informed historical student his dramatic version of the object and effect of Statute 12 Car. II., c. 24. The theory that the produce of agricultural land per acre in France exceeds that in England has been repeatedly disproved; more than thirty years ago Mr. McCulloch showed that the reverse was the case; but some people are too busy scribbling pamphlets to have leisure for reading books. If Mr. Marshall continues his researches at the same rapid rate, or his example is extensively imitated, we shall expect next quarter to be inundated by "Ten Minutes with a Contingent Remainder, with a momentary glance at Attendant Terms," "The Law of General Average, to be mastered on the top of an omnibus between the Bank and Chancery Lane," and other light and easy expositions of legal topics dismissed with the expedition with which Sir Geo. Jessel disposes of applications on motion-day at the Rolls. Instead however of indulging in any more of these intellectual gymnastics, Mr. Marshall might perhaps more profitably employ his leisure moments in perusing a pamphlet entitled "Parnellism Unveiled,"<sup>31</sup> which we have received from Dublin, and which will show him the revolutionary excesses to which some of the theories broached in his half-hour interview would logically lead. The connection between the present "land and labour" agitation in Ireland and the prospects of American Fenianism seems to be clearly proved by Mr. Bagenal, and we cannot but join him in regretting the wide dissemination among the peasantry of inflammable literature like the *Irish World*, an American print compared with which the most violent of the Nationalist organs of Dublin may be pronounced a temperate, highly constitutional and sweetly reasonable journal. We wish, however, that Mr. Bagenal had been able to suggest some legitimate remedy for the causes of distress which he admits to prevail in Connaught, and which we fear can scarcely be regarded as of a merely temporary character.

Mr. Paul has probably done well to publish the lecture on the future of Epping Forest<sup>32</sup> which he delivered last winter before the

<sup>30</sup> "Half-an-Hour with the English Land Laws." By J. J. Marshall. London: E. W. Allen.

<sup>31</sup> "Parnellism Unveiled." By P. H. Bagenal. Dublin: Hodges & Co., 1880.

<sup>32</sup> "The Future of Epping Forest." By W. Paul. Published by Paul & Son, Waltham Cross.

Society of Arts; the subject is one which can only gain by thoughtful discussion, and on which it is desirable to ascertain as far as possible the feeling of the public. We agree with the writer's protest against any attempt to turn the forest into an *arboretum* or a landscape garden, and we do not even feel quite sure that "we want the experience and skill of the landscape gardener to clear away the superabundant rubbish," or that we entertain any implicit confidence in the "capacity of extension and development which his practised eye and mind may discern." Neither do we agree with Mr. Paul's opinion that exotic trees and shrubs might be planted with advantage; but we heartily concur in his judicial summing-up in favour of letting the playful squirrel alone.

We have to acknowledge a series of letters by "Empiricus,"<sup>33</sup> addressed to Mr. Bright and other politicians, advocating, apparently from a Canadian standpoint, a sort of Zollverein of the British Empire, as a stepping-stone to universal free-trade. From Canada we have received another pamphlet, by General Hewson, on the Pacific Railway scheme;<sup>34</sup> from the autobiographical details contained in the preface we gather that the General is a civil engineer, but being of too independent a turn of mind to accept Government employment, he would find his time lying too heavily on his hands if he did not amuse himself now and again by throwing off a few observations on the railway system of the Dominion. The last pamphlet on our table is the Thirty-First Annual Report of the Trustees of the valuable Astor Library at New York.<sup>35</sup> The report contains some interesting features. We are surprised to find that among the "general readers" one of the most popular studies is heraldry and genealogy; whereas the "alcove readers," who are all supposed to be genuine students having some special aim, seem to devote their attention almost exclusively to the study of patents. Perhaps these somewhat recondite branches of literature have been made specialities in the formation of the library. We observe that the Superintendent, in the course of a rather epigrammatic report, severely censures the "idle habit of intemperate and promiscuous reading." We hope that he would at least allow extenuating circumstances in the case of the unfortunate reviewer.

## SCIENCE.

**I**N 1876, Professor Haughton delivered a course of Lectures on Physical Geography, which is now published.<sup>1</sup> In the Preface he regards them as a series of sketches of some important features of Physi-

<sup>33</sup> "The Empiricus Letters." 67, Queen Victoria Street.

<sup>34</sup> "The Canadian Pacific Railway." By General Hewson. Toronto: Boyle, 1880.

<sup>35</sup> "Annual Report for 1879 of the Trustees of the Astor Library." Albany: Weed & Co. 1880.

<sup>1</sup> Dublin University Press Series. "Six Lectures on Physical Geography." By the Rev. Samuel Haughton, F.R.S., M.D., D.C.L. Dublin: Hodges, Foster, & Figgis. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1880.



cal Geography, rather than a formal exposition of this complex branch of knowledge. Perhaps no one living possesses better claims than Professor Haughton to teach physical geography, and in preparing these lectures for the press, he has been able to consult the distinguished natural science professors who are his colleagues in Dublin. The book is a very learned one, marked by considerable originality of treatment, and if not always dealing with the most striking aspects of the questions discussed, yet makes available to the general reader for the first time a vast amount of interesting knowledge. The first lecture is entitled "The Past History and Future Prospects of the Globe on which we Live." In this lecture there is an excellent summary of the arguments advanced by La Place in support of the nebular hypothesis, and to these Professor Haughton adds a number of arguments which result from researches made in more recent years. The second lecture is entitled "Continents and Oceans, Volcanoes and Mountains." Here the reader begins to come in contact with views which are more or less novel. Thus it is suggested that the atmosphere and ocean of the moon have disappeared, by combining with the metallic and earthy bases of the substances which form it. In the same way it is urged that a considerable part of the water of the earth has already become permanently locked up in a solid form by entering into the composition of hydrated minerals. But unfortunately the author throws out many speculations which are not sufficiently amplified to be altogether intelligible. Alluding to the interior heat of the earth, and pointing out its increment at moderate depths, Professor Haughton is "inclined to think that there are hotter and colder layers as we proceed into the interior of the globe, and that there may even be layers intensely cold, corresponding with the intense cold of interplanetary space, which has been proved to be 250° F. below the freezing point of water." Following in the views of Mr. Mallet, all the corrugations visible on the surface of the earth and the phenomena of volcanoes, are explained as the results of contraction consequent upon the radiation of heat from the earth. The method of demonstrating the depth of oceans by the time taken for earthquake waves to cross them, will be new to some readers, but the results are found to be in remarkable accord with those obtained by deep-sea soundings. Various characteristics of the chief axes of elevation and depression are pointed out. The two most striking characteristics of the sea-bed are stated to be its flatness as compared with the land surface, and the abrupt precipitous line by which it is separated from the land; but it may be doubted whether the ancient plains, high and low, are not almost as level as those beneath the sea, and certainly the ascent on to table lands must in most cases be as precipitous as descent of the coast from the shore to the sea. And since these elevated plains have not resulted from fracturing of the earth's crust, which has upheaved portions of land high above the general level, there may be many thinkers unable to agree with the author when he attributes the direction of coast lines to dislocations

or faults of the rocks occurring when the land was upheaved. This caution seems the more necessary from us because, although Professor Haughton appeals to the existence of faults known to geologists, which are as great in amount as any rapid descent of the sea bed, he altogether omits to state that these faults do not now mark great differences in level of the masses of land which they traverse. It is considered that the displacement of the earth's axis resulting from the upheaval of continents, has never exceeded one hundred miles. With regard to volcanoes and volcanic mountains, the author is content chiefly to develop by many examples from volcanic chains, the two doctrines that they are generally arranged in lines and frequently near to the sea coast, but no attempt is made to deal with the causes of volcanic activity or the necessary relation of volcanic phenomena to each other. The third lecture is upon "The Laws of Climate." The first half of this lecture is concerned with speculations about the earth's climate in past time; while the latter part of it treats of the safer ground of existing climatic phenomena. The lecture begins by contesting the views of the Huttonian or Uniformitarian school of geologists, especially in the matter of climate, but many of the doctrines put forward by the author savour of a boldness in speculation, which to our mind is unscientific. In the older geological periods, the earth's climate is supposed to have depended chiefly upon its internal heat, but at the present day the climate is determined by the heat of the sun, and speculating on the basis that the rocks known give the entire record of the earth's history from the earliest time when water condensed upon its surface, it is gravely stated that during the Triassic and Liassic periods the Arctic Regions had a climate of 68° F.; while in the Miocene tertiary time, the mean temperature of the Arctic Regions is set down at 48° F. Professor Haughton apparently finds no difficulty in getting a group of secondary fossils to testify in favour of a tropical climate, but as an instance of the groundless condition of these conclusions, the case of the *Teleosaurus* may be quoted. This fossil reptile, which probably belongs to an order having no living representative, is said closely to resemble the Gavial of India, and because the gavial lives in the tropics, the conditions under which the *Teleosaurus* lived are assumed to have been tropical. It might have been supposed that the slightest acquaintance with the facts of the geographical distribution of life would have shown that many existing families and orders are world-wide in their distribution, and occur indifferently in warm and cold seas, without compelling the student to believe that the temperature of the locality from which a new genus has been brought, can in any way be inferred from his knowledge of either the arctic or tropical representatives of the group. In anxiety to show that the earth's axis could not have been displaced sufficiently to account for assumed conditions of warmer climate in the Arctic Regions, the author is ready to make concessions in favour of another agent, the efficacy of which could be only established with greater difficulty. The fourth lecture

is upon "The Rivers and Lakes of Europe and Asia," and the fifth lecture on "The Rivers and Lakes of Africa and South America." Here there is comparatively little to arrest attention. An interesting map is given on page 174, showing the area occupied by the basin of the streams which feed the lakes which have no outlet in the interior of the continent, which area is said to be two-thirds the size of the rain basins of the Amazons. Lake Baikal is quoted as a singular example of the depth to which lake beds sometimes reach. The lake is in parts 12,356 feet deep, and its surface is 1,536 above the sea, so that the bottom is nearly 11,000 feet below the surface of the sea, but for problems of this kind the author has no explanation to offer. The sixth lecture treats of "The Geographical Distribution of Animals and Plants." In some respects it is likely to be the most disappointing lecture. For commencing with questions as to why coffee should grow in the old world and cinchona in the new, and why the old world lions, tigers, and leopards should be replaced in the new world by pumas and jaguars, no attempt is made to answer these questions in a way that would be intelligible to ordinary readers. The evolutionary teaching is so far adopted as to account for the preservation of life on the earth; but it does not appear with Professor Haughton to have followed as a necessary consequence that the past changes in the outlines of land and water, inevitably forced upon animals and plants conditions of existence sufficiently distinct to have resulted in a changing succession of life through all past time, as well as its preservation under different generic forms in parts of the earth widely distant from each other. Towards the end of the lecture, the author recurs once more to a comparison of the present and miocene climates of Grinnell Land, visited by the Arctic expedition of 1875-76, to repeat under a cloud of figures the same fallacies to which we have already drawn attention, and the result deduced is a climate for Grinnell Land fossils similar to that of Riga Bay in Europe, or Cape Breton Island in America. There are elaborate notes at the end of each lecture—much information on various subjects thrown into tabular form—and ample illustrations of physical phenomena described; and if the volume does not sufficiently adhere to the style of teaching which might be thought best adapted to the wants of the Governess Institution, for which the lectures were delivered, they at least fulfil the professorial function of arousing a desire for further knowledge, and a disposition to question the basis upon which conclusions enunciated are supposed to rest. In this highest function of a teacher, Professor Haughton has been eminently successful, and his book will be welcomed by all geographers as an important contribution to their science.

A little work dedicated to the Great Architect of the Universe,<sup>2</sup> undertakes, with the aid of maps and diagrams, to expound a number

---

<sup>2</sup> "The Scientific Structure of the Universe," with Maps of the Great Globe of Heaven, with its four Star Temples. Also Maps showing the Revolutions of all Stellar Systems in Space round their Centre the Throne of God." By James A. Moncrieff, C.E. Printed for the author. London: Marcus Ward & Co. 1880.

of matters which we fear our readers may have some difficulty in believing, even if they are found intelligible. There is a preface explaining the plan of the work, which appears to be an elaboration of some astronomical charts appended by the author to an epic poem entitled "*Wisdom versus Satan on the Stage of Time.*" Unfortunately the epic poem has not come under the present writer's notice. To the preface succeeds an introduction upon practical astronomy, which reaches to something less than two pages. Then begins the first part of the work, which is entitled—From the first to the sixth degree of initiation into the mysteries of the structure of the universe. In illustration of this profound subject we have a plate, giving under the title of the *Known in Astronomy*, Herschel's view of the form of the universe; under the title of the *Unknown in Astronomy*, the number 666. Between these is a map of the river separating the known from the unknown. This river is represented as having parallel banks, which are perfectly straight; it has no tributaries, neither watershed nor delta, but is blocked at both ends by the number 1881. There are various other maps and diagrams equally singular, but not nearly so remarkable as the astounding text. The distances with which the author is familiar in this part of the work require twenty-four figures in succession for their expression. In fact, so vast are the distances of the heavenly bodies represented in the author's plates, that he appropriately observes in a note, that "all telescopic astronomy is embraced in the small black dot in the centre of Plate VII." In the second and third parts, the reader proceeds with his initiation till he at last reaches the 666 degree. He learns in the second part the mathematical construction of one Chariot of God; and further on, diagrams are given which are termed the *Divine Race Course*. At the conclusion of each part there is an elaborate prayer; and the book concludes with an Appendix by *Elijah the Prophet*, from which it appears that the Millenium will commence in the year 1992. Any comment upon such a production would be superfluous; but even as a barrister sometimes throws up a case when his reputation would suffer by conducting it, so it seems to us that this is a book against which the public might have been protected by the vigilance of respectable publishers.

A valuable Report, by E. A. Ormerod, upon *Injurious Insects*, during the last year, deserves careful attention.<sup>3</sup> In 1878, there was a mild, moist winter. The luxuriant vegetation which succeeded, escaped the ravages of insects in a remarkable degree. In 1879, the unusual cold and frost do not appear to have been unfavourable to insects, for their attacks were fully equal to the average and in some cases exceeded it. The frost in Scotland penetrated the ground from one to two feet, and the temperature at Dumfries, for instance, was nine degrees below the average of the last 115 years during the winter

---

<sup>3</sup> "Notes of Observations on Injurious Insects—Report 1879." London: W. Swan Sonnenschein & Allen. 1880.

months. The only insect that was in any way less prevalent, appears to have been the turnip-fly, but this resulted rather from failure of the turnip crops owing to the weather, than to any other cause. Each species reported upon is represented by figures which usually include the eggs, caterpillar, pupa, and perfect insect. Many of these Reports are of the greatest interest, and result from the observations of numerous observers in different parts of the country. Thus the *Plusia gamma*, silver Y moth, which was unusually prevalent, appears to have left the north-east of Africa about the 26th of April, it reached the eastern Pyrenees by May 26th, and spread over the south-east of France, Switzerland, and Northern Italy. Thousands of specimens were found on the snow at the Hospice of S. Gothard, June the 5th, and the species appeared in Austria and Germany in the second week in June. Paris was reached on the 15th of June, and our own south shores on the 10th. It so far affected the sugar-beet crop of Saxony, that where the yield would have been nine or ten tons to the acre, it became reduced to three tons. The Notes relate to between thirty and forty species, and deserve the attention of all who are interested in the subject.

In the Library of Christ's Hospital, among other early astronomical works, the head mathematical master found copies of Galileo's "Siderius Nuncius" and Kepler's "Dioptrics."<sup>4</sup> A short introduction to his translation of Galileo's book explains the circumstances of its publication and Kepler's interest in the matter. It may be interesting to quote the translation of the original title-page. "The "Sidereal Messenger unfolding great and marvellous sights and proposing them to the attention of every one, but especially philosophers and astronomers, being such as have been observed by Galileo Galilei, a gentleman of Florence, professor of mathematics in the University of Padua, with the aid of a telescope lately invented by him. Respecting the moon's surface, an innumerable number of fixed stars, the milky way, and nebulous stars, but especially respecting four planets which revolve round the planet Jupiter at different distances and in different periodic times, with amazing velocity, and which, after remaining unknown to every one up to this day, the author recently discovered and determined to name the Medician Stars. Venice, 1610." Galileo's figures are reproduced, and the little volume, which appears to be excellently translated, will hardly fail to receive the gracious welcome which the subject and author alike claim for it.

We have received the Report of the Indian Meteorological Department for the past year;<sup>5</sup> it gives a full history of the various steps which have been taken to improve meteorological records during the past year. A first and successful attempt has been made by Mr. Eliot

<sup>4</sup> "The Sidereal Messenger of Galileo Galilei, and part of the Preface to Kepler's Dioptrics, containing the original Account of Galileo's Astronomical Discoveries. A Translation with Introduction and Notes." By Edward Stafford Carlos, M. A. London, Oxford, and Cambridge: Rivingtons. 1880.

<sup>5</sup> "Report on the Administration of the Meteorological Department of the Government of India in 1878-79."

to predict the character of the monsoon rains. The interest of the Report is necessarily local.

The last part of the "Indian Meteorological Memoirs," contains a valuable paper by Mr. S. A. Hill on variations of rainfall in Northern India.<sup>6</sup> This investigation appears to have arisen from the interest drawn to the question of the relation of rainfall to sun-spots. It appears that in the summer rainfall, extending over a period of eleven years, the second, fourth, and eighth, were years of maximum rainfall, while the third, seventh, and ninth, were periods of minimum rainfall. The author arrives at the conclusion that the maximum is reached in the fourth year of the cycle, which extends over eleven years. The winter rainfall is similarly discussed, the driest years appear to be the first and eleventh, the wettest the seventh year. The drought of 1825 occurred midway between the maximum and minimum, and there was a general failure of the succeeding winter rains. That of 1833 coincided with the sun-spot minimum, and the following winter rains at Calcutta were rather below the average. The great famines of 1837-38 and of 1860-61, both occurred at times of maximum sun-spots. There was a partial failure of the summer rains, and an almost complete absence of winter rains. Mr. Blandford contributes a discussion of observations made by Dr. Scully in Western Thibet. The observations are those usually made, and relate to places of very different elevation. It appears that the Indus and Karakash valley systems, and the great table-land between them, have a drier climate than either Kashmir or Yarkand, from which they are separated by the Ladak range, and the Kuen range. The climate of Kashmir is more humid than that of Yarkand.

Mr. Heath's new book "Sylvan Spring" is divided into six parts. The first-named "Sylvan Rambles" extends over a hundred and fifty pages, and is sufficiently explained by its title. The remaining five parts are named from the first five months in the year. The volume gives illustrations in colours of some of the more characteristic plants, and a large number of woodcuts of flowers of the several months. At intervals, landscapes and birds vary the illustrations. The text is written in that clear and attractive style so well known to Mr. Heath's readers, and which has done so much to make his work valued by lovers of Nature. The present volume does not yield in interest to its predecessors, though it covers a field that has been more frequently occupied.

Mr. Lomas tells us in the Preface to his "Alkali Trade,"<sup>8</sup> that he has

<sup>6</sup> "Indian Meteorological Memoirs." Vol. I, Part III. VII., Variation of Rainfall in Northern India. VIII., Meteorological and Hypsometrical Observations in Western Thibet. Under the direction of Henry F. Blandford. Calcutta: Office of the Superintendent of Government Printing. 1879.

<sup>7</sup> "Sylvan Spring." By Francis George Heath, with 12 coloured plates. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, & Rivington. 1880.

<sup>8</sup> "A Manual of the Alkali Trade, including the Manufacture of Sulphuric Acid, Sulphate of Soda, and Bleaching Powder." With 232 illustrations and working drawings. By John Lomas. London: Crosby Lockwood & Co. 1880

endeavoured to produce a complete handbook for manufacturers, their foremen, and managers. The work is founded upon the writer's experience as an alkali manufacturer during fifteen years. The volume is luxuriously printed and elaborately illustrated with excellent figures. The book is divided into sixteen chapters, to which are added several appendices, and an index. The titles of the chapters give a fair idea of the subjects treated of. They include the site and general arrangement of works, full discussion of the manufacture of sulphuric acid, recovery of nitrogen compounds, the salt-cake process, legislation upon noxious vapours, the Jones and Hargrave's processes, the balling process, the refining of alkali, the various soda manufactures, the making of bleaching powder, and utilization of tank waste. It will thus be seen that the volume is entirely technical, but it appears to be excellently planned, well written, thoroughly practical, and will be valued by the trade to which it appeals.

Mr. Urquart's "Electric Light" is a clear and practical little book,<sup>9</sup> which gives a short description of each of the several pieces of apparatus with which the electric light may be produced. The volume is well illustrated with clear woodcuts.

Dr. Prantl's Botany,<sup>10</sup> like most modern works, gives a good deal of attention to anatomy and physiology. It is a small work of 300 pages. The first hundred describe the morphology and anatomy of the cells and tissues. The physiology of plants includes the chemical processes which go on in them; the circulation of water and gases in them; growth, irritability, conditions of existence, and reproduction and alternation of generations. The remaining two hundred pages are devoted to the classification of plants. The work is excellently illustrated and clearly arranged. It has been well translated, and is likely to be useful to a large class of students who require a clear, brief, and thoroughly scientific introduction to botany.

Dr. Bastian's book on "The Brain as an Organ of Mind"<sup>11</sup> is a digest of our knowledge of the nervous system and its functions in man and animals, which brings together a large amount of interesting information, and occupies a position in literature which has hitherto been vacant. It is a volume of the International Scientific Series, extending to more than seven hundred pages, which gives evidence of a large amount of research, is divided into thirty chapters, and is well suited for general reading. To the scientific reader it offers but little that is new; but as popularizing the best available knowledge, old and

<sup>9</sup> "Electric Light; its Production and Use, embodying Plain Directions for the Working of Galvanic Batteries, Electric Laups, and Dynamo-Electric Machines." By J. W. Urquart, C.E. Edited by F. C. Webb, M.I.C.E. London: Crosby Lockwood & Co. 1880.

<sup>10</sup> "An Elementary Text-Book of Botany," translated from the German of Dr. K. Prantl, Professor of Botany in the Royal Academy of Forestry, Aschfenburg, Bavaria. The translation revised by S. H. Vines, M.A., D.Sc., F.L.S. With 275 woodcuts. London: W. Swan Sonnenschein & Allen.

<sup>11</sup> "The Brain as an Organ of Mind." By H. Charlton Bastian, M.A., M.D., F.R.S., with 184 illustrations. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1880.

new, it is likely to have a more important influence than a more original work would have, not but that the mode of treatment gives it a claim to originality. The first chapter—the uses and origin of the nervous system has the more interesting matter drawn from the observations of Mr. Romanes on the Medusæ. Then follow accounts of nerve fibres, cells, and ganglia. The next chapter similarly gives a popular account of the nature and uses of the sense organs, and then succeed several chapters describing and figuring the nervous systems of invertebrate animals. In the same way the brains of fishes, amphibia, reptiles and birds, are treated of; and then the tenth chapter is an exposition of the scope of the mind, followed by a discussion of reflex action and unconscious cognition, sensation, ideation, and perception. Consciousness in the lower animals, and instinct, next claim attention; and then the structures and functions of the brain in mammals and man are explained at great length, but with great clearness. It is a work that reflects the best knowledge of the time, on a subject of great interest, by one admirably qualified to treat the subject in all of its many aspects.

If there is one branch of preventive medicine of more interest to the general public than others, it is surely that which relates to the preservation of sight. It has been estimated that there are over 52,000 blind people in the United Kingdom, and the census of France for 1876 showed that there were then actually 31,631 individuals deprived of vision in that country. Of this number, 5,978, or nearly a sixth, set down as blind from birth, have in reality been so afflicted only from infancy, and there is every reason to believe that the vast majority of these cases, “probably at least 99 out of every 100, would bring with them into the world eyes as good and useful as those of their neighbours.” A large percentage, too, of those who become blind through accident or disease would not lose their sight if they were treated with promptitude and efficiency. It is therefore “most likely true that many more suffer in this way from their own ignorance and carelessness, than in consequence of congenital defect, or incurable disease. Mr. Brudenell Carter’s treatise on this subject”<sup>13</sup> is a book which deserves an extensive circulation. It is extremely rare to meet with a popular medical work which so thoroughly fulfils the promise of its title. The first eight chapters deal with the optical abnormalities of the eye, and their remedy by different kinds of lenses. Although the subject in itself is somewhat dry, Mr. Carter manages to make his information so intelligible and interesting that we do not think the reader will care to skip a single page. The question of colour vision, which acquires so much importance in connection with railway and marine signalling, is dealt with at some length, and Professor Holm-

---

<sup>13</sup>“*Eyesight: Good and Bad. A Treatise on the Exercise and Preservation of Vision.*” By Robert Brudenell Carter, F.R.C.S., London: McMillan & Co. 1880.



gren's Berlin wool method of testing the retinal sensibility is recommended in preference to any other. The chapter on the care of the eyes in infancy and childhood may be studied with profit by those who have the care of children. It will be seen that in many instances backwardness in learning is due to the "artificial production of stupidity," as the author terms it, and that it often has its cause in unrecognized defective vision. For artificial illumination, Mr. Carter advises the use of a colza-oil lamp, with a Silber burner; but as a powerful light is accompanied by a proportional development of heat, those who do much close work should interpose a flat cell filled with a saturated solution of alum between the flame and the eyes. The practice of reading in bed is very properly condemned, and it is suggested that those who suffer from sleeplessness should adopt writing in the dark with Dr. Thursfield's apparatus as a substitute. Another contrivance for saving vision is the "Type Writer," which "is an inexpressible relief either for weary hands or for weary eyes," and which is most strongly recommended to all who write for considerable periods of time, and more especially to those who are short sighted. A chapter containing practical hints on the choice and care of spectacles fitly terminates this most useful volume.

Of late years the thermometric examination of the human body has acquired much importance. The clinical thermometer has become as indispensable to the physician as the stethoscope, and the delicate instruments now procurable not only furnish the practitioner with an accurate means of estimating the intensity of fever, but may also enable him to confirm a diagnosis which would otherwise remain doubtful. The earlier stages of pulmonary phthisis, for instance, are accompanied by an increase of heat in the diseased lung, and this is manifested by a great elevation of temperature at the surface, which is easily appreciable when sought after. In obscure cases of stomach disorder superficial thermometry is also a valuable method of examination, and often affords a solution when it is a question between functional and organic disease. If contradictory results have been obtained by different observers, they are commonly due to the imperfection of most of the instruments in general use. The ordinary clinical thermometer is far too primitive in its construction for surface work, and, on the other hand, the thermo-piles, used by Dr. Lombard<sup>13</sup> are only suitable for the study of the correlation of psychical and physical motion. For the estimation of the surface heat-equivalent of disease nothing can replace the insulated helicoid thermometer designed and used by Dr. Mortimer-Granville. We have also used this instrument to ascertain the changes in the cranial temperature which follow upon different emotional conditions, and it possesses two advantages at least over the thermo-pile: one is, that it is not liable

<sup>13</sup> "Experimental Researches on the Regional Temperature of the Head, under conditions of Rest, Intellectual Activity and Emotion." By J. S. Lombard, M.D., formerly Assistant-Professor of Physiology in Harvard University, U.S. London: H. K. Lewis. 1879.

to get out of order, and the other that its readings are comparable with those of other instruments of the same kind. Thermo-piles, on the contrary, have very distinct individualities, and unless it is that they are all uncertain and capricious in their action, no resemblances can be found amongst them. Dr. Lombard, however, has shown that a careful experimenter may do good work with these instruments, and he has made a very complete and laborious inquiry into the effect of different mental states upon the regional temperatures of the head. He finds that both intellectual and emotional activity increases the surface heat in the cranium. Experiment corroborates the theory that the left hemisphere is chiefly concerned in cerebration; but though it is now tolerably well proved that the faculty of speech is located in Broca's convolution, it is not conclusively established that the temperature of the surface corresponding to it is specially affected by reading aloud. It was noticed that in mental recitation, a greater quantity of heat was evolved, than during recitation aloud, and it is suggested that this is in accordance with the laws of the correlation and conservation of force. "In internal recitation, an additional portion of energy which in recitation aloud was converted into nervous and muscular force, now appears as heat." This may be the true explanation, but there is another quite as plausible. Recitation aloud only calls into activity the higher ganglionic, or, at the most, the lower cerebral, functions. In other words, it gives rise to complex, reflex, or else to very elementary intellectual activity; but in mental recitation the initial energy which should have its external manifestation in speech, occurs coincidentally with the higher energy, inhibiting or restraining it. In this case there are not only two forces at work, instead of one, but also a second force which has its organic seat much nearer to the surface—in the cells of the convolutions themselves.

Dr. MacMunn has written a work on the application of the spectroscope<sup>14</sup> to medicine, which, as far as we know, is the first on the subject in the English language. In other branches of science, spectrum analysis has already been fruitful of results, and, indeed, one of its first achievements was the discovery by Bunsen of the two new metals, cæsium and rubidium. But in medicine this method has been too difficult and delicate of application for general use, and except for the detection of minute quantities of poison in the tissues, and for the determination of the optical reactions of the blood after different modes of death, the spectroscope has hitherto been employed, but seldom for the physical examination of the human body. Dr. MacMunn, however, shows that it has been of use in Pathology and Physiology, and he believes that a simple treatise on the instrument is likely to remove the erroneous ideas as to its difficulty of application, which have hitherto been the chief impediment to its popu-

---

<sup>14</sup> "The Spectroscope in Medicine." By Charles MacMunn, B.A., M.A. (Univ. Dublin). London: Churchill & Co. 1880.

larity. For medical purposes, a one-prism chemical spectroscope may be used, as it is amply sufficient, for the study of the few bright-line spectra which will be met with, and is preferable for absorption-bands, on account of its small dispersion. The two-prism instrument is better for taking the refractive and dispersive powers of solids and liquids. Several methods of mapping the Fraunhofer lines from a one-prism spectroscope are given. The arc and nonius are condemned as too slow. The photographed millimetre scale requires a second light, but has the advantage of enabling the reading to be taken quickly. Colonel Campbell's spectrograph is good, but inferior to the camera lucida, which, according to the author, affords the simplest and readiest means of mapping bands. Those who wish to go beyond the elements of the science should use the micro-spectroscope, and the best is that which is called, after two workers in this direction, the "Sorby-Browning" Spectra. It is very rightly observed, that the relative distances between the Fraunhofer lines vary according to the material composing the prism, and, consequently, no two arbitrary scales give the same reading. It therefore becomes necessary, for the sake of comparison, to reduce all results to wave-lengths, and Dr. MacMunn adopts the method of graphical interpolation. Amongst the applications of the study of bright-line spectra to medicine, one of the most interesting is that which refers to the chemical circulation. Dr. Bence Jones uses this means of determining the time that certain salts take to reach any part of the body. He has found, for example, that if three grains of lithia are taken upon an empty stomach, this substance may be detected in the hip-joint in a quarter of an hour. The recognition of infinitesimal quantities of blood has long been one of the most important applications of the spectroscope; but it is shown that valuable information may be afforded by the coloring matters of other human fluids. The examination of urine may thus reveal the existence of pigments which are foreign to it in a healthy condition, but which are found tolerably constantly in certain pathological conditions. A spectroscopic peculiarity has also been noticed in the liquid obtained from ovarian and parovarian cysts, but further investigation is necessary on this point. Our space is too limited to examine Dr. MacMunn's work more fully, but we trust that he will be encouraged to persevere in the line of study which he has selected.

Chloride of ammonium is said by some physicians to be most useful in diseases of the liver, and Dr. William Stewart has been largely instrumental in bringing it before the medical profession. He has now brought together in a connected form<sup>15</sup> the substance of the

<sup>15</sup> "Clinical Researches on the Therapeutic Action of Chloride of Ammonium in the Treatment of Hepatic Disease; with illustrative Cases and Rules regarding the Auxiliary Treatment, Diet, and Management of Patients suffering from Congestion of the Liver and Tropical Hepatitis." By William Stewart, M.D. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1879.

various papers which he has written on the subject, and which have appeared from time to time in different periodicals. The results obtained by Dr. Stewart are very remarkable, and if they are confirmed by future experience, chloride of ammonium will certainly be entitled to rank amongst the specifics. Whilst nitro-hydrochloric acid and ipecacuanha gave twenty-eight deaths in the 233 cases of acute and chronic hepatitis which occurred amongst the 2nd battalion of the 21st Regiment during a period of four years, 153 patients treated during the three following years all recovered under the influence of chloride of ammonium. It may be observed, moreover, that these included sixteen cases, and sixteen recoveries from hepatic abscess, which is usually followed by a mortality of eighty per cent. It will be a satisfaction to Anglo-Indians to learn that the more acute the congestion, the more marked is the characteristic and special action of the remedy. This will perhaps account for the fact that it has hitherto obtained but very little favour with practitioners in England, where liver-disease most usually runs a chronic course.

We have now to deal with a volume by Dr. Waters<sup>16</sup> in praise of another preparation of ammonia. This pamphlet is strongly bound in what appears to be red sheepskin, evidently intended to protect it from any rough treatment it might experience at the hands of the reader. The title sets forth that the diagnosis and treatment of fits may be learned from its pages, but the author's summary of his own work scarcely bears out this promise. Dr. Waters states that the appropriate treatment of the different affections which he enumerates is to be found in most of the text books on the subject, and supposing that they can be diagnosed it may be carried out. He maintains, however, that in most cases diagnosis is impossible; but fortunately he is able to give a universal remedy for all kinds of fits, which renders the recognition of their nature a matter of secondary importance. This is the strong solution of ammonia of the British Pharmacopœia, inhaled and administered internally in doses of three drops. We cannot relate here all the good which Dr. Waters has been able to effect with this agent, but as he is fond of mnemonics we think that he would do well to condense and embody the whole of his information in the two easily remembered lines which have irresistibly suggested themselves to us at every page of his book. Like the once celebrated couplet about sarsaparilla, they may be set to music, and the police surgeon who is called to an urgent case, and who has remembered by thinking of the word "CRESTS" (a brilliant suggestion of Dr. Waters), that he must examine into the state of the circulation, respiration, eyes, sensibility, temperature, and spasm—might hum as he went along his rule of treatment—thus:—

<sup>16</sup> "Fits: Diagnosis and Immediate Treatment of Cases of Insensibility and Convulsions." By John H. Waters, K.C., St. G. C., M.D., M.B., C.M., L.M., etc. London: Churchill. 1879.

Liquor Ammonizæ, three drops I say—

Liquor Ammonizæ takes all fits away.

(To be set to the air of "Gentle Zitella.")

If a second edition of this compilation should ever be issued, we should advise Dr. Waters to notice the observations which have been made on the sensibility of the iris in alcoholism and coma by his former teacher, Dr. Macewen, of Glasgow. It would also be well to give prominence to the fact that the pupils are not always contracted in poisoning by opium. As Tardieu first observed, there is always mydriasis in the "*foudroyante*" form of narcotism by this drug.

Mr. Morris's book upon "Skin Diseases,"<sup>17</sup> is a good compilation of its kind, and will no doubt be welcome to those students and practitioners who do not care to purchase a larger volume. We will say at once that it possesses all the advantages and defects of an ordinary manual. The catalogue-like arrangement of its contents renders it easy of reference, concise and clear, but at the same time impossible to read; and, when the book is closed, it leaves no mental picture behind. Syphilis has so many cutaneous manifestations that it is difficult to omit it in a work on this subject; but there is no reason whatever for introducing the eruptive fevers into a classification of skin diseases. Scleroderma is here placed amongst the hypertrophies, and this is still a debatable point. For our own part, we should prefer to class it with the trophonéuroses. Mr. Morris is mistaken in stating that scleroderma has never proved fatal. A case has been reported where the induration of the upper part of the alimentary canal caused death by starvation from impossibility of swallowing. Although chloral not unfrequently gives rise to a rash, we see no mention of it in the section on eruptions produced by drugs.

"In compliance with the request of several who heard it," Dr. Herbert Tibbits has published a lecture on Galvanism, which he delivered before the Hunterian Society of London.<sup>18</sup> With this he has incorporated some lectures on other forms of electricity given elsewhere. The description of the apparatus necessary for electrization is clear, and the directions for treatment are good—as far as they go; but they are not sufficient. A medical student who opens this volume in complete ignorance of the subject will, of course, learn something from its pages, but it does not contain a single fact that the busy practitioner of medicine ought not to have at his fingers' ends.

Dr. Althaus has also complied with the request of his friends, and now publishes a lecture on the Functions of the Brain,<sup>19</sup> delivered to the members of the German Athenæum in London. It is a good *résumé*

<sup>17</sup> "Skin Diseases; including their Definition, Symptoms, Diagnosis, Prognosis, Morbid Anatomy, and Treatment." By Malcolm Morris. London: Smith & Elder. 1879.

<sup>18</sup> "How to use a Galvanic Battery in Medicine and Surgery." By Herbert Tibbits, M.D., F.R.C.P.E. London: J. & A. Churchill. 1879.

<sup>19</sup> "The Functions of the Brain: a Popular Essay." By Julius Althaus, M.D. London: Longmans & Co. 1880.

of what was supposed to be known at the time, and is what anyone with a retentive memory might have written after reading Dr. Ferrier's book with the same title.

We regret that we neglected to call the attention of our readers to Dr. Graily Hewitt's very valuable contribution to the mechanical system of uterine pathology at the time we received it;<sup>20</sup> but although it was published as far back as 1878, it is, in our opinion, a book of such intrinsic merit that we gladly atone even now for our fault of omission at that time, by commending it strongly to the attention of all whom it may concern. Displacements of the womb and their many distressing consequences which were rarely recognized even by the most distinguished physicians fifty years ago, are, nevertheless, widely prevalent, and the source of much and, too generally, of prolonged suffering. Dr. Hewitt gives a formidable list of the consequences or symptoms, some, and often several, of which are produced by one or other of the different kinds of displacement. One of those consequences, and one often met with, is sterility, while pain, difficulty of locomotion, and grave disorder of the menstrual function, as well as of the action of the bladder, are among the most frequent concomitants of such displacements.

And yet, strange to say, some physicians deny even the existence of several of these displacements, and there are many, especially in France, who, while admitting their existence and frequency, maintain that their pathological importance is very slight. Respecting their alleged non-existence, we cannot understand how men venture to affirm it unless we adopt the hypothesis of Dr. Barnes who says they are chiefly "those who do not avail themselves of the necessary means to recognize the physical condition of the pelvic organs. To deny the existence of displacements of the uterus without physical examination is as unreasonable as it would be to deny displacement of the heart or of a joint without physical examination. . . . All who are in the habit of examining the pelvic organs when they show signs of distress recognize the clinical fact that displacements of the uterus are not only real but frequent." Dr. Hewitt states that of 1,205 out-patients seen by him at University College Hospital during a period of a little over four years, 620 were subjected to internal examination, and that of these, 377, or 60·8 per cent., were found to be suffering from displacement of the womb—viz., 81 from prolapse, 184 from ante-flexion, and 112 from retroflexion. Surely these figures attest decisively that uterine displacements form a large proportion of the maladies peculiar to women.

Dr. Hewitt's observations on those causes of uterine displacements, named by him respectively, "Forces of a dislocating tendency," and "Abnormal softness of the uterus," strike us as deserving special attention. In fact, under the latter heading, he has, we think, made a con-

<sup>20</sup> "The Mechanical System of Uterine Pathology: being the Harveian Lectures delivered before the Harveian Society of London, December, 1877." By Graily Hewitt, M.D. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1878.

tribution of considerable originality and great practical importance to uterine pathology—a contribution fertile, as ideas which are at once original and true generally are, not only as an explanation of phenomena previously inexplicable, but also in the direction of practical utility. While, on the one hand, we may discern in the fact of abnormal softness of the uterine structure an explanation of how, in a large proportion of cases, flexions of the womb are induced—on the other, finding very frequently that abnormal softness and flexions of the womb stand in a causal relation to each other, we are led to infer that a considerable proportion of the latter have a constitutional origin, and, therefore, that that treatment of these disorders is most likely to prove successful which, while intent on relieving local suffering, especially conduces to develop the constitutional vitality and strength of the patient. Having repeatedly observed the coexistence of uterine flexions and undue softness of the uterine tissues in unmarried women, who, of course, are less subject than are married women to the operation of numerous causes of uterine displacement, Dr. Hewitt investigated the history of such cases, and, “it became evident,” he says, “that the extreme softness of the uterine tissues was met with chiefly, indeed, I may say, almost universally, in young women whose nutrition was in a very low state, and who had for some time—some years in some of the cases—habitually taken little food. . . . In short, the preceding history of these cases was one of semi-starvation.”

Adverting to the causes which co-operate to maintain the womb in its normal shape and position, Dr. Hewitt remarks:—

“When the circulation is proceeding healthily and regularly, the tension of the full blood-vessels will contribute to the firmness of the organ as a whole, and, consequently, to the preservation of its natural form and shape. In fact, by some authorities the uterus is regarded as a partly erectile organ.”

Dr. Hewitt does not say whether he agrees with these authorities in regarding the uterus “as a partly erectile organ.” We are acquainted with facts justifying our belief that it is. But if it is, analogical reasoning must lead us to the conclusion that its erectile energy is derived from the nervous system, and that its maintenance in a normally erect position is in intimate correspondence with the amount and character of the nervous force which animates it. And here we touch on one of the defects of this valuable monograph—a defect which, however, so far as we know, is common to all treatises on the subject in question—viz., the absence of any recognition of the rôle played by the nervous system, both positively and negatively, and, notably, by strong mental emotion, in determining and modifying the textural condition, the shape, and the position of the womb. This is not the place in which to discuss this important subject, but careful and repeated observations enable us to affirm with the utmost confidence that the more the neural physiology and pathology of the womb is studied the stronger will become the conviction that the great majority of causes operative to produce uterine displacements, especially those causes conducing to the production of uterine

flexions, are, in fact, secondary, or intermediate, agents ultimately dependent on, and subject to, the ever-varying force of the nervous system—the atonic, tonic, calm, and stormy states of which affect the womb in a manner and with an intensity accurately representative of themselves.

We cordially thank Dr. Hewitt for this important contribution to uterine pathology. Its chief merit consists in the demonstration which it contains that, in most cases, displacements, especially flexions, of the womb are expressions and consequences of constitutional feebleness. This truth, pregnant with suggestions of great practical import, is as yet scarcely suspected, much less apprehended, by gynecologists generally; and Dr. Hewitt has done an excellent work by emphatically proclaiming it in the clear and concise language which distinguishes his monograph.

---

#### HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

MR. SPENCER WALPOLE'S *History*<sup>1</sup> will undoubtedly be a valuable contribution to the historical literature of this century. Mr. Walpole, if he lack the picturesque style and powers of graphic description which have rendered certain historians popular, is always accurate in his statements, tolerant in his judgments, and, though a partisan, fairly free from party prejudices. The history of England from the year 1815 to the present time, naturally divides itself into three distinct periods: the first from the commencement of the peace to the accession of George IV.; the second from the reconstruction of the Liverpool Administration, by the appointment of Peel to the Home Office, and of Canning to the Foreign Office, to the passage of the Reform Act; and the third period, from the passage of the Reform Act to the fall of Melbourne in 1841. In the first volume of his work Mr. Walpole dealt with the policy of the Tories during this first period; in his second volume he recorded the great reforms in legislation, administration, and finance which distinguished the second period; and in his present volume he describes the use which the Whigs under Grey made of their triumph in 1832 and the causes which subsequently led to their humiliation under Melbourne. The domestic policy of the Whig Government from 1833 to 1841 is one of pride and shame. Under Lord Grey great reforms were introduced; Slavery was abolished, a Factory Act passed, the Irish Church reformed, the Poor Laws placed on a new basis, and the information which was to result in Corporation Reform collected. Then came the Melbourne Administration with its little measures and great compromises, and which, after being continually thwarted in its attempt to regulate the

---

<sup>1</sup> "A History of England from the Conclusion of the Great War in 1815." By Spencer Walpole. Vol. III. Longman.



policy of the State, was finally overwhelmed by the universal contempt which its weak and vacillating conduct had inspired. Indolent, luxurious, hating bother, Melbourne, though always an advocate of Liberal measures, could never be made to see why an abuse which had been uncorrected for generations should not be allowed to continue for another year. He obtained office by the assertion of a great principle, yet, after three years of power, the great principle was shunted into a siding. He was an advocate of self-government, yet he introduced autocracy into Canada, and he was desirous of introducing it into Jamaica. His conduct of the Irish Tithe Bill and Irish Municipal Bill, his West Indian and Canadian policy, exposed him to the censure of men, not more liberal, but more earnest than himself. During his whole tenure of office he was constantly asserting Liberal maxims, and as constantly abandoning them. The political information contained in this volume ranges over a wide field, and Mr. Spencer Walpole is both a safe and pleasant guide. The extension of railways, legal reform, the O'Connell agitation, Irish tithes, the slave question, factory reform, the new poor law, municipal reform, rebellion in Canada, the Jamaica crisis, postal reform, and corn laws, are among the subjects to which we are introduced, and are always dismissed wiser than when we came. Not the least able chapters in this work are those which deal with the foreign policy of Lord Palmerston. Mr. Walpole's volumes may be recommended both to the general reader and the student.

The object of Mr. Hodgkin's work<sup>2</sup> is to trace some of the changes by which classical Italy, the centre of government and law for the Western world, became that Italy of the Middle Ages whose life was as rich in intellectual and artistic culture as it was poor in national cohesion and enduring political strength. Five great invasions by the barbarians, corresponding roughly to five generations of mankind, or 160 years, mark the period which may be called the death of Rome. These five invasions are those of the Visigoths, the Huns, the Vandals, the Ostrogoths, and the Lombards. It is the history of the three earlier invasions that Mr. Hodgkin has narrated in these two goodly volumes, and not even the most fervent admirer of Gibbon will be opinion that the work is uncalled for. Mr. Hodgkin has specially directed his attention to the century which intervenes between the years A.D. 376 and 476. It is true that the Visigoths did not actually set foot in Italy till A.D. 402, but the cause which moved them, and which more than any other determined the great migration of the Germanic tribes into the countries constituting the Roman Empire, was the appearance of the Huns, a horde of Asiatic savages on the borders of the Visigothic territory, between the Black Sea and the Carpathians, in the year A.D. 376, and precisely a century after this event the last Roman Emperor was ousted from his throne by Odoacer, the first

---

\* "Italy and her Invaders, 376—476." By Thomas Hodgkin. Two vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Teutonic ruler of Italy. Mr. Hodgkin divides his subject into three books. The first book, which covers much the longest interval in time, deals with the events from A.D. 376 to 446, considered chiefly either as causes or consequences of the great Visigothic invasions. In the second book is narrated the history of the seven eventful years during which Italy and the whole of Europe, Teutonic and Roman, trembled before the power of Attila, King of the Huns. The third book is devoted to the history of the Vandal invasions of Italy and the revolt of the German mercenaries in the Roman army. To him who cannot devote the time to study the stately prose of Gibbon's numerous volumes, or who is deterred by that author's lengthy and learned notes, Mr. Hodgkin will prove a most useful and acceptable teacher. He is neither dry nor tedious, whilst his historical scholarship cannot be disputed. The contents of his volumes form a chapter of history, as will be seen from the following summary, complete in itself:—The dynasty of Valentinian; early history of the Goths; last years of Valens; Theodosius; Alaric's first invasion; the fall of Stilicho; Alaric's three sieges of Rome; the lovers of Placidia; early history of the Huns; Attila and the Court of Constantinople; Attila in Gaul and Italy; the Vandals; and causes of the fall of the Western Empire, are among the chief subjects discussed by Mr. Hodgkin. The book is adorned by some excellent chromo-lithographs. To students reading up for honours in history in the schools of our Universities, these volumes will be invaluable.

Herr Caro, of Gotha, has made the Canterbury League, as an important episode in the Council of Constance of 1416, the subject of a very elaborate monograph.<sup>3</sup> The most interesting point in the history of that Council is the journey of Sigismund, King of the Romans, which seems to have been undertaken in haste, as soon as the difficulties which attended the deliberations of the Council became apparent, and lasted two years. The objects of this journey appear to have been, in the first place, to induce Benedict XIII. to resign, which he declined to do; secondly, to effect a reconciliation after their long-standing quarrel between France and England, and so frustrate the opposition of John of Burgundy; and finally to unite Europe for the reform of the Church and the settlement of the Eastern question by a crusade against the Turks. Sigismund, who was already bound by a general treaty with France, offered himself as a mediator with England, and ended by concluding the Canterbury League with England against France. He has therefore been charged either with betraying France in order to gain an English alliance for his own ends, or with having been duped by the superior diplomacy of Henry V. This view has been adopted even by German writers, and Windeck, Sigismund's banker and biographer, has been discredited wherever he differs from the French version of these occurrences. Herr Caro seems to prove from a close examination of the diplomatic documents that this account is erroneous, and that Sigismund did not

<sup>3</sup> "Das Bündniss von Canterbury." Von J. Caro. Gotha: Perthes. 1880. London: Trübner & Co.

desert his French allies until Charles VI. and his military and monkish advisers had made it clear that they only wanted to involve him in their dispute with England, and cared nothing for the objects on account of which the Council met. Sigismund is indeed to be blamed for imprudently meddling in a quarrel which he did not understand; but his intentions were as usual good, and his plans only too magnificent. That there was treachery and even falsification of documents on the French side seems pretty clearly proved; while Herr Caro's incidental vindication of Henry V. disposes of a charge against one of the best of our own kings. Henry looked carefully after "British interests," but in an honest way; and he was ever ready to make some sacrifice for the peace of Europe.

Mr. Wheeler's very useful and a very important work,<sup>4</sup> fills up a gap that has too long been allowed to remain blank. Numerous as are the educational volumes at the present day upon almost every conceivable subject, we know no book, save the one before us, which furnishes the reader with a concise but complete history of India. To the masses, India, though literally a modern reflex of the ancient world and a part and parcel of the British Empire, is a sealed book. The essays of Macaulay on Robert Clive and Warren Hastings are of course well known; but they refer to mere episodes in the history of India, and lack that familiarity with native character and form of thought essential to a right appreciation of the great collision between Europe and Asia that has been going on in India for the last two centuries. Mr. Wheeler, who was Assistant-Secretary to the Government of India, has compiled his work from records of the Indian Government, and from official reports and Parliamentary Blue-Books, as well as from such current annals, memoirs, travels, and correspondence as have been found to yield historical materials. Commencing with the misty dawn of legend he brings down the history of Hindu, Muhammadan, and British India, to the present time. The volume is crowded with facts, and is therefore more to be studied than to be read through for enjoyment. Should it reach a second edition we recommend Mr. Wheeler to examine the "Calendars of Colonial State Papers," published by the Public Record Office; he will find there some information relating to his subject not to be obtained elsewhere.

The lovers of geology have an intellectual pleasure of no mean order in store for them in the perusal of Mr. Dawkins's "Early Man in Britain."<sup>5</sup> The work is an inquiry, by one of the most eminent of living geologists, into primæval man, his growth in culture, his conditions of life and his relation to history. We can but briefly summarize Mr. Dawkins's conclusions. In the Eocene and Miocene ages our islands formed part of a continent extending northward to Iceland, Spitzbergen and Greenland, with a warm climate and a luxuriant

<sup>4</sup> "A Short History of India." By J. T. Wheeler. Macmillan.

<sup>5</sup> "Early Man in Britain." By W. Boyd Dawkins, Professor of Geology, Owens College, Manchester. Macmillan.

vegetation inhabited by wild beasts belonging to extinct species. As none of the mammalia then alive are now living, it is unreasonable to suppose that man, the most highly specialized of all, should then have been on the earth. Nor is it likely that he lived in Europe in the Pliocene age after the land connecting Britain with Greenland had been submerged, and the Atlantic was united to the North Sea and the Arctic Ocean, because the living species of mammalia are so few. When the living species became abundant, the *genus homo* appears just in the Pleistocene stage. The River-drift man first comes before us; next follows the Cave-man of the same race as the Eskimos; and the disappearance of the Cave-man from Britain coincides with the geographical change by which the country became an island. In the Prehistoric age, the earliest of the present inhabitants arrived in Britain. The small dark non-Aryan peoples, who spread over France and Spain, brought with them into Britain the domestic animals and the cultivated plants and seeds, and laid the foundation of our present culture. The next invaders were the bronze-using Celtic tribes composing the van of the Aryan race. In the course of time, the use of iron became known, and in the Prehistoric Iron age the condition of Britain was higher than it ever had been before. A commerce was carried on with the Mediterranean peoples, and works of Etruscan art penetrated as far to the west as Ireland. Into further details we cannot enter. Mr. Dawkins introduces us to Britain as part of a continent and without human inhabitants, and he leaves it at the end an island, with its inhabitants and its condition to be dealt with by the historian. "History," says our author, "must take up the story of human progress at the point where it is dropped by geology, archaeology, and ethnology, and carry it on to the present day."

The Biography of Francis Deak, the Hampden of Hungary, is one that cannot fail to be interesting. "A statesman, a patriot, a lover of law, a Magyar of the Magyars, as he called himself, Deak was distinguished, not only by his power of realizing, with keen perception and pursuing with unwearied courage a single political truth, but by the calm wisdom which enabled him to see this truth in relation to other truths and to shape his actions accordingly. A patriot he was to the backbone, and he did not stay his hand till he saw Hungary acknowledge, of her own free will, the sovereignty of her lawful king, and the Emperor of Austria recognizing, with equal loyalty, the full right of Hungary to her lawful Constitution. It was no mere courtly compliment when the Emperor declared, on the death of his great Hungarian subject, that by "his fidelity to throne and country, Deak had earned the confidence and affection of his Sovereign and his countrymen." To those who wish to know the work of the patriot, and what manner of man he was, we refer them to this pleasant volume. A preface has been written to it by Mr. Grant Duff, M.P., which strikes us as feeble and disappointing.

We are not surprised that Mr. Poole's Essay should have gained the Lothian prize at Oxford.<sup>7</sup> The author has consulted original authorities, and, instead of the string of facts and schoolboy inferences to be expected in treatises of this kind, we have a really valuable contribution to historical literature. Mr. Poole deals with the religious and political opinions of the Huguenots, the persecution they endured, and their dispersion throughout the Netherlands, England, America, Germany, and Switzerland. One fact particularly strikes us. Certain it is, that in almost every branch of industry the Huguenots surpassed the Catholics. This bears out the saying of Sir William Petty, that "trade is most vigorously carried on in every State and Government by the heterodox part of the same, and such as profess opinions different from what are publicly established." This essay is curious, and upon a question hitherto neglected, and will repay perusal. It will also be valuable as a work of reference, for Mr. Poole has made an exhaustive study of the whole literature of his subject.

Don Pedro Calderon de la Barca was a celebrated Spanish soldier-priest and dramatic author. His talents were recognized by Philip IV., who summoned him to Court, patronized him, and provided the necessary funds for the representation of his plays. Subsequently, Calderon entered the Church, and became Canon of Toledo. Such is the man of whom Archbishop Trench has written a short biography.<sup>8</sup> It is a reprint of an edition published in 1856. Calderon's two great works are "Life's a Dream," and "Great Theatre of the World;" but we fancy he has few readers in this country, and we fear that the Archbishop will appeal only to the curiosity of a minority.

In a little volume,<sup>9</sup> contributed by Mr. Froude to the series entitled "English Men of Letters," the life and character of Bunyan stand out in bold relief, and for the first time the author of the "Pilgrim's Progress" is portrayed as he really existed, and not as sectarian approval or prejudice has loved to paint him. We see Bunyan as he appeared to his contemporaries—the man of strong religious sympathies, of sound common sense, honest, straightforward, sensitive, and almost morbidly conscientious. Mr. Froude is essentially the biographer for such a character—his sympathy with the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, his hatred of all cant and superstition, his love for manly straightforward action, the tendency of his theological views, all make him enter fully into the mental condition of the tinker of Elstow. This being the case, we are not surprised that several of the hackneyed ideas with regard to Bunyan are here refuted. Mr. Froude does not credit him with being the dissolute and abandoned youth he is supposed to have been; he believes that if he fought during the Civil War he espoused the cause of the Royalists and not of the Parliamentarians; he disputes the much-talked of imprisonment in the gaol on Bedford Bridge, and in sundry other

<sup>7</sup> "A History of the Huguenots of the Dispersion." By R. L. Poole. Macmillan.

<sup>8</sup> "An Essay on the Life and Genius of Calderon." By Archbishop Trench. Second Edition. Macmillan.

<sup>9</sup> "English Men of Letters—John Bunyan." By J. A. Froude. Macmillan.

particulars inclines more to the views of George Offor, the laborious editor of Bunyan, than to those of Macaulay. Unlike certain critics of the present day, who have branded the great Puritan as a "Philiistine of genius," Mr. Froude has a high appreciation of the literary excellences of Bunyan's works. He was a poet in the technical sense of the word, though "it has been the fashion to call his verse doggerel; but no verse is doggerel which has a sincere and rational meaning in it." His invention was infinite. His command of English was excellent, and he could express what he wished with sharp, defined outlines, and without the waste of a word. Take his "Pilgrim's Progress," his "Holy War," his "Mr. Badman," and we shall find throughout the rhythmical structure of his poem carefully correct, scarcely a syllable out of place, and conspicuous for the sound sense they contain. Of the "Pilgrim's Progress" Mr. Froude thinks with the majority most highly. It is an allegoric story of the Protestant plan of salvation conceived in the large, wide spirit of humanity itself. Its religion is the religion which must be always and everywhere as long as man believes that he has a soul and is responsible for his actions. "He sees there the reflection of himself, the familiar features of his own nature, which remain the same from era to era. Time cannot impair its interest, or intellectual progress make it cease to be true to experience." We are not surprised at the wide success this book has obtained. It has all Mr. Froude's graces of style and powers of narration, whilst the religious disquisitions throw a light upon Bunyan's actions which hitherto to the many have been confusing or incomprehensible. No one after reading this biographical criticism can fail to have a keener appreciation of the merits of Bunyan as a man, and of his sterling excellences as an author.

We cannot accord the same praise to Mr. Goldwin Smith's effort in a similar field. His life of Cowper<sup>10</sup> is cold, unsympathetic, bald, and incomplete. Next to Mr. Trollope's Thackeray it is the least successful of the series of "English Men of Letters." Mr. Smith, who is a political writer of a high order, is utterly wanting in the capabilities of a poetical critic. He does not understand the character of Cowper, and he fails to grasp the grace and suggestiveness of his poetry. He admits that the poet was a charming letter-writer, but he can see no beauty in the "Castaway"—which Dr. Arnold could never read without emotion—or the "Negro's Complaint." Cowper—the author of "The Task," "The Sofa," the "History of John Gilpin," and of some of the most perfect epistles in the English language—in the opinion of Mr. Goldwin Smith, owed his fame to the peculiar circumstances of his time, and to the sympathy which existed between himself and those circumstances; he suited his age, but when another age dawned different in its teaching and its aspirations, he sank to the obscurity from which accident alone had raised him. "Cowper," says Mr. Smith, "belongs to a particular religious movement, with the vitality of which the interest of a great part of his works has departed

or is departing. Still more emphatically does he belong to Christianity. In no natural struggle for existence would he have been the survivor, by no natural process of selection would he ever have been picked out as a vessel of honour. If the shield which for eighteen centuries Christ by His teaching and His death has spread over the weak things of this world should fail, and might should again become the title to existence and the measure to worth, Cowper will be cast aside as a specimen of despicable infirmity, and all who have said anything in his praise will be treated with the same scorn." Yet, in the face of this narrow and ill-natured judgment, intellects of the highest order—statesmen, jurists, practical politicians, men of letters—have not been ashamed to own themselves students of Cowper; and in that portion of the North American continent with which Mr. Smith is most in sympathy few poets are more read and quickly appreciated. We cannot but regret that so gentle a bard as he of Olney should have been entrusted to one whose treatment of him has been so harsh and ungenial.

As Messrs. Macmillan are endeavouring, by their excellent series of "English Men of Letters," to bring within the reach of all a knowledge of those writers who have been raised to the position of English classics, so Messrs. Blackwood, by their "Foreign Classics for English Readers," are making the works of those great Continental authors whose names are as household words in Europe, familiar to many Englishmen whose knowledge of language is confined to that of their own country. Already biographies and criticisms have appeared of Dante, Voltaire, Pascal, Petrarch, Goethe, Molière, Montaigne, Rabelais, Calderon, and now to this useful list the name of St. Simon is added.<sup>11</sup> Mr. Collins deserves the thanks of the reader—for who in these hasty days would have time to wade through twenty volumes of Memoirs to arrive at a knowledge of what an author wrote, thought, and observed? But, thanks to Mr. Collins, without attempting this formidable task, we are able to obtain all that the ordinary reader requires to know about St. Simon in a few hours' light and pleasant study. From these pages we gather no superficial information of the deeds and remarks of the last of the old courteous servile exclusive dukes of France. We hear St. Simon criticizing the pedigree (and often sneering at it) of every peer that crosses his path; we see him proud and happy holding the King's shirt in the royal dressing-chamber, or swaggering about the galleries at Marli, or dancing attendance upon the illustrious personages that visited the great monarch, or performing other flunkey-like acts which to him were the most solemn and important duties of life, until he fell into disgrace and withdrew from the Court. He settled down at his splendid country seat, and wrote those Memoirs which, for their exquisite style, their profound knowledge of character, their powers of delineation, their cynical reflections, and their spiteful personalities, will ever live in the

---

<sup>11</sup> "Saint Simon." By Clifton W. Collins. Wm. Blackwood & Sons. Edinburgh.

French language. To most Englishmen St. Simon is a sealed book, and this little volume will render it all the more sealed, for these are days when an epitome is preferred to its voluminous original. Macaulay said, after reading the Memoirs a second time, "The good parts are as good as ever, but the road from fountain to fountain lies through a very dry desert." If the man who read Photius for pleasure found St. Simon a task, the ordinary student may certainly be excused from attempting to peruse his Memoirs.

During the last decade of the seventeenth century the Benedictine editors of St. Ambrose, in their preface to the commentary of the Ambrosian Hilary, called attention to the circumstance that a MS., formerly belonging to the Monastery of Corbie, contained a Latin commentary identical with the Ambrosiasters' on the Epistles to the Romans and Corinthians, but altogether distinct from the latter and from every other known exposition in its treatment of the remaining nine epistles. The MS.<sup>12</sup> was carefully examined by Cardinal Pitra, who, believing that he had found a genuine work of St. Hilary of Poitiers, published the commentary on Galatians, Ephesians, and Philemon. Shortly after the Cardinal's publication it was found that the MS. was a translation of a Greek commentary of which the original was due to the exegetical school of Antioch, and to its greatest expositor, Theodore, Bishop of Mopsuestia. Within the last few years the interest excited by this discovery has been revived through the detection of another copy of the same commentary among the MSS. of the Harley collection at the British Museum. This second MS. seems to be somewhat earlier than the first, and, though less carefully written, is a valuable witness in many places where the Corbie MS. is corrupt or doubtful. A third MS. is now known to exist in one of the private libraries of Europe, though its contents are not accessible to the public. The sources to which Mr. Swete has gone for this edition are the Corbie and Harley MSS. He has also consulted the printed compilation of "Rabanus," excerpts from the Latin version in the works of other compilers from the eighth to the twelfth century, and the Greek fragments of the original published in Cramer's *Catæne*, and collated anew with the MS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale. The writings of Theodore were condemned and neglected by the Church, but found shelter and an eager acceptance amongst the Nestorians, who at an early date translated them into Syriac and other Oriental languages. The value of his commentaries consists in their constant endeavour to expound the sequence of the thought, their careful examination of the clauses and phraseology, their suggestive exegesis, and the light they throw upon the condition of the Eastern Church at the beginning of the fifth century. To theologians Mr. Swete's work will be interesting.

Dr. Dawson, who has attained no mean place in science, but who is yet a sincere believer in revealed religion, has written a popular expo-

---

<sup>12</sup> "Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Minor Epistles of St. Paul." By H. B. Swete, B.D. Vol. I. Cambridge University Press.



sition of some of the more important facts in connection with geology.<sup>13</sup> Dr. Dawson is a pleasant and instructive teacher, and, to those who have found the deeper works on the antiquity of man too dry and too severely scientific, his readable volume will be welcome. No subject of geological investigation is in a more unsatisfactory state than that which relates to the connection of the more modern, or human period, with preceding epochs. Problems yet unsolved encompass the history of that remarkable glacial age which seem to have preceded the advent of man and the modern mammalia in the northern hemisphere. Much uncertainty attaches to the study of the superficial deposits which alone contain the remains of man and his works. Whilst the geologist, the archæologist, the ethnologist, and the historian, approaching this obscure region from different directions, all claim to be heard and often vie with each other in dogmatic assertions respecting facts of the most uncertain character, Dr. Dawson attempts to explain some of the graver topics from the point of view of the geologist and naturalist, and to that principle of referring to modern causes for the explanation of ancient effects which is the basis of theoretical geology, the principal modern facts relied upon in his case being those furnished by the aboriginal tribes of America. His book should be read in connection with that of Mr. Dawkins.

We have received from New York a translation of an interesting biography of the illustrious French poet, statesman, and historian, Lamartine, written by one who knew him well and was admitted into his confidence.<sup>14</sup> We see Lamartine, not as he appeared to the world at large, but as he was in the seclusion of his library and in the society of his friends. We watch him playing with his dogs, exercising his horses, and giving his opinions upon the political topics of his day and the literary works that were then being discussed. This volume is a biography such as the general reader loves, in which there is more of the man than of his labours. There are some capital anecdotes to be found in its pages. The translation cannot be considered a success; it is feeble, schoolboyish, and full of American vulgarisms.

Herr von Nohl throws a new light on the famous musical composer,<sup>15</sup> Mozart, by showing us the estimation in which he was held by his contemporaries. Much novel information is also given by the author as to Mozart when in England, France, and Switzerland, and not the least interesting part of the book is the chapter entitled "Reminiscenzen seiner Frau." We hope to see this work soon in an English garb, for the admirers of Mozart are not only limited to Germany. His is a genius which belongs to the whole world, and not merely to the nation which gave it birth.

<sup>13</sup> "Fossil Men and their Modern Representatives. An Attempt to Illustrate the Characters and Condition of Pre-historic Men in Europe by those of the American Races." By J. W. Dawson, LL.D. Hodder & Stoughton.

<sup>14</sup> "Lamartine and his Friends." By Henri Lacretelle. Translated by Mrs. Odell. Putnam: New York. Trübner: London.

<sup>15</sup> "Mozart nach den Schilderungen seiner Zeitgenossen." Von L. Nohl. Trübner.

A Whig of the old school, Dr. Edward Rigby, happened to be travelling in France at the time of the French Revolution. After a few days in Paris he proceeded to Versailles, where the National Assembly was deliberating, and where he heard Mirabeau, La Fayette, and Lally Tollendal speak. He was also introduced to them. During his stay he saw and heard much, and wrote his impressions to his family at home. His letters have now been published by his daughter, Lady Eastlake, and we are fully of opinion that the public will readily appreciate her filial task. Dr. Rigby's letters,<sup>16</sup> though written in the quaint style of his generation, are full of matter not to be found in the ordinary historical works, whilst his views as to the condition of the French peasantry at that time are at variance with much that has been written upon the subject. Whether he be right or wrong his correspondence is worth perusal.

Professor Baird has written a work<sup>17</sup> which is a valuable contribution to our historical literature; read in conjunction with Mr. Poole's essay it furnishes the most complete account that exists of an interesting period and an interesting people. The volumes extend from the beginning of the French Reformation to the Edict of January, 1562. Mr. Baird writes in a graphic style, he arrives at his conclusions only after sound arguments, and he is one of those historians who, not content with printed authorities, goes to the fountain-head for his information; his references to MSS. will render his book of great importance to the scholar and future compiler. The period with which Mr. Baird deals is the formation age of the Huguenots of France. It includes the first planting of the reformed doctrines, the steady growth of the Reformation in spite of all persecutions, the regular organization of the Huguenot communities, the failure of the cruel and intolerant legislation of three successive monarchs to suppress French Protestantism, and the sanguinary wars into which the Huguenots had been driven by their implacable enemies. Hence the history of the Huguenots during a great part of the period covered by this work is in reality the history of France as well. But Mr. Baird, by consulting the archives of England and France and such publications as have been the result of modern research, has thrown much new light upon the subject, and we may say that he has done for the Huguenots what Motley has done for the Low Countries and what Froude has done for the Reformation. His work is extremely readable and deserves to be widely circulated. Nothing can exceed in interest and in picturesque description his accounts of Francis I. and Margaret of Angoulême, of the Civil Wars, and of the terrible Massacre of St. Bartholomew.

In a handsome volume Mr. Clayden attempts to tell the story of a very striking episode in the political history of England.<sup>18</sup> Mr. Clayden deals

---

<sup>16</sup> "Dr. Rigby's Letters from France in 1789." Edited by Lady Eastlake. Longmans.

<sup>17</sup> "History of the Rise of the Huguenots." By H. M. Baird. Two volumes. Hodder & Stoughton.

<sup>18</sup> "England under Lord Beaconsfield, 1873—1880." By P. W. Clayden. C. Kegan Paul & Co.

with the events of the last six years—the Liberal defeat, the various Conservative measures introduced, the Eastern Question, the massacres in Bulgaria, the secret understandings, and the Berlin Treaty, the Afghan War, and the South African troubles—from a strong Liberal point of view. Lord Beaconsfield is painted *en noir*, and, whatever our political sympathies may be, we object to a portrait which is all shade. Nor do we consider these criticisms upon an immediate present of much value. The time for the discussion of the events in question is too near, and our partialities or prejudices too strong for sound criticism. Mr. Clayden strikes the keynote of his volume when he says “England under Lord Beaconsfield has been led back from prosperous to unprosperous days, from peace and plenty to privation and war, from assured self-government to personal rule.” Mr. Clayden’s volume would be a more valuable and trustworthy guide if it were less inspired by that animus and one-sided judgment which convert history into a party pamphlet instead of a philosophical and well-balanced estimate of a nation’s proceedings.

“Old Glasgow”<sup>19</sup> is one of those *éditions de luxe* which publishers occasionally present to the antiquarian and literary world. “Old Glasgow” is printed on magnificent paper, is splendidly bound, and is most handsomely illustrated, whilst the literary ability displayed in its pages is in accordance with the rest of the volume. The object of Mr. Macgeorge has been in this work to bring together the varied and scattered materials for a history of Glasgow in such a systematic form as to give a connected view of the early history of the city. From his pages we learn all that can be gleaned of the locality around Glasgow at and subsequent to the time of Kentigern, its patron saint; of the growth of the city; of the condition of the people—their language, their habits and customs, and their municipal history; with some notices of the geology of the basin of the Clyde and the wonderful development of the river as a means of traffic. Too little is known as to the history of Glasgow from an antiquarian and topographical point of view, and Mr. Macgeorge has collected so much new and original matter upon the subject that we almost regret that his work should have been so elaborately published as to appeal to the few. Unlike books of this kind “Old Glasgow” is replete with no mere dry-as-dust statements, but with the most readable information as to the past and present history of the city. We recommend the publishers to issue the volume in a cheaper form. The engravings are admirable for finish and clearness of outline, especially those which relate to the Cathedral and the Old Tolbooth at the Cross.

Mr. Irwin’s careful and practical work, “The Garden of India,”<sup>20</sup> is in reality a history of Oudh, more from an agricultural than a political point of view. The area of the province of Oudh amounts in round numbers to 24,000 square miles, of which about 13,000 or, say, 55 per cent., containing 8,400,000 acres, are cultivated; of the remainder,

<sup>19</sup> “Old Glasgow—the Place and the People.” By A. Macgeorge. Blackie & Son.

<sup>20</sup> “The Garden of India.” By H. C. Irwin. W. H. Allen.

5,305 square miles, or 22 per cent., are culturable waste. According to Mr. Irwin the first and most crying need of Indian industry is protection; and the second is instruction. Agriculture is mainly in need of the former, arts and manufactures of the latter. The most urgent of the wants of Oudh for the present is the need of security for the cultivator. The agricultural system of Oudh is a system of large estates divided into very small farms, occupied by tenants at will cultivating with their own stock and without any security of tenure. Mr. Irwin is not in favour of peasant proprietorship, but he thinks that fixity of tenure should be adopted. He recommends that rents should be fixed for a term of certainly not less than thirty years, and that the actual occupants should be maintained in possession so long as the rents thus fixed are paid, and that every measure should be advocated to raise the standard of the Oudh labourer, who for ignorance and degradation is on a par with the Irish peasant. To all interested in the future of India—and especially to those who await the report of the Famine Commission—this work, written by one who has had a long experience of Indian affairs, is replete with suggestions which are as sound as they are practicable. The statistics and novel nature of the information supplied will be of great service to the statesman and the politician. Mr. Irwin's work is one to be studied.

We have little to say of the "Annual Register for 1879"<sup>21</sup> beyond what we have already said as to its predecessors. It is a useful compilation full of information—historical, political, social, literary, and commercial—concerning the occurrences of the past year. Few works of reference are more carefully edited and put together. The aim the "Annual Register" sets before it, of preserving for future students an absolutely impartial record of contemporary history, is fully attained.

The eighth volume of the Duke of Wellington's despatches<sup>22</sup> deals only with the events during the limited period between Nov. 1831 and the December of 1832. Syria, Spain, Ireland, and other countries occupy the attention of the Duke, and are the subject of his comments, but the chief feature of the volume before us are the discussions upon the question of Reform. At last the country had resolved upon abolishing the gross anomalies that then existed in the Constitution, and upon admitting the people to a larger share in the representation. The Duke, who was as shortsighted as a politician as he was far-seeing as a military strategist, was hotly opposed to Reform, and his correspondence on this matter occupies the lion's share of the pages of his eighth volume. He declared that there was no necessity for Reform, that there was no general feeling throughout the country in favour of it, and that the consequences of such a measure would be most dangerous. Once admit the principle of the Bill and it would be followed, he said, by an agitation for universal suffrage, annual parliaments, vote by

<sup>21</sup> "Annual Register, 1879." Rivingtons.

<sup>22</sup> "Despatches, Correspondence, and Memoranda of the Duke of Wellington." Vol. VIII. John Murray.

ballot, abolition of tithes, repeal of taxes, adjustment of funded debt, repeal of Corn Laws, and some sacrifice of property." He thus writes to Mr. Gleig:—"To conduct the Government will be impossible if by Reform the House of Commons should be brought to a greater degree under popular influence. Yet let those who wish for Reform reflect for a moment where we should all stand if we were to lose for a day the protection of Government. That is the ground on which I stand in respect to the question in general of Reform in Parliament. I have more experience in the government of this country than any man now alive, as well as in foreign countries. I have no borough influence to lose; and I hate the whole concern too much to think of endeavouring to gain any. On the other hand, I know that I should be very popular in the country if I would pretend to alter my opinion and alter my course; and I know that I exclude myself from political power by persevering in the course which I have taken." His Grace was undoubtedly conscientious in the views he held, and his correspondence is interesting as an exhibition of how utterly an able man can misinterpret the spirit of the age in which he lives, and can allow his prejudices to cloud and distort his judgment.

The Blundells are one of the oldest families in Lincolnshire, and they have done wisely in permitting this journal of their ancestor, "A Cavalier's Note-Book,"<sup>23</sup> to be made public. It consists of anecdotes and observations made by William Blundell, of Crosby, a captain of Dragoons in the Royalist army of 1642. It contains much matter of interest touching the condition of the loyal Catholic gentry during the time of the Rebellion, Commonwealth, and Restoration. As Captain Blundell lost his leg in the first engagement between the Royalists and the Parliamentarians, the reader will be disappointed if he expects to find in these records new information relating to the Civil War.

The publication of the "Records of the City of Oxford,"<sup>24</sup> is one of the many proofs given by the antiquarian world that the example furnished by the Master of the Rolls, in permitting the more important records in his custody to be published, either as Treasury publications or as appendices to the deputy-keeper's reports, is bearing good fruit. One by one our various cities are examining their archives, separating the chaff from the grain, and printing the result of their labours in handsome volumes like the one now before us. The "Records of the City of Oxford" are peculiarly interesting. Most cities have had to contend with the Crown at various times of their history for the preservation of their charters, and have been supported in their efforts by a united civic body. Oxford, however, has had a rival in her very midst, for between the City and the University there was a constant clashing of authority and a mutual jealousy that was ever being

<sup>23</sup> "Crosby Records. A Cavalier's Note-Book." Edited by Rev. T. E. Gibson. Longmans.

<sup>24</sup> "Records of the City of Oxford, 1509—1583." Edited by W. H. Turner. Parker & Co.

aroused. In this work the future historian of Oxford will find much valuable information concerning the feuds between the City and the University as to the respective jurisdiction of each, the management of the City property, the regulations respecting the trades and crafts of the town, and other municipal matters of interest. There are in the volume some curious entries relating to the cost to which the City was put for the maintenance of Cranmer during the interval that preceded his execution. The prospect of the stake does not appear to have interfered with the appetite of the martyr.

Mrs. Stenhouse's autobiography is a work<sup>25</sup> of deep and painful interest. We have heard much of the Mormons, but never from one who at one time conscientiously believed in their doctrines, who lived long in Utah, and who, as a woman, was made to suffer much from the most offensive form of polygamy by which she was surrounded. The life of the authoress is an instance of what lengths humanity can go when it permits superstition to cloud the intellect and to crush reflection. Mrs. Stenhouse has to deal with matters of some plainness, but we have to congratulate her upon the good taste with which she treats such subjects. Her book is one to be read.

#### BELLES LETTRES.

WE are very glad to see Mr. Black's new tale<sup>1</sup> appearing in a serial form, putting us in mind of the days of Dickens and Thackeray. Mr. Black, too, has broken new ground. Of course it is impossible to form any idea of either what the plot of the story or what the characters will be like from merely two parts. If we may, however, venture to prophesy, there seems to be an entirely new character brought before us in Lord Evelyn. He is the child of the day—the heir of all its hopes and expectations. We shall look forward with real interest for each new part.

Mr. Jefferies has not given us another "Greene Ferne Farm," but something equally good.<sup>2</sup> He here shows us the raw article, as it is seen in the south-western shires, before it is used up in ladies' novels. The manufactured Mudie peasant is very different from the real man in Mr. Jefferies' pages. There is not more difference between Yorkshire shoddy and West of England cloth. Equally good, too, are Mr. Jefferies' sketches of the farmer. His hand is not confined to painting one class. He can equally sketch the idle, pot-house farmer,

<sup>25</sup> "The Englishwoman in Utah." Mrs. Stenhouse. Sampson Low.

<sup>1</sup> "Sunrise. A Story of these Times." By William Black, Author of "A Daughter of Heth," &c., &c. Parts I. and II. Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington. 1880.

<sup>2</sup> "Hodge and his Masters." By Richard Jefferies. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1880.

and the new scientific man who tickles the crops with electricity. He can not only paint the hunting farmer, but the sporting agriculturist—a very different character. Altogether this book is as amusing as it is instructive. Many a landlord might profitably take a leaf from it; and, if there are landlords who still go to rent-dinners, by its help be able to judge something of the characters of his tenants, if he can't tell them by their farming.

Mark Twain,<sup>3</sup> too, does not this time send us a regular novel, but a sort of tale upon wheels. We do not ourselves care very much for what we must call topographical jokes. A joking companion always at our side on our travels is somewhat of a nuisance. We can dispense with him altogether when we enter a cathedral or a picture-gallery. However, Mark Twain is never offensive, and his account of many places, as of Heidelberg, may be read with pleasure.

Everything that Mr. Burke<sup>4</sup> writes is sure to be worth reading. His first novel was a real success. Though, perhaps, a trifle too political for the general reader, we can recommend "Loyal and Lawless" to Whig, Radical, and Tory. They will all learn something. With Mr. Burke's book let us class "The White Month,"<sup>5</sup> for its bearings upon the sufferings of another gallant people. Both tales, too, are interesting from their plots and characters.

"Hard Hit"<sup>6</sup> is a badly told story, written in the style which might be expected from the author of "Wreaths of Smoke," which we shall notice further on. Probably the author will reply that all his incidents are strictly true. They may be so. His want of art, however, makes them too often appear improbable, and sometimes ridiculous. The book is, fortunately, only in one volume.

Mr. Ascott Hope<sup>7</sup> is well known as a writer of stories for boys. He can draw the kind of characters which boys like, especially old sea-captains, who have had more adventures than ever befell Columbus. In his present work we find plenty of anecdotes, and also plenty of incidents both at home and abroad.

"Sussex Stories"<sup>8</sup> may be recommended to any one who wants to take up a short tale for half an hour or so. Mrs. O'Reilly evidently knows not only the country well, but the ways of country people. We are especially glad to see that the work is illustrated, though the illustrations are not all that we could wish. It is, however, a

<sup>3</sup> "A Tramp Abroad." By Mark Twain. London: Chatto & Windus. 1880.

<sup>4</sup> "Loyal and Lawless." By Ulrick Ralph Burke. London: Chapman & Hall. 1880.

<sup>5</sup> "The White Month." By the Author of "Cartouche," "The Rose Garden," "Unawares," &c. &c. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1880.

<sup>6</sup> "Hard Hit. A Newfoundland Story." By T. U. Author of "Wreaths of Smoke," "Florimel Jones," &c. &c. Published by the Author. 1880.

<sup>7</sup> "Seven Stories. About Old Folks and Young Ones." By A. R. Hope. Author of "Buttons," "Stories of Whitminster," &c. &c. London: Griffith and Farran. 1880.

<sup>8</sup> "Sussex Stories." By Mrs. Robert O'Reilly. Author of "Phoebe's Fortunes," "The Girls of the Square," &c. &c. London: Strahan & Co. 1880.

step in the right direction. By the way, Mrs. O'Reilly is one of those good people, who are so abundant in country villages, who think that there is some mysterious connection between a large crop of haws and a hard winter.

There is a certain amount of "go" in an "Australian Heroine," which carries the reader pleasantly enough along. For instance, the description of Esther at the Crystal Palace is well described, especially how she enjoyed the pantomime and the transformation scene, and how she almost became a part of Fairy Land. The book, however, does not make any pretensions to any high literary qualities.

On the other hand, as a work of art, "A Dreamer"<sup>10</sup> must certainly be ranked high. The authoress has a good eye for character. There is an individuality about her personages which promises still better things for the future. Her analysis of feelings, especially of woman's feelings, is often very shrewd and subtle. What is wanting is a certain lightness of touch. This, however, will come in time.

• Two stories, each in two volumes, may be classed together. Both authors have far more than average powers of description. The author of "El Dorado"<sup>11</sup> has, in addition, a strong mimetic gift. The most touching scene in "Martha and Mary"<sup>12</sup> is that in the hospital. It is drawn with much tenderness. The remarks, too, upon woman's place and mission are also excellent. The whole book, in fact, shows reading and reflection. We regret that we have not more room to do its many merits justice.

The remaining novels can only be briefly noticed. "The Sword of Damocles"<sup>13</sup> possesses a knowledge of English, and "Prince Hugo"<sup>14</sup> of Continental, life. The last is emphatically a bright and lively tale. "Dignity and Grace"<sup>15</sup> is a trifle heavy, showing, perhaps, rather more dignity than grace. Still it is very readable. Some passages, too, are amusing.

Nothing can be more perfect than Mr. Swinburne's Introduction to his "Thalassius."<sup>16</sup> It may not only be placed side by side with the happiest passages in his "Atalanta in Calydon," and "Erechtheus," but may challenge comparison with any descriptive passage in the whole range of English poetry. We have Mr. Swinburne here at his

<sup>9</sup> "An Australian Heroine." By R. Murray Prior. London: Chapman and Hall. 1880.

<sup>10</sup> "A Dreamer." By Katherine Wylde. In Three Volumes. London: William Blackwood & Sons. 1880.

<sup>11</sup> "El Dorado." A Novel. By Alfred Leigh. London: Remington & Co. 1880.

<sup>12</sup> "Martha and Mary." In Two Volumes. London: Smith, Elder & Co.

<sup>13</sup> "The Sword of Damocles." By Theodore A. Tharp. London: Chapman & Hall. 1880.

<sup>14</sup> "Prince Hugo." By Miss Grant. London: Chapman & Hall. 1880.

<sup>15</sup> "Her Dignity and Grace." A Tale. By H. C. London: Chapman and Hall. 1880.

<sup>16</sup> "Songs of the Spring-tides." By Algernon Charles Swinburne. London: Chatto & Windus. 1880.



best, not disfigured by any tricks of alliteration, and not obscured by any fantastic imagery. The more the passage is studied, the more do its beauties appear. We shall, therefore, make no apology for quoting what must some day take its place amongst the classical beauties of English poetry:—

“ Upon the flowery forefront of the year,  
 One wandering by the grey-green April sea  
 Found on a reach of shingle and shallower sand  
 Inlaid with starrier glimmering jewellery,  
 Left for the sun’s love and the light wind’s cheer,  
 Along the foam-flowered strand  
 Breeze-brightened, something nearer sea than land,  
 Though the last shoreward blossom-fringe was near,  
 A babe asleep with flower-soft face that gleamed  
 To sun and seaward as it laughed and dreamed,  
 Too sure of either love for either’s fear.”

Now here we have the perfection of description, fresh, clear-cut, and set in most exquisite rhythm. The question which naturally rises in one’s mind after reading this passage is, why will Mr. Swinburne, who can write like this—who, in short, can write as no other poet in this generation can—give way to the extravagances and obscurities which meet us in other parts of the volume. There is no use in pointing them out. Mr. Swinburne must know them as well as we do. We must, therefore, suppose that he has some reason in writing them. We must hope, however, that it is but a passing mood which produces such fantastic freaks. How great Mr. Swinburne can be, how marvellous is his power over our language, let the following lines in the “Garden of Cymodice” show:—

“ Was it here, in the waste of his waters,  
 That the lordly north-wind, when his love  
 For the finest of many kings’ daughters  
 Bore down for a spoil from above?  
 Chose forth of all farthest far islands  
 As a haven to harbour her head,  
 Of all lowlands on earth and all highlands  
 His bride-worthy bed ?

“ Or haply, my sea-flower, he found thee  
 Made fast as with anchors to land,  
 And broke, that his waves might be round thee,  
 Thy fetters like rivets of sand ?  
 And afar by the blast of him drifted  
 Thy blossom of beauty was borne,  
 As a lark by the heart of her lifted  
 To mix with the morn ?”

The volume contains many more gems equally beautiful. On the whole, it must most certainly take its place by the side of Mr. Swinburne’s best work. We cannot, however, close it without expressing our especial gratitude to Mr. Swinburne for his sonnet on the proposed monument to the son of Napoleon III. One word more, the

book, above all things, proves to us, what we have once or twice ventured to say, that Mr. Swinburne is essentially a poet rather than a prose-writer, and that he is simply untrue to himself when he descends into controversies such as have lately engaged him. We trust for the future that we may see him only in his singing robes.

There can, we think, be no doubt that "The City of Dreadful Night"<sup>17</sup> contains many passages of great beauty. The impress of real genius is upon it, but genius which is only likely to be appreciated by a few. About three years ago a little book, very like it in spirit, "Songs and Sonnets," by "Proteus," made its appearance. With the exception of three or four notices, that most striking volume was treated with silence by the press. Mr. Thomson must not be surprised if a similar fate awaits his own poems. He is both a scholar and a thinker. In short, he writes above the heads of the multitude. In these days, in proportion to the depth of his thoughts is a poet unpopular. The most popular poet of the day is Longfellow. He numbers probably thousands of readers, where a man like Matthew Arnold has only one. But that one, let us remember, is worth all the thousands. Mr. Thomson must console himself with some such reflection. He must also remember that the poet who looks on the dark side of life is hardly likely to find so many admirers as he who prophesies soft things. Then, again, there is a certain general feeling with mankind, by no means ill-founded, that poetry should be the healer of our woes—be, as Hesiod says, *Δημοσύνη τε κακῶν ἄμπαυμί τε μερμηραῶν*. It is quite true that the "Rubaiat" of Omar Kharyan has gone through several editions in a few years, but this is owing partly to its transcendently magnificent imagery. Out of a certain circle the "Rubaiat" is utterly unknown. It is not to be found on the shelves of provincial libraries. We say all this to warn Mr. Thomson of the fate which probably awaits his book with the general public. The general public will not for one moment bear to be told, as Mr. Thomson tells it—

"The sense that sorry struggle brings defeat,  
Because Fate holds no prize to crown success;  
That all the oracles are dumb or cheat,  
Because they have no secret to express;  
That none can pierce the vast black veil uncertain  
Because there is no light beyond the curtain,  
That all is vanity and nothingness."

The public, on the other hand, like to be told that nothing is more certain than their oracle, and any one who doubts a single word of it is at once denounced as an Atheist. One of the finest of Mr. Thomson's poems after "The City of Dreadful Night," or, in other words, Life, is an allegory of "The Naked Goddess." The poem is not merely marked by great beauty both of thought and felicity of language,

---

<sup>17</sup> "The City of Dreadful Night; and other Poems." By James Thomson ("B. V.") London: Reeves and Turner. 1880.

but by a quaint subtle humour, which is a characteristic of many of Mr. Thomson's pieces. "The Naked Goddess" is, as we interpret the poem, Nature herself. She dwells alone, beautiful and "naked as a lily gleaming." Reports of her reach the town, and there is at once a strong feeling amongst all respectable people, just as there is now with regard to the Venus of Malos, that she ought to be clothed. "Fye! Fye!" is the cry. A deputation went out, headed apparently by the Society for the Suppression of Vice, to beg Nature to be a little more decent. The deputation found her in a wood:—

"Four broad beech-trees, great of bole,  
Crowned the green, smooth-swelling knoll ;  
There she leant, the glorious form  
Dazzling with its beauty warm,  
Naked as the sun of noon,  
Naked as the midnight moon ;  
And around her tame and mild  
All the forest creatures wild,—  
Lion, panther, kid, and fawn,  
Eagle, hawk, and dove all drawn  
By the magic of her splendour,  
By her great voice rich and tender,  
Whereof every beast and bird  
Understood each tone and word,  
While she fondled and caressed,  
Playing freaks of joyous zest."

Then follows a remarkably powerful passage, telling how the lion awes the Philistines, how the Goddess—

"Smote them with the flash and blaze  
Of her terrible swift gaze."

After a time, however, the Philistines pluck up courage, and the Archbishop lectures her on the indecency of going naked, and begs of her, as our own late Archbishop did the Crystal Palace statues, to at least put on a fig-leaf. Then she tries on the various dresses which are brought to her:—

"She arose and went half down,  
Took the vestal sister's gown,  
Tried it on, burst through its shroud,  
As the sun burns through a cloud :  
Flung it from her split and rent ;  
Said : 'This cerement sad was meant  
For some creature, stunted, thin,  
Breastless, blighted, bones and skin.'

"Then the sage's robe she tried,  
Muffling in its long robes wide  
All her lithe and glorious grace :  
'I should stumble every pace !'

"So she flung it off again  
With a gesture of disdain.

“Naked as the midnight moon,  
 Naked as the sun of noon,  
 Burning too intensely bright,  
 Clothed in its own dazzling light ;  
 Seen less thus than in the shroud  
 Of morning mist or evening cloud,  
 She stood terrible and proud,  
 O'er the pallid quivering crowd.”

Let those who will read between the lines. There is no necessity for us to interpret the words. Immediately after this scene the Goddess flies away into the air, and is seen no more. The Philistines and their bishops return to their city ; but all things go wrong, and a gloom falls upon the world. The most beautiful part, however, of the allegory is the incident of two little children, a boy and a girl, who come to the Goddess and beg to live with her in the wood. She takes no notice of their request at the time, but the children grow up and at length marry. One day they take a boat, which floats out to sea, and bears them away to the island of Atlantis, and there they once more meet the Goddess. Another equally beautiful allegory is “Hebe” telling how Nature offers to us all a cup of nectar to drink, but how we all of us adulterate it with poison, and are never content to drink it pure. Amongst the satirical poems let us call especial attention to “Virtue and Vice.” It might have taken for its motto Thackeray's saying, “The bad do much harm, but no one knows how much evil the good do.” Lastly, the volume closes with some admirable translations of Heine, with whose genius Mr. Thomson has so much in common. Let us strongly recommend “The City of Dreadful Night” to all who are interested in the great problems of existence. Our quotations will show how much beauty it contains. Mr. Thomson, however, cannot well be judged by quotations. His Muse takes a very wide and bold sweep.

Dr. Hake<sup>18</sup> has won for himself a distinct place amongst the poets of the day. His individuality no less than his originality mark him off from the crowd. He imitates no one. He borrows from no one. He refuses to be classified. It is quite true that critics have placed him between Swinburne and Rossetti, and in one or two points there is a certain affinity between him and these two great poets. His love for Nature, his sympathy with all human interest, more especially, too, with those problems which have a special interest in our own day, are the connecting links between Dr. Hake and the authors of “Songs before Sunrise,” and “Jenny.” But Dr. Hake's treatment is far more analytical than theirs. This is probably the reason why he is not so popular as they are. His subtlety of thought and of argument makes him at times somewhat difficult to follow. Dr. Hake demands study, and this the average reader of poetry will not give. His fresh-

<sup>18</sup> “Maiden Ecstasy.” By Thomas Gordon Hake, M.D., Author of “Parables and Tales,” “New Symbols,” “Legends of the Morrow,” &c. &c. London : Chatto & Windus. 1880.

ness of thought, his colour, and above all his style, will well repay no little labour. "Maiden Ecstasy" fulfills all the promises of Dr. Hake's earlier works. The two finest poems in the collection are, perhaps, "The Betrothal," and "The Dancing Girl." They will unfortunately from their length not admit of quotation, and to give extracts would simply do them injustice. In both of them we find Dr. Hake's subtlety of analysis, power of expression, and originality of thought. His new volume will certainly do something more than sustain his reputation. But there is always a "but" with the critic, and we must for our part confess that we find a certain limitation in both Dr. Hake's ideas and his style. We may be wrong in finding fault on this score. When a man brings us sugar, the best, too, that he has, we have no right to blame him for not bringing salt. We, however, venture to throw out this hint to Dr. Hake. We think that it would be as well for him to throw a somewhat wider net. There is, further, a certain stiffness, arising probably from the weight of thought, in his verse, which, perhaps, it would be as well to shake off. This last peculiarity is not at times, however, unaccompanied with a certain dignified effect, which we should be sorry to lose, and which gives a charm of its own to Dr. Hake's writings. It is a difficult problem how to separate one from the other. Dr. Hake, will, however, we trust, perceive our meaning, and take our suggestion for what it is worth.

Mr. Milne,<sup>19</sup> we feel certain, is a most well-intentioned man. But good intentions, though they may serve as pavement for a certain place, will not make the foundations of a poem. He is, too, a lover of Nature and a lover of books. But these two qualifications, even when combined with good grammar, will not make a poet. Here, for instance, is a stanza from a poem of Mr. Milne's on a violet:—

"Oft 'neath other plants thou growest,  
Loving best the place that's lowest;  
But beneath the foot they tread thee,  
If less modest now they heed thee."

It is hopeless to expect much from a man who thinks that "tread" and "heed" make a rhyme. But worse than Mr. Milne's want of ear is his misplaced jocularity.

Bad as Mr. Milne's jocularity is, it is far outdone by the author of "The Tale of the Three Tinkers."<sup>20</sup> This book comprises all the worst characteristics of our lowest comic journals.

Some years ago we used to fancy that Mr. Barlow<sup>21</sup> had in him the

<sup>19</sup> "Thoughts in Rhyme and Prose. Relating chiefly to Subjects Ethical, Historical, Social and Philosophical." By William Milne, A.M. Edinburgh: William P. Nimmo. 1880.

<sup>20</sup> "The Tale of the Three Tinkers. With Notes and a Glossary." By Eugenio. London: Remington and Co. 1880.

<sup>21</sup> "Time's Whisperings. Sonnets and Songs." By George Barlow, Author of "Through Death to Life," &c. &c. Remington and Co. 1880.

true poetic gift. He has not, however, fulfilled the promises which his earlier poems held forth. He may not actually have gone back, but he has not gone forward. He writes eternally on the same old theme,—his own personal love affairs—until we are thoroughly tired. In the next place, he writes far too much and far too often. In the present volume he favours us with some some personal disclosures. From one of his sonnets we learn that he is still quite young. On the score of age, there is therefore no reason whatever why he should not make good the promise which his first poems most indubitably gave. He is only now at an age when many first think about writing. If, however, Mr. Barlow means to achieve anything great, he must give up his present lotus-eating, philandering muse. He has without doubt a very great command of language, and an excellent ear for rhythm. His eye for colour is equally good, and his similes and metaphors are marked by originality. With these gifts he ought to have achieved a far greater success than he has done. We trust that he may be yet true to himself.

The author of "Betrayed,"<sup>22</sup> who for nearly three hundred closely printed octavo pages has been abusing the Muses, concludes by abusing his critics :—

"Now, critics, how! fret, rave and scold!  
Like hungry wolves on frozen wold.

Who ne'er a sentence kind could mould,  
Save unto ye was shown some gold."

We are afraid that all the gold in the world cannot gild this doggrel. Very different is Sir Philip Perring's<sup>23</sup> address to his critics :—

"Think not, O man, who dost this book review,  
I fancy all within is good and new :  
Much it contains has been already said,  
And may perchance be elsewhere better read."

Sir Philip Perring, in fact, addresses his readers—for all intelligent readers are as much critics, each in their way, as the professional reviewer—in the spirit of Fuller : "I envy no man who knows more than I do, but I pity all who know less." It is a real pleasure to meet a clergyman of the Church of England so thoroughly liberal-minded, who dares to speak about "a creed so presumptuously precise in its definitions and distinctions; so daringly dogmatic in its sweeping denunciations, as the so-called Creed of St. Athanasius." The greater portion of Sir Philip Perring's volume is taken up with devotional pieces. They are all marked by a devout and liberal spirit. The translations at the end show both refinement and scholarship.

<sup>22</sup> "Betrayed. A Northern Tale." In Seven Parts. By J. D. Hylton, Author of the "Heir of Lyolynn." New Jersey : Palmyre. London : Trübner & Co. 1880.

<sup>23</sup> "The Spirit and the Muse. Containing Original Hymns and other Poems with Translations from the Odes of Horace." By Sir Philip Perring, Bart., late Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge. London : Longmans, Green & Co. 1880.

The subject-matter of "Ave"<sup>24</sup> disarms it from any severe criticism. Like "In Memoriam," it mourns the loss of one dearly loved; but, unlike "In Memoriam," possesses no depth of thought. The little volume, we ought to add, is most daintily bound.

"Allaooddeen"<sup>25</sup> possesses some real merits, a manly style, and no slight knowledge of human nature. We fear, however, that a drama on such a subject, even though it is only in three acts, will hardly find favour with the public. Of the miscellaneous pieces we prefer *The Gate of Westminster Abbey*. There is a fine manly ring about it.

Still less chance of success is there, we fear, for Mr. Williams' drama of "*The Princess Elizabeth*."<sup>26</sup> We can, however, very safely say that it is good imitation work of the Elizabethan dramatists, and that the songs are pretty. But if the whole play were twice as good, we do not think that it would be successful. The age of the drama is, as we have said over and over again, past. We already possess a dramatic literature such as no other nation, not even the Greek, possesses. Men will not readily be tempted to lay down their Shakespeare, and take up a play by some unknown writer. Both the dramas which we have just noticed are full of merit. Their authors are evidently men of cultivation, and one of them most certainly possesses the rare gift of song-writing. Why do they not try some other field for their powers than the abandoned ground of the drama? It has been proposed to revive the masque in some new form. We certainly think that this is a far more hopeful task than to attempt to resuscitate the Elizabethan drama. The masque, it should be remembered, never did attain its full glory, and was prematurely destroyed by the mistaken zeal of the Puritans. The masque is capable of further development, a development peculiarly suited to the needs and tastes of the day, which the Elizabethan drama is not. The matter cannot now be dealt with in these pages. We may, however, have some other opportunity of recurring to this most important subject.

It is said that our great living poet was once asked what he thought of the poetry of the day, and that he replied he was surprised at its high standard of general excellence. Certainly, the poetry which we have received this quarter has been much above the average. Here, for instance, is "*The Prince's Quest*,"<sup>27</sup> by Mr. Watson, which would, if it had been published a hundred years ago, most certainly have taken its place amongst standard English poetry. Now we are doubtful if it will attract any attention save amongst a few lovers of poetry. In these days it would almost seem as if quantity as well as quality were necessary to ensure success. Mr. Watson will pro-

<sup>24</sup> "Ave." By Meta Orred. London: Smith, Elder & Co.

<sup>25</sup> "Allaooddeen: a Tragedy; and other Poems." By the Author of "Constance." London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1880.

<sup>26</sup> "The Princess Elizabeth. A Lyric Drama." By Francis H. Williams. Philadelphia: Claxton, Romsen & Haffelfinger. London: Trübner & Co. 1880.

<sup>27</sup> "The Prince's Quest: and other Poems." By William Watson. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1880.

bably be disgusted at the apathy with which his book will be received, and will write no more. We cannot make our assertions good by quotations, for we have no space; but "The Prince's Quest" rises certainly far above the general average of poems of the day, and is distinguished by three characteristics now too often utterly neglected—perfect clearness of style, absence of all fantastic imagery, and, above all, harmonious expression.

"The Ode of Life"<sup>28</sup> ought to be the most popular of all the works by the author of "The Epic of Hades." People flock to hear Mr. Stopford Brooke, or Dean Stanley, or the Bishop of Manchester preach, but in this book they will hear a voice more eloquent than theirs, dealing with the most important subjects that can ever occupy the thoughts of man. We have often said that the views of the author of "The Epic of Hades" are not our views, and there is now no necessity for again discussing the question. In "The Ode of Life" we find the same smooth style, the same happy metaphors, the same clearness of thought, and the same graceful flow of rhythm which in his other works won for the writer so many admirers.

Here, at the end of the volumes of poetry, we may fitly put "The English Poets,"<sup>29</sup> edited by Mr. Ward. The introduction, by Mr. Matthew Arnold, has in these days, when the battle between poetry, science, and theology is being so bitterly, because so ignorantly, fought, an especial value. Mr. Arnold takes for his text his own words:—"The future of poetry is immense, because in poetry, where it is worthy of its high destinies, our race, as time goes on, will find an ever and ever surer stay. There is not a creed which is not shaken, not an accredited dogma which is not shown to be questionable, not a received tradition which does not threaten to dissolve." And he goes on in the next page to add, "More and more, mankind will discover that we have to turn to poetry to interpret life for us, to console us, to sustain us. Without poetry our science will appear incomplete; and most of what now passes with us for religion and philosophy will be replaced by poetry." Goethe has said something to the same effect, but never so clearly and so fully. Then Mr. Arnold proceeds to repeat his much-misunderstood definition of poetry as "a criticism of life," and goes on, if the reader will only carefully mark the meaning of the whole of the next two or three pages, to really explain what the definition means. He makes clear who amongst the poets have been critics of life, and who have not, and why they have not. We must, however, leave the preface and turn to the book itself. The plan upon which it has been compiled is the only right one, that each author should be treated by some one who has made an especial study either of the author, or of, in other cases, of the period and school of

<sup>28</sup> "The Ode of Life." By the Author of "The Epic of Hades." London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1880.

<sup>29</sup> "The English Poets. Selections, with Critical Introductions." By various Writers, and a General Introduction by Matthew Arnold. Edited by Thomas Humphrey Ward, M.A. Vol. I. Chaucer to Donne. Vol. II. Ben Jonson to Dryden. London: Macmillan & Co. 1880.



poetry. Thus, the Rector of Lincoln College rightfully takes Milton, Professor Dowden Shakspeare, and Mr. Lang the English Ballads. Perhaps, here and there, a lover of poetry may detect the omission of some favourite piece, but there certainly never has been any collection of English poetry which has been at once so choice and so comprehensive. Perhaps it is not too late to urge that Mr. Lang or Mr. Gosse, or some other kindred spirit, should just look through the privately printed volumes of the Roxburgh and other similar clubs, and see if there be not something worth gleaning. It is many years since we did so, and our estimate now might be very different to what it was then. We fancy, however, that in such a poem as "Caltha," and one or two other similar pieces, some genuine bits of poetry, utterly unknown to the world, might be found. The value, however, of Mr. Ward's work consists not only in the collection of poems, but in the admirable criticisms which are prefixed to each author. This must give the book a special character of its own. In most collections authors are pitched together, without a word of comment, in an alphabetical order. It would be invidious, when all are so good, to select any of the criticisms for especial praise. Some of them, as the Rector's of Lincoln, ably support the lines of thought laid down in Mr. Arnold's preface. Mr. Arnold quotes Aristotle's observation that "the superiority of poetry over history consists in possessing a higher truth." Mr. Pattison still further compresses the saying, "truth of poetry may be called philosophical truth; truth of fact, historical," and people who do not know this, do not know what poetry is, nor what is meant by poetry being "a criticism of life."

All lovers of the two Brownings will welcome two new volumes of Selections.<sup>30 31</sup> They appear to be made with the same care and taste which distinguished the former series.

Those who still trifle with the Latin Muse cannot do better than add Dr. Kynaston's new volume<sup>32</sup> to the "Sabrinæ Corolla," and the "Arundines Cami."

"Wreaths of Smoke"<sup>33</sup> is a hybrid book, half prose and half verse, and we do not know which of the two is the worst. The bane of the book is its forced facetiousness. The author, however, has been guilty of a far more literary offence in attributing certain well-known lines to his hero, and in another place suggesting that Poe plagiarized "Annabel Lee" from a poem written by his hero. This may be the author's idea of wit. It is the first time, however, that humour has been confounded with what is forbidden by the Ninth Commandment. His statement about Darwin and the dog which always walked on its hind-legs may be placed in the same category. It would be well practi-

<sup>30</sup> "Selections from the Poetical Works of Robert Browning." Second Series. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1880.

<sup>31</sup> "A Selection from the Poetry of Elizabeth Barrett Browning." Second Series. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1880.

<sup>32</sup> "Exemplaria Cheltoniensia." Redditi: H. Kynaston, M.A. Londoni: apud Macmillan et Soc. 1880.

<sup>33</sup> "Wreaths of Smoke." By T. V. Published by the Author. 1880.

cally to remind such persons that the law of libel still exists. Criticism is powerless to deal with such offenders.

Mr. Poste's translation of the "Diosemeia" of Aratus<sup>34</sup> seems to promise the fulfilment of Ovid's line,

"Cum sole et lunâ semper Aratus erit."

As every scrap of weather-lore is now eagerly collected, we have no doubt that Mr. Poste's translation will be welcomed by meteorologists. The notes show much varied and out-of-the-way reading.

The anonymous collector of "Tuscan Fairy Tales"<sup>35</sup> has given us a thoroughly delightful book. The comparative mythologist and the child will alike find something to gratify their very different tastes. We are here taken thoroughly out of the prosaic working-day world. The good are all rewarded, and the bad all punished except in one case, where some robbers are made governors of provinces; but this also happens, we fancy, sometimes out of fairyland. The collector tells us that he has taken the whole of these tales from the mouths of the Tuscan peasantry. We only hope that our Folk-Lore Society may be half as fortunate with the English peasant. The first story goes back to the days when animals could speak. In those days the cats kept a convent, of which the Gatto Mammone was the head. To this convent went little Lisina, a peasant girl, to wait upon the cats. By her good conduct she soon won over all the cats' hearts. When she was about to leave, the Gatto Mammone asked her "Whether she would be dipped in a jar of oil or gold?" "Oil," answered Lisina. So into oil she was dipped, and came out shining all over in gold. "Now, as you go home, you shall meet a cock and a donkey; turn to the cock, but not to the donkey," said the Gatto Mammone. So the child did, and her beauty increased, and a golden star appeared on her forehead. At this point the real interest of the story begins, but we have no space to read the riddle. How Lisina's beauty becomes her curse, how her mother and sister combine to ruin her, and how at last she marries a prince, the reader must find out from the book itself. The second story is called The Fairies' Sieve, and is, in part, a version of the first; but only in a fragmentary condition. There are one or two incidents in it, and one or two characters, which would seem to show that in its perfect state it had been full of dramatic interest. In the story of The Three Cauliflowers we have our own Blue Beard reproduced, but in a much more poetical shape. The tale, however, which we like best is the King of Portugal's Cowherd. There are one or two delightful strokes of humour in it, such as the incidents of an ogre going all over the world begging someone to kill him, for, since he has lost his brother, life was not worth living. At last a little cowherd kills him, and is rewarded by a magnificent castle, the furniture of which is gold, whilst the flowers and the fruits in the garden are

<sup>34</sup> "The Skies and Weather Forecasts of Aratus." Translated, with Notes, by E. Poste, M.A. London: Macmillan & Co. 1880.

<sup>35</sup> "Tuscan Fairy Tales." With Sixteen Illustrations. By J. Stanley. London: W. Satchell & Co. 1880.

jewels. Virtue and "Little Billee" were never before so well rewarded. The illustrations are amateurish, but they possess a humour which makes us overlook their obvious defects. We trust that the author may be persuaded to publish the other stories which he has collected on the same ground. If they at all resemble the present collection, they will, we are quite sure, be heartily welcomed.

Mr. Yardley<sup>36</sup> has taken a good subject. He has, however, not made the most of it. This in a great measure arises from his having tried to compress too much into too small a space. He evidently not only likes his subject, but has taken great pains. His reading has been wide, if not deep. But in trying to be brief, he has done himself injustice. At least double the space was requisite. Works of art—for fairy tales and fiction of all kinds are works of art—require to be treated with art. The average reader soon becomes wearied when he is presented with mere details, and puzzled with constant allusions about which he probably knows nothing, but about which he probably came to this very book to learn something. Further, Mr. Yardley is too much of a mere collector of the magpie type. He is not sufficiently critical. It is not pleasant to meet with such a sentence as "According to the modern wise men, such as Professors Max Müller and De Gubernatis, most, if not all, of the beautiful old stories are simply allegorical, and may be explained by natural phenomena, such as the rising and the setting of the sun. They may be right, but one would rather not believe so. The explanation makes the old stories somewhat uninteresting" (p. 138). Now, Mr. Yardley has certainly no right to sneer in this fashion at two men so infinitely his superiors. If Mr. Yardley does not believe in Max Müller's theories, let him refute them. But the whole reason of the existence of such books as Mr. Yardley's is, that they shall serve as a go-between the public and the best minds of the day. A great many people have neither the leisure nor the learning to read the works of Max Müller and De Gubernatis, and are only too glad to have some popular account of them. Had Mr. Yardley done this, he would have made his work doubly acceptable. As it stands, it is by no means badly compiled. It is full both of fairy and folk-lore. One of Mr. Yardley's fables we shall venture to borrow, telling how like will also associate with like, or, as the Greek proverb has it, how jackdaw will always mate with jackdaw. Once, when the world was young, a man found a mouse, which was changed into a beautiful girl. When the girl grew up she wanted, not only a husband, but the mightiest of all things for a husband. • So the sun was entreated to be her husband, but declined, saying that the cloud which hid his rays was stronger than he. The cloud was next besought, but also declined, alleging that the wind which blew him about was far stronger than he. The wind then was asked in marriage, but he answered that the mountain which hindered his progress was stronger than he. Then the mountain was asked, but he said "No, the rat which pierces my

<sup>36</sup> "The Supernatural in Romantic Fiction." By Edward Yardley. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1880.

sides is my master." The girl was therefore engaged to the rat; but, to make the match more equal, was transformed back again to a mouse. So, as is generally the case in such marriages, the dish was fit for the cover.

Amongst reprints, we may notice a handsome edition of Washington Irving's works,<sup>37</sup> and another of Lauder's "Highland Legends."<sup>38</sup>

### MISCELLANEA.

DR. HUEFFER apologizes in his preface for republishing his collection of articles on various musical topics on the ground that such articles have, as a rule, only a temporary interest and do not call for republication in volume form.<sup>1</sup> This is no doubt true of the generality of newspaper and magazine articles, but, in Dr. Hueffer's case very distinct exception must be made to the rule. All the essays contained in this volume have a special value, not only to musical students, but to all lovers of literature, which fully justifies their being preserved in some enduring form. His article, for example, on Thayer's Beethoven is for all practical purposes as instructive to the general reader as a study of the book itself would be. Mr. A. W. Thayer's immense volumes require some such condensation and explanation as Dr. Hueffer has afforded them, and even those who are determined to go through their exhaustive pages will feel very grateful for the explanation and assistance which this article will give them. The way in which Dr. Hueffer treats the love affairs of the great musician will be of special interest to those who regard the passionate side of any great artist's life as being of paramount importance. According to many thinkers the source of artistic inspiration is most often to be found in the relationships with women, which great poets and great painters and great musicians have entered into. It is for this reason that people are especially anxious to know who was the Lesbia of Catullus, and whether the Laura of Petrarch was really the wife of Hugh de Sade, or what were the characteristics of the young lady who inspired Keats with so fatal an attachment. To this school of thinkers Dr. Hueffer's account of Beethoven's romantic affection for the beautiful Countess Guicciardi will be intensely attractive. It seems, however, that she must not be regarded as the idol of Beethoven's life and the inspiration of some of his finest compositions, and that the immortal love to whom he refers in the famous undated letter is not after all the beautiful countess to whom the moonlight sonata is dedicated, but some different and unknown lady. The next article in the volume, that on Chopin, will be especially dear to the numerous admirers of this master's music. Dr.

<sup>37</sup> "Irving's Works." Geoffrey Crayon Edition. Complete in Twenty-six Vols. Vol. I. New York: Putnam & Sons. 1880.

<sup>38</sup> "Highland Legends." By Sir Thomas Dick Lauder, Bart. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co. 1880.

<sup>1</sup> "Musical Studies." By Francis Hueffer. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black. 1880.

Hueffer has gone with great care and elaborateness into the early biography of Chopin's life, and has elicited a very large number of interesting facts. On the same principle which associates Beethoven's name with that of the Countess Guicciardi, the name of Chopin is linked eternally, like that of the wayward and unhappy poet Alfred de Musset, with the name of George Sand. On this point Dr. Hueffer is very instructive. The relationships between Chopin and George Sand are described with a calm and unimpassioned psychology which, if it does not gratify the poetic aspirations of the reader who wishes for romance in everything, is of great importance as a genuine account of one of the most remarkable friendships in history. The article on Richard Wagner's Ring of the Niblung will commend itself to the devotees of the modern German master, and is also of great use to those who are interested in drawing comparisons between the genuine Norse story and the version to which Herr Wagner has given a musical immortality. But the most important article in the volume to our mind is that on Arthur Schopenhauer. It is at first rather surprising to find an article on the great German pessimist in a volume apparently devoted to the consideration of purely musical topics; but Dr. Hueffer shows that Wagner adopted the results of Schopenhauer's philosophy—he has, indeed, been somewhat absurdly called the musical expounder of pessimism—and that for this reason alone he deserves the attention of all intelligent musicians. Still, though Dr. Hueffer thus subtly gives to this article an appearance of connection with the main purpose of his work, it must be admitted that the article deals chiefly with Schopenhauer as a philosopher rather than a contributor to any knowledge of music, and this indeed is not a defect, but rather a merit in the article. A clearer and wider knowledge of Schopenhauer is really very much of a necessity at the present time when almost every young man who at all goes in for "higher culture" poses as a disciple of the author of "The World as Will and Imagination," and figures at æsthetic teas as a pupil of the doctrines of pessimism. No one is better qualified than Dr. Hueffer to explain what Arthur Schopenhauer really thought and taught on the subjects of morality and metaphysics, and it is not too much praise to say that those who read this article with attention will understand more of Arthur Schopenhauer's life and works than they could from that of any other work on the subject in the English language. The service that Dr. Hueffer rendered to the music of the future by his first volume, and to the study of *Provençal* literature in his second, he has rendered not only to music again, but to philosophy, in this his latest and in many respects his most attractive volume.

Mr. Vernon Lee, if that be the author's real name, has written one of the most fascinating books that it has been our good fortune to meet with for a very long time.<sup>2</sup> Probably no portion of the history of the eighteenth century is less known than that which relates to Italy. Mr. Vernon Lee has therefore done good service to literature

<sup>2</sup> "Studies of the Eighteenth Century in Italy." By Vernon Lee. W. Satchell Co. 1880.

in these his collected contributions to a more extended knowledge on the subject. The author seems to be completely steeped in the life and the action of the time he is describing, and his style has not a little of the peculiar charm which belongs to the easy introduction of comprehensive culture which Mr. George Augustus Sala has made so peculiarly his own. Perhaps the most interesting article in the whole volume is that on the Arcadian Academy. It is to be feared that most persons now-a-days have forgotten what the Arcadian Academy was. At one time it was probably the most fashionable institution of poetry and letters that the world has ever seen, the Courts of Love not excepted. It began one verdant spring morning of the year 1692, when a party of fourteen men of letters met together in the large pastured tracts behind the Castle of St. Angelo to read and improvise verses. Impressed by the beauty of the scene, one of them exclaimed, "It seems to-day as if Arcadia were revived for us." "His speech was hailed as an inspiration, and it was immediately determined that since Arcadia had been thus happily recuscitated it should be kept alive by their care. The first and most obvious necessity was to exchange their real names for such as would suit their new capacity of Arcadian shepherds, and fourteen pastoral names and surnames were forthwith written on as many slips of paper, which were extracted in the order that fate ordained out of the hat of one of the company. This being done, the fourteen shepherds in black coats, bands, and horsehair wigs, pastoral lawyers, physicians, priests, and professors, set about framing the constitution of the newly created state. It was republican, but paternal. The head of the state was called *Custode*, and to him were given two subordinates or *Vice-Custodi*. Such was the rudimentary form of government." Mr. Vernon Lee goes on to describe how the fortunes of the Arcadian Academy waxed and flourished, and he describes in a manner that is vividly interesting the famous feud between Crescimbeni and Gravina which led for a time to a violent schism between the Arcadians and the installation of an anti-Arcadia in one of the villas of the curious Mecænas Don Livio Odescalchi. The success of the Academy was for a long time tremendous, and the course of years saw the whole of Italy practically converted into a collection of Arcadias. How at last it fell from all this greatness and became the mock of that scoffing spirit whom Johnson tolerated and Mrs. Thrale detested, Barretti, is told by Mr. Vernon Lee in a singularly attractive manner. Those of our æsthetic people who delight in posturing after the semi-forgotten fashions of thought and custom of the eighteenth century, will find in this book a fund of new ideas and fresh suggestions for which they ought to be exceedingly grateful. England, both early Georgian and Queen Anne, is practically played out, and even France of the Regency or the Directory, with its *Crebillons*, its *Greccourts*, its *Lauzans* and its revolutionists, has been overdone. But the quaint eighteenth century of Italy is practically unknown, except perhaps to a very small number of students of whom Mr. Vernon Lee is the first to make his knowledge popular and attractive. Mr.

Vernon Lee's style is yet capable of much improvement, and he ought to avoid a somewhat awkward habit of frequently repeating himself. But these are but slight defects in an exceedingly delightful and very able volume.

Mr. Mahaffy, whose name is well known as a Greek scholar, has added one more to the many existing histories of Greek literature, both English and foreign.\* Mr. Mahaffy is an exhaustive, but hardly an interesting writer. His style has not that singular poetic grace and beauty of expression which give so intense if so oversweet a charm to the writings of Mr. Addington Symonds. Nor has he that happy combination of erudition and ease which make Professor Jebb's contributions to Greek scholarship so attractive to the general reader as well as to the professional student. But in many ways Mr. Mahaffy's volume will be more useful to the ordinary student of Hellenic literature than those of any of his rivals. He is well read in all that foreign criticism has given us on the subject, and he possesses the inestimable art of presenting his knowledge in a ready and compact form, so that the reader who succeeds in mastering Mr. Mahaffy's two stout volumes will have obtained a very copious body of information on all that modern research has done for the literature of ancient Greece. In the volume which is devoted to the Greek poets he appears to least advantage, for here his usefulness seems to be somewhat counter-balanced by his want of any poetic method of treating the great poets of Greece. Here it is that Mr. Symonds is by far his superior. The student who read through Mr. Symonds' two volumes on the Greek poets would not come away possessed of the peculiarly minute information which a study of Mr. Mahaffy's work would give him, but he would have a far truer and better idea of the beauty of Grecian song, of the splendour of Grecian thought, and would carry away with him a truer impression of the vividness and beauty of that ancient world which was the chief source of Goethe's inspiration. Mr. Mahaffy devotes several chapters to a deep research into the great Homeric controversy. For ourselves we must honestly observe that the whole question seems to us to be at once unimportant and uninteresting. It is to us difficult to understand how men can really care to occupy their time in considerations of whom the Homeric poems were written by; when they were written, what lines are genuine or the reverse, how far the character of Hector is sustained in the different books, and how far the Iliad may be divided into a song of the Trojan war and a separate Achilles. All such questions seem to us as profitless and barren as the tedious work of Mr. Furnival and his new Shakspeare Society appears, and we honestly believe that a boy who has mastered Pope's Homer, not to speak of a singer like Keats on whom the splendour of the Homeric song has shone throughout the lofty life of Chapman, has a deeper and truer acquaintance with the spirit and the beauty of the so-called Homeric poems than the wisest of German critics or the most patient of his English followers. In the volume on

\* "A History of Classical Greek Literature." By the Rev. J. P. Mahaffy, M.A. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1880.

the prose authors Mr. Mahaffy is decidedly satisfactory. He has managed to present the whole field of Hellenic prose literature in a comparatively short space. From the earliest use of prose writing, which won for its inventor the title of "the obscure," down to the last historians of the fourth century B.C., Mr. Mahaffy presents all that practically can be included under the head of classical literature in a very complete and scholarly manner. One of the most interesting and novel features of the two volumes are the biographical paragraphs at the close of the treatment of each author, which indicate to the student the best manuscripts, the *princeps*, and the new editions, as well as studies on the text, which show the amount of interest each author has raised among philologists.

At the present time when a knowledge of modern Greek is gradually becoming more and more of a necessity to all who have any connection with modern politics, the manual of Messrs Dickson and Vincent<sup>4</sup> will prove practically invaluable. Grammars of modern Greek have been written before this, but none which is so well adapted to meet the wants at once of the ordinary student, the traveller, and the politician. The simplicity and yet completeness of this little volume deserves the highest praise, and the manner in which the dialogues have been chosen to express what people may really want to say, rather than distorted and fantastical phrases with little or no bearing upon ordinary existence, marks it off especially from the ordinary kind of grammar. A considerable portion of the volume is devoted to selections from Greek authors, ancient and modern, a translation of the ancient passages into the modern Hellene being always given, and there are several very considerable and important extracts from contemporary Greek authors, translations from Shakspeare, and from the French, and passages from Greek newspapers. So complete is this little volume, that it actually contains a specimen of the curious cursive hand with which the new Hellenes represent the letters that Cadmus gave, and which is so exceedingly difficult for untaught eyes to decipher. We believe that Mr. Gladstone, who, as it is well known, carries on an extensive correspondence with friends in Greece, has had to request his correspondents when writing to him to use the ordinary printed Greek character, and not the writing-hand, which he has not time to obtain the necessary perfection in deciphering. The letter in this handwriting which is given at the end of the volume will certainly seem not a little peculiar to those accustomed to the Greek type of the well-printed English and German classical texts; but it will be well worth acquiring by any who have occasion to visit Greece, or who may be in any way connected with diplomacy. To students of languages of all kinds we most cordially recommend this admirable little volume.

Miss Thompson has issued a third edition of her valuable hand-book

---

<sup>4</sup> "A Handbook to Modern Greek." By Edgar Vincent and T. G. Dickson. Macmillan & Co. 1879.



to the Public Picture Galleries of Europe,<sup>5</sup> which we had occasion to praise very highly when it first appeared. It is now further enriched by a very large number of illustrations of the various and most important pictures of the famous picture galleries, somewhat after the fashion inaugurated by Mr. Blackburn in his "Academy Notes." If the book was valuable before, this improvement has at least doubled its importance as a companion on a foreign tour, or as a useful work of reference.

Many years ago William Godwin, having nothing better to do, and being always ready to write upon any topic whatever, which he thought was likely to sell, wrote a voluminous and ponderous life of Chaucer, which aroused the humour and indignation of Sir Walter Scott, who cut it to pieces in a lengthy and brilliant article. We do books now on a different principle from that adopted by the schoolmen of the type of Godwin. Men now-a-days are specialists who devote their lives to the study of one author, or at most of one class of authors, and bookmakers are happily now few who would be ready at a moment's notice to undertake some work of which they had no previous knowledge whatever, but which they were ready to work up from the writings of others. In the some two hundred pages of Mr. Ward's addition to the series of "English Men of Letters," there is more genuine scholarship than in the whole of Godwin's forgotten volumes, and those who read them through will obtain all the information that modern research and critical inquiry have afforded concerning the life and the writings of the great English poet whom Mr. William Morris has chosen as his master. We can hardly expect anything more will be known of Geoffrey Chaucer than we now know, and in Mr. Ward's book all our knowledge is condensed into an exceedingly agreeable and instructive essay. With some of Mr. Ward's critical opinions we may not quite agree, but we cannot but pay him a tribute of admiration for the scholarly manner in which he has completed a decidedly difficult undertaking.

Among schoolbooks we may mention a new and improved edition of Mr. Rutherford's Greek Grammar;<sup>7</sup> a useful little French Primer by Mr. Bowen;<sup>8</sup> some of Macmillan's admirable School Classics;<sup>9</sup> a very well arranged Geography of Northern Europe, by Mr. Moberly;<sup>10</sup> a capital Logic Primer, by Alfred Milnes;<sup>11</sup> and a valuable Essay upon the principles of learning Modern Languages, especially French, by Francis Lichtenberger.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>5</sup> "A Handbook to the Public Picture Galleries of Europe." By Kate Thompson. Macmillan and Co. 1880.

<sup>6</sup> "Chaucer." By Adolphus William Ward. Macmillan. 1879.

<sup>7</sup> "First Greek Grammar." By W. G. Rutherford. Macmillan.

<sup>8</sup> "First Lessons in French." By H. C. Bowen. Macmillan.

<sup>9</sup> "Virgil. Georgic II." Edited by Rev. J. H. Skrine. Macmillan.

"Select Orations of Cicero." J. R. King.

"Euripides' Alcestis." C. S. Jerram.

"Xenophon, Memorabilia." A. R. Cluer.

<sup>10</sup> "Geography of Northern Europe." By C. E. Moberly. Rivingtons.

<sup>11</sup> "Elementary Notion of Logic." By A. Milnes. Sonnenschein & Allen.

<sup>12</sup> "Modern Languages." By Francis Lichtenberger. Newman & Co.

# CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE
I. <i>Paul and Seneca.</i>	
Drei Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der alten Philosophie und ihres Verhältnisses zum Christenthum. Von Dr. F. C. BAUR. Leipzig. 1876 . . . . .	309
II. <i>The Parliamentary Oath Question : Mr. Bradlaugh's Case.</i>	
1. Report from the Select Committee on the Parliamentary Oath, with the Proceedings of the Committee. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 20th May, 1880.	
2. Report from the Select Committee on Parliamentary Oath (Mr. Bradlaugh), together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence and Appendix. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 16th June, 1880.	
3. "The Times" and other Newspapers for May, June, and July, 1880. "Hansard," vol. 253, Session 1880 . . . . .	333
III. <i>Caroline von Linsingen and King William IV.</i>	
1. Caroline von Linsingen, die Göttin eines Englischen Prinzen. Ungedruckte Briefe und Abhandlungen aus dem Nachlasse des Freiherrn K. von Reichenbach, herausgegeben und mit einer Einleitung versehen. Von . . . Leipzig: Verlag von Duncker und Humblot. 1880. London: Trübner and Co.	
2. Caroline von Linsingen and King William the Fourth. Unpublished Love Letters discovered among the Literary Remains of Baron Reichenbach. Translated, with the German Editor's Introduction, and Baron Reichenbach's Account of the Letters. By THEOPHILUS G. ARUNDEL. London: W. Swan Sonnenschein and Allen, Paternoster Square. 1880 . . . . .	356
IV. <i>Plato and his Times.</i>	
1. The Dialogues of Plato Translated into English. By B. JOWETT, M.A. Second Edition. Oxford. 1875.	
2. Zeller. Die Philosophie der Griechen. Zweiter Theil, Erste Abtheilung. Plato und die alte Academie. Leipzig. 1875.	389
V. <i>Chastity : its Development and Maintenance</i> . . . . .	419

## Contents.

265  
A.M.

PAGE

### VI. "The Religious Instinct" of the House of Commons.

1. The National Reformer; Radical Advocate, and Freethought Journal. Edited by CHARLES BRADLAUGH.
2. The Saturday Review. June 26, 1880.
3. The Nineteenth Century. August, 1880.
4. The Fortnightly Review. August, 1880 . . . . . 487

### *East Indian Currency and Exchange.*

1. The Times, May 23 and 24, and June 13, 1879, containing Debate on the East Indian Budget.
2. The Fortnightly Review for July, 1879; Article, "A Simple Way out of the Indian Difficulty," by ROBERT LOWE.
3. The Nineteenth Century for January, 1879; Article, "The Depreciation of Silver and the Indian Finances," by Colonel GEORGE CHESNEY.
4. Silver and the Indian Exchanges—a Remedy for its Depreciation. Ten Essays submitted to the Secretary of State for India in Council, by Colonel J. T. SMITH, R.E., F.R.S., &c. &c. London: Effingham Wilson.
  - (11) On a Change of Standard for India, and
  - (12) On a Gold Standard and Silver Currency, by Colonel J. T. SMITH, &c. &c. Prepared for the Committee appointed by the Secretary of State for India . . . . . 459

### *India and our Colonial Empire* . . . . . 489

### *Contemporary Literature.*

Theology . . . . .	514
Philosophy . . . . .	524
Politics, Sociology, Voyages, and Travels . . . . .	533
Science . . . . .	553
History and Biography . . . . .	564
Belles Lettres . . . . .	573
Miscellanea . . . . .	588

THE  
WESTMINSTER

AND

FOREIGN QUARTERLY  
REVIEW.

OCTOBER 1, 1880.

ART. I.—PAUL AND SENECA.

*Drei Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der alten Philosophie und ihres Verhältnisses zum Christenthum.* Von Dr. F. C. BAUR. Leipzig, 1876.

IT has been observed by an eminent Catholic divine, whom all men agree in honouring, that “a great portion of what is generally received as Christian truth is in its rudiments or separate parts to be found in heathen philosophies or religions.” Students of classical literature will confirm the justness of this observation, as verified within the limits of that literature. In Seneca, born shortly before the Christian era and long surviving the founder of the new faith, so striking was this generic resemblance, that it proved the pregnant occasion of the birth of a curious legend. This legend, created we know not by whom, but accepted by grave and august authority in the earlier period of the Church, and faithfully transmitted through the Middle Ages, has been defended in a recent day with sincere and ingenious plausibility.\* The profoundly religious character of Seneca’s mind was acknowledged by the eloquent Tertullian when he feelingly claimed him as “often ours.” No truer word, responded Lactantius, could have been spoken by one who knew God, than was spoken by this man to whom the true religion was unknown. Augustine, whose *Confessions* have endeared him to us all, beheld in him the

---

\* By Dr. C. Schmidt, Troplong and Amédée, Fleury.

contemporary of the apostles and the correspondent of Paul. Finally, the learned Jerome inscribed his name in the catalogue of saints, and placed him in the sacred roll of Christian writers, justifying this promotion by an appeal to the "much read letters" interchanged by Seneca and Paul. As a fact, fourteen letters purporting to have passed between the apostle and the philosopher are still extant.

The admission of the genuineness of these letters, the same, as we think, which Jerome admired—is not considered indispensable to the hypothesis of Paul's conversion. Those who with Jerome believe in that conversion, but unlike Jerome regard the present collection as spurious, infer it from what they consider the necessity of the case. They discover in the historical relations of the reputed correspondents, probabilities which, with a little help from the imagination, can easily be exalted into absolute certainties. They point with an air of triumph to Paul's residence at Rome, under the probable supervision of the Prefect of the City, Burrhus, the friend of Seneca, to the probable correspondence of Gallio, with his philosophical brother, to the probable patronage extended by Seneca to the apostle as a probable protégé of the liberal Proconsul of Achaia, to probable secret interviews between the supposed friends, and as the frequency of such interviews might have compromised the security of Seneca, to a probable epistolary inter-communication as a substitute for conversational intercourse. They are confident, moreover, that Paul actually took his proposed journey to Spain, the native land of Seneca, at the desire and with the assistance of the enlightened minister of Nero, who naturally saw in the eloquent agent of his own conversion, the appropriate instrument for the desired conversion of his countrymen.

In the exciting mental conditions which predispose a Fleury or a Troplong to adopt this kind of reasoning, we can only see a revival of the same moral and intellectual motives which created the legend of the correspondence of Seneca and Paul. What the pencil of fancy can depict, is assumed to have historical reality. Our own expectations, our own estimates, our own idiosyncrasies are perverted into the measure of the action and judgment of men remote in time and place, and with habits and mental characteristics all unlike our own. With our present knowledge of St. Paul's conspicuous place in history, as a great religious reformer, we attribute to Gallio or Seneca an interest in his sayings and doings, which, had we lived in their days we should not have felt ourselves. The secret interview, the mysterious correspondence, the prudence that eludes difficulties and baffles a vigilant police, the proconsular communication respecting questions which the liberal official of Rome must have regarded

with perfect indifference, hypothetical motives and an imaginary journey, constitute a chimerical machinery, fabricated by a susceptible imagination, working in unison with pre-existing sentiment, to support the theory of a romantic correspondence between the Pagan philosopher and the Christian saint.

So unquestionably spurious is the still extant sample of this singular correspondence, that to prop up the original myth, a second myth has been manufactured. Our present *Collection*, it is pretended, is not that which Jerome and Augustine had. The older and genuine work, we are first required to believe, was probably written in Greek. This probable Greek original, we are next asked to assume, was unfortunately lost. An anonymous fabrication is then postulated to fill the gap which its disappearance rendered but too conspicuous. Invited by the allusions in Tertullian, Augustine and Jerome, to repair this literary loss, the ingenious fabulist produced a new series of letters, in the bad Latin of the ninth or tenth century; in subject matter so poor, in statement so inaccurate, in picturesque verisimilitude so deficient, that they richly deserve the chronological affiliation assigned them, and might well have appeared in what Dr. Baur denounces as the Midnight of the Middle Ages.

In favour of the intricate hypothesis which we have described, not a single argument can be advanced, and there is at least one textual presumption against it. The wish obscurely expressed by Seneca, in the eleventh letter, that he was in Paul's place, and Paul in his, agrees very well with Jerome's paraphrase: "*optare se dicit esse loci apud suos cujus sit Paulus apud Christianos,*" and supports the inference that our *Collection* existed in the days of that father. Other considerations evince the spuriousness of the correspondence. By a ridiculous misapprehension of the Pauline rule of conduct, "*being all things to all men,*" the apostle in one of these veracious letters, apologizes to Seneca for having placed his own name before that of his correspondent, thereby, as he pretends, contravening the Roman law, which honoured all senators with this titular priority. Seneca, unwilling to be outdone by Paul in courtesy, compliments him in turn on his exalted position, assures him that he has a right to the priority he had assumed, and insinuates that he must be bantering him, adding with a touch that betrays the fabricator, *you know yourself to be a Roman citizen.*

In another of these letters Seneca expresses the satisfaction which he had in reading the Epistles to the Galatians, Corinthians and people of Achaia, and declares that the Emperor was extremely pleased with the sentiments they contained, and quite surprised to find such notions in a person who had had no regular education.

The style, however, he thinks, might be improved, and a less inelegant diction adopted suitable to the majesty of the subject. The objection of Nero, grounded on Paul's want of education, Seneca rebuts by reminding him of a poor rustic, named Vaticanus, to whom somewhere in Reate two men, called Castor and Pollux, appeared, and who was thus privileged to receive a revelation from the gods. Nero, reading with pleasure the Epistles of St. Paul, and Seneca writing to the saint an account of his royal master's impressions, recommending, at the same time, attention to style, and recording his defence of Paul's inspiration by paralleling his case with that of the Pagan countryman, compose a picture too ridiculous for serious criticism. As a conclusive specimen of this authentic correspondence, we subjoin the whole of the twelfth letter, which professes to be written shortly after the famous fire, which was the disastrous incentive to the first persecution of the Christians.

“ANNÆUS SENECA TO PAUL GREETING.\*—All happiness to you my dearest Paul. Do you not suppose that I am extremely concerned and grieved that your innocence should bring you into suffering, and that all the people should believe you so criminal, and imagine all the misfortunes that happen to the city, to be caused by you (the Christians)? But let us bear the charge with a patient temper, appealing for our innocence to the court above, which is the only one our hard fortune will allow us to address, till at length our troubles shall end in unalterable happiness. Former ages have produced tyrants, Alexander the son of Philip, and Dionysius; ours also, has produced Caius Cæsar, whose inclinations were their only laws. As to the frequent burnings of the City of Rome, the cause is manifest; and if a person in my mean circumstances might be allowed to speak, and one might declare these dark things without danger, everyone should see the whole of the matter. The Christians and Jews are indeed commonly punished for the crime of burning the city; but that impious miscreant, who delights in murders and butcheries, and disguises his villainies with lies, is appointed to or reserved till his proper time: and as the life of every excellent person is now sacrificed, instead of that one person, who is the author of the mischief, so this one shall be sacrificed for many, and he shall be devoted to be burned with fire instead of all. One hundred and thirty-two houses and four whole squares *or islands*, were burnt down in six days, the seventh put an end to the burning. I wish you all happiness.” Dated the fifth of the calends of April, in the consulship of Frigius and Bassus.

In this letter the reference to Nero as “reserved to his proper time and devoted to destruction,” recalls the strange legend of

---

\* Our translation will be found in the Apocryphal New Testament, printed for William Hone, 1820.

the primitive Christian belief in the return of the wicked Emperor as Antichrist, and affords some presumption of the early date of the composition. The writer, it will be observed, is obliging enough to correct and supplement the narrative of the event recorded, which has been left us by the historian Tacitus. For while Tacitus reports that the first conflagration lasted six days, and was followed by a second which lasted three more, Seneca informs Paul that the fire raged only for seven days, and while Tacitus forbears to enumerate the houses destroyed, Seneca gives, as the exact number, one hundred and thirty-two, besides four *insule* or blocks of houses. In this officious obtrusion of superfluous knowledge, we have another illustration of the spuriousness of our *Collection*. The verdict of Merivale, the historian of the Romans, that some of the dates are quite sufficient to condemn the letters as clumsy forgeries, must also be repeated here. C. L. Bassus and M. L. C. Frugi were the consuls of the year 64, the year in which the fire took place, and so far there is no inaccuracy to be detected in the letters cited above; but the residuary date, the 5th of the calends of April, is a gross error, the conflagration not occurring till the 19th July. The tenth letter is dated in the consulship of Nero and Messala—that is, in the year 58, three years before Paul's entrance into Rome! The eleventh letter professes to be written when Apronianus and Capito were consuls, or in the year 59. The two last letters are referred to the consulship of Leo and Sabinus. No Leo appears in the *Fusti Consulares*, so far as we have examined them, and though two persons of the name of Sabinus are registered in the year 69, Nero had then certainly, and Paul almost as certainly, ceased to exist.

If the two reputed friends had nothing more interesting to say to each other than what they are made to say in these letters, it would be difficult to see what attraction Seneca had for Paul or Paul for Seneca. But if the author of these imaginary letters sadly "abused his leisure" in composing them, it must be allowed that the idea which suggested their fabrication had an adequate historical motive. The theology of Seneca was, in fact, a pale reflex of the theology of Paul; if not Christianity itself, it was a startling approximation to it. The very thoughts, in some instances almost the very words, of Paul or Jesus, surprise us as we turn over the pages of the Roman Stoic. In one of the letters of Seneca (120), in which he draws an ideal portrait of a perfect man, a fanciful logic has detected an incontestible reference to the person of Christ. Arguing that a high standard of moral excellence can only be found by the observation of noble and beautiful qualities in the lives of individual men, by the actual revelation of wisdom, purity, and goodness in their words and



actions, Seneca describes his ideal man in words that might plausibly be referred to a real historical character. The context, however, shows that he had no such personal embodiment of his ideal in view. He constructed it out of real experiences, partly by abstraction, partly by exaggeration, removing natural defects and magnifying praiseworthy qualities. The historical matter of the type remains, but in an idealized form. The philosopher accounts for its existence in his mind by assuming the existence, as it were, of an unknown, though definite person, in whom the traits which compose the portrait have been realized.

“This perfect and upright man never railed at fortune, never met with sullen sadness the contingencies of life. Believing himself to be a citizen and soldier of the universe, he endured all sufferings as if inflicted by command. He scorned no event, whatever it might be, as evil and accidentally directed against himself; but accepted it as delegated and intended for him. Of necessity, then, did he appear great, who never bewailed his misfortunes, never complained of his fate, who gave many power to know and comprehend themselves, who shone a light in darkness and drew all regard to himself, because he was quiet, and gentle, and untroubled, alike in all contingencies human and divine. Attaining to the highest excellence belonging to his nature, he possessed a soul that was perfect, for above it is nothing but the mind of God, that mind a portion of which has passed into the breast of mortals here.” (Ep. 120.)

With a passage of such startling relevancy to favour the hypothesis, we can scarcely be astonished that minds predisposed to accept it have acknowledged a fellow-Christian in the Roman philosopher. In the elaboration of this imaginary portrait Seneca really occupies a position very like that of the early Christians. If in their primitive communities, argues Baur, there had not been disciples, who, from their intimate knowledge of their great Master as he lived and taught in the fields of Galilee and in the streets of Jerusalem, were able to furnish the traits in his life and character which enter into the evangelical portrait, the idealized representation of the historical Jesus could not have been developed in the early Christian consciousness. Baur further remarks that Seneca's conception is almost identical with the assumption of all revealed religions. At a certain point speculation ceases; henceforth history and revelation are assumed to be the sources of religious knowledge. To account, then, for the presence of this and other quasi-Christian representations, the intimacy of the apostle and philosopher was postulated. The assumption affords a satisfactory solution of the difficulty. An external investment had to be formed for the idea, and agreeably to the prevailing practice of obtaining the sanction of high authority by affiliating contemporary belief on eminent men of the

past, the intellectual *want* was satisfied and the craving for explanation stilled by the usual expedient—*literary fiction*. The myth of the conversion of Seneca and his friendship with Paul was embodied in the correspondence, with some specimens of which we have, perhaps, amused our readers.

The close resemblance of the théology of Seneca to that of Paul is easily explained without the aid of the hypothesis of a personal acquaintance. That resemblance is the inevitable result of the growth of the human mind ; it is the necessary issue of philosophical speculation under the requisite conditions of intellectual and social progress, of the gradual unfolding of the flower of thought, leaf by leaf, petal by petal, from the first germination in an obscure past to its highest development in the Christian period. The old Greek polytheism, with its cruelty, its sensualism, its irrationality, was destined to be transformed by the slow but certain progress of intelligence. As the ruder and more destructive varieties of the popular religion were superseded by human ideals, divinely incarnate in an Apollo or Athene, so the fair humanities of this purer type of religion were, in their turn, superseded by the wiser intuition which, among the multifarious phenomena of nature, discerned a unity of causation, and, rejecting the idea of a plurality of the gods as irreconcilable with the idea of the divine nature, subordinated the populace of independent deities to one supreme and autocratic God. With the humanizing pieties of the Sophoclean tragedy, with the touching and contagious influence of Socrates—the Athenian martyr who both in life and death typified the greater martyrs of Palestine—with the theological speculations of Plato, with his doctrine of ideas and his cardinal idea of the GOOD as identical with God himself ; with his conception of virtue as the health and harmony of the soul, with his belief in an antenatal state of pure contemplation, from which the spirit had passed into its prison, the human body ; and his aspiration for an immortality in which it should regain its freedom, and once more be privileged to contemplate supersensuous realities—began the announcement and preparation of a great religious reform, the preliminary stage of that evolution which, when reinforced by the appropriate Jewish elements, flowered and ripened into Christianity. In the Aristotelian doctrines of the essential energy of God, as the Everlasting Life and the absorption of the universe in the ideal and divine ; in the Stoical acknowledgment of an all-pervading Spirit, of a Reason, Logos, or Word, as the creative Power of Nature ; in the enforcement of resignation to the external order as to the will of God, in the recognition of the interdependence and brotherhood of men as the citizens of one great republic, we trace the transmission and expansion of a religious life and senti-

ment in the direction and in the spirit of the ultimate movement which we call Christianity.

The universalism of Christianity, Baur explains, is that universal form of consciousness at which the development of man had arrived when Christianity dawned upon the world. The conquests of Alexander had opened to Western civilization the portals of the East; the Greek language and culture were diffused through all lands; men of unknown nationality were brought into close relation, and Roman police, Roman commerce, Roman locomotion, Roman law tended to induce that broad sense of universality in which minor differences ceased to be felt. The universalism of the Empire was coincident with the universalism of Christianity. Both Melito and Origen saw the fact and felt the significance of this universalism. The enthronement of Christianity in the world was preceded by the universal sovereignty of the Cæsars. Before Augustus reigned, Cicero glorified "the eternal and immutable law which was to embrace all nations and all times, and proclaimed the one common Master and Ruler of all, God"—the great Originator of this law. Before Jesus taught he had celebrated the fellowship of the human race and whispered the Christian word *charity*. Even the laughing dramatist, Plautus, had appealed to the principle of a common humanity, "*homo ego sum, homo tu es,*" and declared the omnipresence of a God who hears the words and sees the actions of men, and will reward them according to their merits.\* Simplicity of life and the practice of forgiveness and mercy were recommended by Epicurus, and the principle of his school, that it is better to confer a benefit than accept it, has its nobler echo in the words of Jesus: "It is more blessed to give than to receive."

To the Græco-Roman development corresponded that of the people among whom Christianity arose. The original polytheism of the Hebrew nation had disappeared before the growing intelligence of its more eminent men. The sublime monotheism of the prophets, the belief in the renewal of individual existence after death, the aspiration after a higher ideal of holiness which characterized the Essenes, were direct antecedents of the faith which was to supersede the creeds of the ancient world. The religion of Jesus was a transformation of the theocratic idea. Jesus came as a new power among men, offering the spiritual resources, the sweetness and gladness of a sublimer faith than that of Sinai, but aiming primarily at the exposition and elevation, not at the abolition of the ancestral creed of His country. He never broke with the Mosaic law. His wish was to purify and complete it. His Galilæan disciples rightly construed their

historical position. Far from carrying out the rude radicalism which some writers attribute to Jesus, the apostles, after his death, were regular attendants on the temple worship, and persisted in taking a strictly conservative view of the binding force of the ancient law and ritual.

But the spirit of the new religion was too powerful to be repressed—too expansive to be coerced into the narrow limits of an obsolete creed. The holy ideal which Jesus proclaimed transcended the limits which He had contemplated. The destruction of the Temple, imputed to Him and the Hellenist Stephen, was a symbol of the really revolutionary principle of the Christian Reform. An unforeseen extension of the new religion was at hand. The timid, narrow, patriotic party fell before the daring genius, the flaming energy and indefatigable activity of Saul of Tarsus, the bold antagonist of the time-serving Peter, the mythical correspondent of the ineffectual Seneca.

A Jew of rigorous orthodoxy, by prejudice of birth and the prepossession of education, Saul of Tarsus was originally a resolute adherent of the creed of his country. Fanatically conscientious, he regarded it as a sacred duty not only to destroy "error," but to destroy its propagators. He was a persecutor on principle. The conversion of Saul to Christianity had its origin in an extraordinary revulsion of mind. The nobler elements of thought and feeling which had hitherto been sleeping in his soul, were awakened into activity, very probably, by the eloquent remonstrance and touching martyrdom of Stephen. A recoil from the murderous work which he had set himself to do issued in a violent internal conflict. A suspicion that men who were ready to lay down their lives in evidence of the sincerity of their conviction—that He, whom they believed to be the promised deliverer, had risen from the dead and had actually appeared to them—must have some ground for their strange story, now seems to have fastened upon his mind. Some misgiving that, after all, this Jesus of Nazareth might be the hope of Israel—some fragment of Hebrew prophecy, reinterpreted by his excited imagination, drove him to the conclusion that not a temporal and triumphant Messiah, but a spiritual and suffering Christ, was, in reality, the Prince of Peace—the offspring of David, whom the pale dreaming prophets of his people had announced. In this dawn of a new light, this trance of passion, the tragic terror of the death of Jesus was realized by him with all the vividness which belongs to a visible occurrence. In the morbidly nervous organization of Paul, on which Canon Farrar lays quite as much emphasis as we do, we find the physiological impulse which united with the psychological action just indicated to produce what may be metaphorically called the essential

miracle of his conversion. When, says the eloquent author of a recent "Life of St. Paul," the whole soul is filled with a spiritual light and a spiritual fire, what, to such a soul, is objective, and what is subjective? What, indeed? Referring to this vision of Jesus, Paul might well exclaim with St. Teresa, as Canon Farrar appropriately suggests: "I saw Him with the eyes of the soul more distinctly than I could have seen Him with the eyes of the body."

This vision of the crucified Jesus transformed the conception of the expected Messiah. It was no longer the triumph of the conquering son of David, but the triumph of the Cross, which was for Paul the secret of all law, of all prophecy, of all Messianic aspiration. For him the temporal Messiah had ceased to exist. *His* Messiah was elevated above all the accidents of time. External relations, historical incidents, were all alike indifferent to one whose soul was possessed by the transforming vision of an ideal Christ—a celestial Adam, not the man of earth. Unlike the Jesus of evangelical narrative, in his untroubled and harmonious consciousness, Paul, ever at enmity with himself, was naturally a man agitated by internal conflict, and shaken by the whirlwind of passionate self-contention. The sense of a divided and wavering nature, of a proclivity to evil ever counteracting the bias to good, the sense of a crushing despair in the presence of infinite holiness and the terror of the invisible world, created in him melancholy experiences and gloomy forebodings. Anxiously seeking for internal purity and freedom, for the conquest of moral evil and the avoidance of its dreaded consequences, he discovered the solution of the mystery in the idea of sacrifice, as he now understood it. The reconciliation, not of the Jewish people alone, nor of a few favoured persons only, but of all men in all nations, with the alienated Creator—the redemption of the world—had for its sole and sufficient instrument the sublime immolation of the Crucified Martyr. The universal sacrifice! The universal redemption! These were the two vivifying ideas of the Pauline theology. The associated beliefs were developments of these ideas, or corollaries from propositions based on traditional postulates, or the partial adoption of primitive Christian testimony.

With the subversion of Jewish particularism was closely connected the conception of the catholicity of his vocation, which Paul asserted from the first. From the moment when the vision of the Cross solved for him the mysteries of life and death, he recognised the universal character of the religion of the Crucified. Nor was his version of the Glad Tidings borrowed or derivative. It was original, independent—the result of a revelation all his own. Accordingly, with the exception of a short visit to Peter,

we find him avoiding all intercourse with the older apostles. Henceforth there were two gospels; that for the Jews, or the *Petrine* gospel, and that for the Gentiles, or the *Pauline*.

Ere long the new movement was regarded with suspicion. Alarm, debate, discussion, compromise, followed. Paul's writings, occasional and fragmentary as they are, afford unquestionable evidence of the organised opposition which everywhere obstructed his efforts; an opposition which undoubtedly emanated from the old Hebraic party, and had the direct sanction of James, and probably of Peter and John. After the death of Paul this party attained the ascendancy it coveted. At a later period the influence of the great liberal apostle ceased to be operative. Justin has no knowledge of him; Papias appears not to have recognised him: Hegesiphus has left us a picture of James the Just, the Chief of the Church in Jerusalem, worshipping in the Temple and living the life of a Nazarite. The bitter animosity of the Jewish Christians pursued and blackened the memory of Paul after his death, and the echo of the original clamour penetrating into the heart of the second century is heard in the "Clementine Homilies," a romance of the Ebionites, which, while asserting the supremacy of James, stigmatizes Paul as Simon Magus, the pretender to visions and revelations, the opponent and reprover of Peter, who is compelled to follow him in his travels, in order to counteract the pernicious tendency of his teaching.

When the reputation of Paul again began to emerge from obscurity, it is in the hands, not of an orthodox Christian, but of the Gnostic Marcion, that we first behold a collection of his writings. Invaluable to the theologian as a depository of doctrine, they have an intrinsic recommendation, as historical records containing indications of the origin and growth of the Christian religion, and effectually disposing of the strange mythological hypothesis of *Dupuis* and others, which ingeniously detects in the traditions of Christianity a residual variety of the worship of the Sun. The earliest decisive evidence even of the existence of Christ, bequeathed by a classical historian, is long posterior to the testimony of the Pauline letters. Half a century or more before Tacitus records the death of Christ, the founder of the religion which bears his name, referring it to the reign of Tiberius and the procuratorship of Pilate, Paul, though he had not seen Jesus himself, had conversed with Peter, James, and John, who had. His testimony must be decisive to all but inveterate sceptics. With the existence of a Jewish Church in Jerusalem, with the knowledge that Paul had more than once visited the city in which the scene of that dread tragedy was placed, with the evidence that the apostles were constantly

appealing to the facts of their master's life and death, it requires more credulity than we possess to maintain that the martyrdom on the Cross was an illusion, that Jesus never lived and never died, and that the whole phenomenon of Christendom has an impersonal and purely ideal origin.

With all its originality and independence, the universalism of Paul was a consequence of the general condition of the beliefs and sentiments of his age. It would have been impossible without the historical existence of Jesus; impossible without the existence of that persistent Messianic hope which made the Jewish people the heirs of the future; impossible without the early Palestinian movement which followed on the Galilean prophet's inspiring call; impossible without the historical education of the Hebrew race, and the modifying influences of Greek culture and Roman civilization. Paul himself was a Roman citizen. His habitual language was Greek; he thought in Greek, he spoke Greek, he wrote Greek, and though we are far from convinced that Paul was familiar with the literature of Greece because a few citations from Menander, Aratus, or others, are attributed to him, it would be unreasonable to suppose that in an essentially Greek city, the birthplace of many a philosophical thinker, Paul had failed to acquire some superficial and fragmentary knowledge of Greek life and thought. If a distinguished author is right in detecting in Christianity a necessary combination of the social monotheism of Paul with the intellectual monotheism of Aristotle, this combination could hardly be a result of the study of the *Metaphysics* of his Greek predecessor, but was rather a consequence of the general diffusion of the characteristic speculations of Aristotelian theology. The peculiar vocabulary of Paul was certainly a derivation of the prevailing fusion of thought and language. If not Philonic, it is at least quasi-Philonic. Paul, like Philo, interprets history allegorically. The symbolism of persons and places which stamps the writings of the Christian, was anticipated by the fanciful philosophizing Jew whose track in life lay by the very side of the Christian pathway. The rock in the wilderness, the manna, the cloud by the Red Sea, the simple category of virtues—faith, hope, and charity—the ministry of angels in the legislation of Sinai, the heavenly and earthly man, are all common to the two compatriot writers. Yet Paul no more borrowed of Philo than Philo borrowed of Paul.

While Paul was thus transforming the antiquated ideal of Judaism and daringly overleaping the barriers of national exclusiveness, Seneca was developing his philosophical gospel at Rome. The universalism of the one was in some sort the correspondent of that of the other. But what a difference in the character, what a difference in the result, in the case of the two

men! Paul, with uncompromising magnanimity, bore his gospel through the world, suffered for it, spoke for it, wrote for it, worked for it, lived and died for it. Seneca, the complaisant courtier, the accommodating tutor of an insanely wicked prince, temporizing, tolerating, dallying with the splendours of a palace life, talked and wrote only. He did not act out a creed; he did not renounce the world which he affected to despise; he amassed and loved money; he feared danger and condoned wrong. True, his position was one which demands an indulgent interpretation. True, he had in him some of the elements of a beautiful and noble soul; but he was not an heroic man; he was not made of the stuff that saints and martyrs are made of. His generous sweetness, his tender heart, his large and sometimes wise tolerance, his affectionateness and loving attachment to friends, entitle him to some admiration. But the loftier and sterner qualities which we note in Paul, the noble indignation at wrong, the moral elevation which prompts rejection of all insincerities and cowardly compliances, the concentration of purpose, the sustained enthusiasm, the unselfish devotion to a great cause which fired the soul of Paul, shattering all conventions, breaking with all traditions, forfeiting all friendships, forgoing present privileges, and sacrificing future prospects, were not native and constitutional to the mind of Seneca. Though his life was one of the purest and best of lives in the evil days on which he had fallen, though his death was made beautiful by the quiet dignity and patient fortitude with which he had met it, it was not in Seneca to move the world by the influence of action or the magic of example. His philosophy was an unrealized dream. Carlyle is hard upon Seneca, but his almost Draconic sentence is not altogether undeserved. The notable Seneca was, as he says, wistfully desirous to stand well with truth and yet not ill with Nero.

By some strange paradox, some unaccountable sport of Nature, it was precisely this "niceliest-proportioned half and half, this plausiblest Plausible on record," whose ideas and sentiments approximate most closely to those of "the rude, self-helping, sharp-tongued Apostle Paul." The faint prelusions of Christian thought and feeling which thus vibrate through the utterances of Seneca we will now attempt to re-echo, if not in harmonious, at least in intelligible sequence.

.I. The primary point of resemblance between the religion of Christ and the stoicism of Seneca lies in the cardinal conception of all theology; the analogy between the idea of God as held by the philosopher and the idea which revealed itself in Christian consciousness. The orthodox conception of a creative, ordering, and presiding mind; of an intelligent maker and governor of the world, is more nearly approached by Seneca than by any of the



old thinkers: God is represented by him as the architect and ruler, the lord and artificer, the judge, guardian, spirit, and mind of the universe, the cause of causes, the providence that consults for the welfare of the world, the divine reason, wise, holy, omniscient, infinitely good and loving. Embarrassed as is his creed with Pantheistic implications, Seneca nevertheless gives prominence to the *personal* idea of Deity as the formative, regulative reason, distinct from the world, and even working for the attainment of moral ends. The *religious* aspect of his theology, as distinguished from the theoretical, presents striking affinities with that of Christ. The sentiment of man's dependence on a higher being, of the relation of the human soul to the spirit of the universe, of the living intercommunion of man and God, find expression in Seneca as in no other teacher of the old world. Between men and God there exists a likeness, a tie as of blood or friendship. God is near us, with us, in us. A good man is the disciple, offspring, imitator of God. God is the father magnificent, who tries and trains with kindly austerity the children whom he loves with a paternal, but robust affection. He is the providence that works for the weal of men. The order of the world reposes on the eternal laws of the divine and universal reason. There is nothing arbitrary, nothing accidental in the contingencies of human life. To obey God is freedom, insists the half-Christian philosopher; yet adds, in mystic whisper, I do not obey—I assent. I follow God because my heart bids me, not because I must. God comes to us, nay, enters into us. We must imitate Him.

II. The pride of the Stoic is little favourable to the recognition of human frailty, the consciousness of sin, or the need of a moral deliverance. In Seneca, however, we find an exceptional sympathy with Christian doctrine, a profound sense of the general imperfection of human nature. We have all sinned, he confesses; there is none free from fault; our resistance to temptation is feeble, our innocence is lost. In almost Pauline language Seneca acknowledges the indwelling propensity to sin and corruption in human nature, the conflict of the animal with the spiritual principle, pronouncing death to be a punishment which justly awaits us all, and declaring that we have a war to wage which gives us no rest, the war with bad passions and low desires. To assist us in our flight from evil and progress to good, Seneca advises us to place before us the example of some great and virtuous man, invoking him as the witness of all our actions; bearing him in our hearts, regarding him with a reverence which will purify our souls; in a word, seeing in him that type of all human excellence which Christians recognise in the person of their Master. As with Seneca the beginning of salvation lies in

the conviction of sin, the first condition of that salvation is obedience to the voice of conscience. Of our good actions the approving witness is mankind. Of our secret misconduct, the condemning testimony is the voice of the human heart within us. The heavenly Powers are present to corroborate this internal attestation. Above us and around us are these inevitable censors of our lives. With this treble check on wrongdoing Seneca connects the practice of daily, or rather nightly, self-examination.

III. Seneca's theory of the relation of men to their fellow-men exhibits the same general affinity with Christian doctrine, as his theory of the relation of man to God. In one of the most finished of his works, Seneca has treated with surprising depth and lucidity the great subject of beneficent action. As Christianity refers its central principle to the inward disposition, so Seneca declares that the merit of a good deed consists not in external considerations, but in the motive which prompts it. It is the voluntary gift, the aid to an enemy, that he prescribes; the succour of infirmity, poverty, shame, that he praises; the good deed that is done in silence, that he approves. He discountenances all merely self-regarding actions; he teaches that that man cannot live happily who lives only for himself. He anticipates the *Altruism* of the Positivists. His *alteri vivas* precedes their *vive pour autrui*. He preaches the subordination of self-interest to the common interest. Christian morality derives its most effective motive from faith in Christ; Stoical morality from the idea of a pure unselfish satisfaction in the performance of a virtuous action. The motive apart, it resembles Christian morality; but the morality of Christians is often less pure, because too frequently associated with personal preoccupation. Like Jesus, Seneca recognises the natural tendency to good, the inherent predisposition to benevolent activity as the spring of action. There is no law, says Seneca, to bid us love our parents or be kind to our children—there is no law needed to impel us whither we are naturally inclined to go. The aristocratic exclusiveness of antiquity is exchanged by him for the impartial standard of the Christian ideal. That man, as man, is the object of all human action, is the teaching which he proffers. To make light of injuries done to ourselves, to refrain from unkind words as from a species of revenge, to have a conscience open as to heaven, to live as though we lived with every eye on us, are among the lessons of the Stoic preacher. Health, beauty, liberty, he reckons as the prizes of virtue; but above all rewards, above all pleasures, he places those which arise from devotion to the welfare of man. Man is a sacred thing to man. "I hear with joy," he writes to an old acquaintance, "that you associate familiarly with

your slaves: slaves are men, companions, humble friends. He whom you call slave is born of the same blood as you are, beholds the same heaven, breathes, lives, and dies like you."

Against cruelty in general, against that of gladiatorial exhibitions in particular, Seneca enters a touching protest. He condemns the butchery of men, brought naked and unarmed into the arena, to make holiday for Roman idlers. He reprobates private homicides, and censures, in language too frequently applicable to a later age, the *glorious iniquity* of war, the carnage of unoffending nations. With this appreciation of the capacity and position of the slave, this commiseration for the oppressed, Seneca associated a high moral idea of Family Life. Unfaithfulness on the part of a husband he regards as a wrong done to the wife. His affection for his own Paulina testifies to the sincerity of his thought. "Paulina's good and mine were so wrapt up together, that in consulting her comfort I provided for my own, and when I could not prevail upon her to take less care for me, she prevailed upon me to take more care for myself. There is nothing more delightful than for a man to become dearer in his own eyes because he is dearer in those of his wife." Comments on filial piety, on the care of children, on the good offices of father to son or son to father, favourably illustrate his domestic ethics. In brief, all the various relations of master and slave, husband and wife, father and child, friendship between man and man, are recognized by Seneca in words that display the strength of the old stoicism interpenetrated and softened by the spirit of a love which embraces all humanity; a pity that throbs with the sorrow, or thrills with the delight of men.

IV. The ethical inspiration of Seneca was the natural overflow of his emotional nature. The love which he felt for his wife, or friend, or country, was spontaneously extended to mankind, both as a consequence of the stoical theory and as the expression of a tender interest in all that involved the joys or sufferings of the human family. The germ of a larger love than that of home or country lay in the response of Aristotle when reproached for giving to an undeserving object—"I give, not to him, but to *the human* which is in him." Aristotle, however, like Plato, still clung to the old Hellenic antithesis of Greeks and Barbarians. In the Cynical school the idea of a citizenship of the world had been early opposed to that of the State; but it had then little more than a negative significance, offering philosophical independence rather than the essential independence of all men. In the Stoic creed, the idea first began to bear fruit. The common culture which followed the international fusion of the Macedonian conquest aided in the removal of the antipathies of race. The distinction between Greeks and barbarians was

probably attenuated by the characteristic position of the founder of Stoicism. Apparently but half Greek by descent, Zeno developed his cosmopolitan doctrine in the interest of the non-Hellenic world.\* The equal authority of the reason in all men is the basis of the community of mankind; and the limitation of this community to *one* people is logically impossible. The fellowship, the concord, the common action of the human race, are frequently extolled in the writings of Seneca. All nations have one fatherland, one origin, one destiny; all are friends, or, as Epictetus afterwards taught, all are brothers. "God," says the pious Seneca, "has given all privileges to the human race. The winds blow for all; the commerce of the seas is open to all. The bounds of our city—the city of man—are measured by the sun. We are members of one majestic body, the universe. Without due care and love for all the separate parts, the friendship and unity of the whole—of mankind—could not be preserved." The resemblance of this cosmopolitan sentence to the Catholic teaching of Christianity is obvious. The religion of Christ was not primarily, indeed, what liberal theologians are often pleased to call it now, the *Religion of Humanity*; but its anti-national and universal principle enabled it, in some sense and in some degree, to aspire to this character. In the sense and degree, however, in which recent authors have used the words, the religion of the Stoic, more nearly than that of the Christian, was the religion of humanity. In Seneca alone of all the ancients can we discern the dawning light of that great conception with which Pascal and Auguste Comte have made us familiar. "Men then perish," cries the Stoic of imperial Rome; "but the humanity in whose likeness man is formed, endures, and while men travail and pass away, it suffers no change." (Ep. 65.)

V. If the ideas and sentiments of Seneca resemble Christian ideas and sentiments in relation to the *present* life, the resemblance between the two creeds in reference to a *future existence* is no less noticeable. Seneca re-echoes the words in which the apostle tells us—

"That we are pilgrims and strangers on earth, and that only after death can we enter into our true home. The human soul, he asserts, has no limits but what are common to it and God. Not Ephesus, not Alexandria, nor any other city, though more populous and beautiful than these, but all space is the native country of the soul; this overhanging blue, with seas and land that at once separate and unite what is human and what is divine, with innumerable deities that keep watch over their charge, is the glorious fatherland of the soul. Your brother,

---

\* See Zeller's "Philosophy of the Greeks."

he writes to comfort Polybius, is at rest, he is free, safe, eternal; he is in that happy place which shelters souls released from chains. He has not left us: he has gone before. 'The spirit endures, it returns to the place from which it came. Through virtue it enters into the great peace of eternity, where neither evil, pleasure, nor envy, nor shame, nor misfortune will touch it more. Perfect knowledge, the clear vision of nature, the approach to the Divine so long desired, the disclosure of all secrets, the withdrawal of darkness, the dawn of light, are the enjoyments and privileges of liberated souls. The spirits of the blessed, in sublime form, look down on us from the celestial city, speak to us, summon us, entreat us to regard earth and all that it contains, as if we saw it, in the bright light in which they move.'

Such fragments suffice to show the resemblance of Seneca's speculations on a future state to the visions of celestial happiness which the Christian Hope reveals. Even the LAST JUDGMENT is shadowed forth in his pages, though he recognises no judicial sentence from an external authority, but only the secret verdict in the hour of death of the absolving or condemning soul. With prophetic glance, the Stoic philosopher sees across the centuries the final destruction of men and nations, describing the end of the world, the great conflagration, the falling stars, the fiery mass, the consuming flames, in language which recalls the corresponding picture in the Christian doctrine of the latter days. And, as in the Apocalypse of St. John, a new heaven and a new earth succeed the old, so, in the vision of Seneca, the spirits of the blessed, if God see fit, shall recommence their past career; there shall be change, but not annihilation. Eternally, life passes into death and death into life. The soul is thus half promised another existence in the new world of Stoic speculation analogous to the reanimation of the dead in the Christian creed.

VI. These general correspondences, however, are perhaps less impressive, as pre-intimations of Christian thought and sentiment, than the particular undertones which vibrate harmoniously in detached fragments of the musical philosophy of Seneca. The antithesis of the two natures, the flesh and spirit; the comparison of the body to a house of which the soul is the tenant; the eternal rest which remains for us, are Pauline ideas. That the knowledge of sin is the beginning of salvation; that love cannot be united with fear; that a Holy Spirit dwells in man; that the most unhappy may be really happy; that true joy is within; that when we live *above* all which men most strive or long for, we are essentially blessed; that we should regard all the good things of this world, not as our own, but as lent to us; that we should be content with a little, even with bread and water; that we should turn our thoughts to the true riches; that happiness does not consist in gold and silver; that we should be

ready to give up what rends the very heart asunder, are aphorisms or prescriptions that recall the evangelical paradoxes. Again, the sacred assembly of which Seneca speaks is the counterpart of the general assembly and church in the Epistle to the Hebrews. "I claim you for myself, you are my workmanship," might be taken from one of the letters to the Corinthians. "Good is not born of evil, nor a fig from an olive," is like a reminiscence from the Epistle of James. "No man hath known God; only the pure and holy comprehend God," are as fragments from the gospels. "A likeness of God cannot be made of gold or silver," has an equivalent in a passage in St. Paul's discourse at Athens.

The comparison in Seneca of human society to the interlacing of stones in an arch, reappears in the building fitly framed of the letter to the Ephesians: "We are members of one body; should the hands harm the feet or the eyes the hands?" is a question which Seneca proposes and Paul repeats. "Sin we not in our anger," says Seneca, as Jesus also said. God gives his blessings to all: He does not send a favourable wind for the good and a contrary wind for the bad; nor is there any law to prevent the rain from falling on the fields of wicked men; the sun rises on the unjust; the seas are open to the pirates—are sentences written by Seneca, and uttered by the prophet of Nazareth. Virtue is for all—for the freeborn, the freedman, the slave, the king; wisdom is for all men and for all nations, is the declaration of Seneca. There is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither bond nor free, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus is the proclamation of Paul. That the Godhead is not to be worshipped with sacrifices and ceremonial, but with purity of life; not in temples of stone, but in the sanctuary of the heart, is a sentence which we find alike in the writings of Seneca and in the words of Paul and Stephen. A good woman, hints the philosopher, should not be adorned with gems or pearls, her only ornament should be modesty; advice which has apostolic sanction, but advice which, notwithstanding that sanction, Christian ladies are no longer eager to follow.

All these doctrinal and verbal resemblances are like so many scintillations of the dawn, heralding the sunrise of Christianity. But, notwithstanding the astonishing likeness, there is an equally astonishing dissimilarity of feature. Of the various dogmatic dissidences is that perhaps to which, on account of its remarkable accordances also, we have given a foremost place in the catalogue of correspondences, the *Eschatology* of the Stoic and Christian systems. In Christianity, the course of the world has its completion in a kind of spiritual Pantheism. In it all events conspire to one end—the enthronement on the universe of divine power and holiness—God, as St. Paul expresses it, being all in all. In

the Stoic Eschatology the world perishes, yet the world's great course begins anew; the soul, too, passes away, but is possibly re-endowed with a new life. *Accipimus peritura perituri*. We are carried away by a fate, by a divine and irrevocable torrent of circumstance, which bears the universe, bears even the gods along with it. As in the mysterious world of Shelley, "we are borne darkly, fearfully afar." Christianity, with its doctrines of atonement and reconciliation, with its humanlike love of God to man, with its personal providence which orders all for the ultimate good of saintly souls, and grants them an irreversible security of bliss, is all unlike the Stoical philosophy which elevates man to the Deity through the intrinsic grandeur of his own mind, and places him, untouched by passion, unshaken by the storm of adversity, in proud self-confidence, by the side of the heavenly powers, or makes him a fitting object of admiring contemplation to the Divinity, who surpasses him only in the duration, not in the reality or intensity of happiness.

These cardinal divergences from the Christian type suffice to show that Seneca was never a convert to the religion of Jesus. Had he, in reality, listened to the voice of Saul of Tarsus, he could not have held the old pagan faith of God, and man, and heaven, and the world to come; he could not have continued to assert the identity of God and nature, of the inherent force of the soul with the power of the Holy Spirit; nor have sanctioned the belief in an endless recurrence of the same monotonous cycle of events. To support our contention, that doctrinal or even verbal resemblances afford no presumption of Christian derivation, we may appeal to similar correspondences in the writings of Cicero Epicurus, Aristotle, Plato, whose distance in anterior time precludes the possibility of a direct action of Christian thought on Hellenic philosophy. A further confirmation may be drawn from details in the pathetic narrative which the great Roman historian has left of the death of Seneca. Had Seneca been a Christian, he would not have sprinkled with water the slaves who stood near his bath, or declared that in doing so he was offering a libation to Jupiter the Liberator.

The true explanation of the problem is more complex and very different. An historical development is traceable in the speculations which have interested the human race from the beginning of time. In the battlefield of thought, no less than in that of external life, the great struggle for existence asserts itself, outward circumstance and practical exigency modifying the general drift of the human mind. Man spontaneously selects what is most suitable to his wants, what coincides best with his mental infirmities, his imagination, his aspirations, his feelings. Partly because physical science requires a long and elaborate preparation,

partly because pure speculation has irresistible attractions for the undisciplined mind, and principally because the importunities of practical life are clamorous in their demand, some of the most eminent men of antiquity were induced to devote an almost exclusive attention to the moral sciences—that is, to logic, ethics, social or political research, and religion. At the commencement of the first century before Christ, the preponderance of moral and practical considerations over theoretical, characterised the three great philosophical schools, the Stoical, Epicurean and Sceptical.\* All alike valued philosophy as a means for the attainment of happiness. All alike regarded natural science as an appendix of morality. The Epicurean imperturbability coincides with the tranquillity of the Sceptic, and both with the Stoical apathy. Activity was subordinated to contemplation, politics to ethics, and patriotism to cosmopolitanism. Dissatisfied with human science, the later Pythagoreans and Platonists sought a refuge in extra-mundane communications. With the Stoics, subordination of all egoistical propensities, secession from the world, abandonment of external interest, retirement into the depths of our own nature, were preliminaries to the great religious movement called Christianity.

Christianity has been defined as a spiritualized Judaism. Hebrew monotheism transmitted the belief in a personal God to the religion which succeeded it. In Alexandria, Judaism entered on a new phase of development. The Alexandrian philosophy flowered and bore fruit in the writings of Philo. The reason or Logos, as the archangelic Power, as the paraclete, as the second God, † was an ideal creation of that philosophy, before Christian speculation had borrowed corresponding terms, if not from the pages of Philo, at least from a cognate vocabulary. Hellenistic thought found its way into the new Palestinian Judaism. Though Christianity did not originate in essenism, it is at least allied to it. Essenism professed to be a spiritual medical art; it undertook to heal the soul and exalt it above the region of sense. Its practical benevolence, its community of goods, its voluntary poverty, its prohibition of oaths, all remind us of an early type of Christianity. With the internal sense of joy and peace, the spiritual resources of a religion, which, giving nothing, yet gave all things, was blended the Messianic hope, purified and exalted by the founder of that religion. The kingdom of God, a kingdom which, though on this earth, was not of this world, a kingdom in which all should be subjects who accepted the conditions of the great deliverance, was the promise of an ennobled Judaism,

\* See Zeller's "Philosophy of the Greeks." † Eus. Pr. Ev., vii. 13, 1.



when Paul appeared to complete the work which Jesus had commenced.

To this Universalism, the philosophical development had tended. Various currents of thought, whose course had been divergent, at last intermingled. All these currents belong to one and the same intellectual stream. Christianity is no miraculous phenomenon, no celestial *coup d'état* intruded into the world's history by supernatural agency. It is the concentration of the many rays of thought and feeling projected from different points to converge in one common unity. The wisdom of Greece, the law of Rome, the piety of Judæa, the allegorizing spirit of Alexandria, the Universalism of the Macedonian and Roman conquests, all conspired to produce Christianity.

The Catholic idea of the Stoics was resumed in a new form in the religion of the Crucified. The kingdom of God or of the universe was taken from the philosophers and given to a Galilean peasant. The original conception of Jesus, however, only received its full development through the transforming idealism of Saul of Tarsus. At once a Jew, a citizen of Rome, a pupil of Greece, Paul overleaped all barriers, rejected all exclusive principles, and beholding in his idealized Messiah the hope of the world, he gave to the empire a monotheism far better suited to the popular mind than that of the Stoics; a God whose purity and majesty at least were unapproached by the disinherited deities of Olympus; a personal type of compassionate goodness and devotion which eclipsed by its beauty and its reality that of the fictitious saint of Seneca's philosophy. By his abandonment of Jewish restrictions, the inclusion in his kingdom of God of all men of all nations, he unconsciously prepared the way for a prodigious change in the conception and practice of political life; the separation of the temporal and spiritual powers. For this separation of the two powers we are indebted for liberty of conscience. The early Christian Church in her struggle against barbarism introduced the principle. She proposed, in fact, writes Guizot, for the salvation of mankind the fundamental belief that there exists above all human laws a law which is denominated, according to periods and customs, sometimes reason, sometimes the divine law, but which everywhere and always is the same law under different names. "Enormous as have been the sins of the Catholic Church in the way of religious intolerance, her assertion of this principle has done more for human freedom than all the fires she ever kindled have done to destroy it." (J. S. Mill.)

Christianity found Paganism in possession of the world, and dethroned it. For many centuries after the coming of Christ, retrograde theologians and visionary philosophers continued their

efforts for social regeneration, to end in intellectual barrenness and political defeat. On the whole, Christianity deserved to conquer, and Paul merits the high praise of initiating the movement which has contributed such important elements to the civilization of the world.

The theology of Paul, however, is not eternal. The liberal thought of our own time refuses to base its Christianity on the historic Fall, on the story of the talking serpent and magical trees of Eden. Paul's Antinomian idealism, even in days not far distant from his own, was found too subjective, too obscure, too susceptible of perversion, to become popular; his law of liberty too easily separable from discipline to furnish safe practical guidance. The Jewish Christians caricatured him as Simon Magus, rejected his doctrine as lawless, denied his apostolic authority, and criticized and made light of his visions.

In the physical infirmities, the psychological extravagance, the trances and visions, which depressed the spirit or clouded the brain of this heroic man, we discern the constitutional limitations to perfect sanity. In the encouragement which he gave to superstitious practices; in the asceticism which led him to postpone human affection to divine passion, the love of man to the love of God; in the Ecstatic speech which he practised himself and allowed in others, we recognize so many evidences of deficient knowledge and defective judgment. In his entire theological system, with its rabbinical interpretation, its illogical ratiocination, its pseudo-historical basis, a riper criticism and a profounder science discover little more than a fantastic elaboration of doctrines, admirably suited to the age in which it was produced, but totally inadequate to satisfy the intellect or the heart, in a day when the old forms of religion "live no longer in the faith of reason." But the crowning aberration of Paul—an aberration shared, however, by all the early Christians—was the confident expectation of the immediate return of Christ; for that Paul and the original apostles of Jesus regarded the advent of their Master as imminent, heterodox as the opinion would have been pronounced a generation or two ago, is now generally admitted by the more learned of the clergy, notably by Canon Farrar, in his recent eloquent "Life of St. Paul." This admission cannot but carry with it important concessions. It modifies our entire view of apostolic intention and aspiration. To St. Paul, in particular, who imagined that the trumpet of the archangel would call the dead from their graves while he was yet living, we cannot ascribe a profoundly wise and prospective policy. Not for a moment did he dream of the separation of the two powers, nor of the ecclesiastical organization that the grand succession of wise and saintly men created. The Church Catholic

was a consequence of his action, but not an intended consequence. He was but an organ of the great spirit of humanity, which appears in all ages, incarnate in the great men of the old polytheistic creed as in those of Jewish, Mahomedan, and Christian monotheism; a link in the vast chain of human thought and action, a mesh in the network of our common civilization, of that universal and continuous history which is the developed life of the race.

Yet with all the imperfections, personal and philosophical, which attach to him, the man of Tarsus towers above the man of Nero's court. The feeble saint of Paganism, with his ignoble compliances, his servile hesitations, his love of both worlds, furnish but a sorry appearance when brought face to face with the noble Paul, "a man fiery-real from the great fire-bosom of nature herself," a man who had no cowardly egoisms, who feared no consequences, who was indifferent to pain, suffering, and disgrace, so he could compass his one great object, the conversion and salvation of the world. Let us be just, however, to both the apostle and philosopher. Seneca's beautiful sayings, his tender consolations, his temperate life, his judicious administration during the golden five years of Nero, his affection for wife and friend, his fortitude and resignation in death in spite of faults and flaws and "bad half-hours," deserve our grateful commendation. But the flaming energy, the unbiassed enthusiasm, the sublime devotion and indefatigable activity of Paul, place him, morally, high above Seneca. Seneca is but one of the many distinguished men who survive in virtue of an exotic fame. The memory of Paul endures through the natural efficacy of influence and example. He believed his work would close with his own age. That work, like all true-hearted work perhaps, entered into the life of the world to modify and continue that life. Paul was greater than he knew. The fabled correspondence with Seneca is an illustration of his greatness. The inspiration he lent to Augustine and Calvin, the empire which he exercises over thousands of saintly souls, demonstrates the creative power and fascinating splendour of his theological genius; while the homage he receives from men, who like ourselves, share none of his doctrinal prepossessions, though admiring his moral grandeur and acknowledging the value of his services, may be admitted as final and unimpeachable testimony to the noble activity of a life consecrated by unshaken faith, unailing hope, and unconquerable love.

ART. II.—THE PARLIAMENTARY OATH QUESTION :  
MR. BRADLAUGH'S CASE.

1. *Report from the Select Committee on the Parliamentary Oath, with the Proceedings of the Committee.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 20th May, 1880.
2. *Report from the Select Committee on Parliamentary Oath (Mr. Bradlaugh), together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence and Appendix.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 16th June, 1880.
3. "*The Times*" and other Newspapers for May, June, and July, 1880. *Hansard*, vol. 253. Session 1880.

IT is close upon a century ago since Burke wrote :—

"From Magna Charta to the Declaration of Rights it has been the uniform policy of our Constitution to claim and assert our liberties, as an *entailed inheritance* derived to us from our forefathers, and to be transmitted to our posterity, as an estate specially belonging to the people of this kingdom, without any reference whatever to any other more general or prior right."\*

This ever has been, and still is, the doctrine and practice of English statesmen and lawyers of the Traditional or Whig school as distinguished from the school of, for instance, Bentham and the Mills, who founded their arguments for Liberal measures not on prescription or precedent, but on considerations prior to and therefore independent of them. This school has never been popular with the majority of English politicians—whether Whig or Tory, nor with the great mass of the English people, whose opinion of them is thus expressed by Lord Sherbrooke :—

"When I find a book or a speech appealing to abstract *à priori* principles I put it aside in despair, being well aware that I can learn nothing useful from it. Such works only present to us the limited and qualified propositions which experience has established, without their limitations and qualifications, and elevates them into principles by a rash generalization which strips them of whatever truth they originally possessed."†

Liberal writers and speakers of the Traditional school are, however, oft-times hampered in their attempts to prove that the measures which they advocate are in conformity with prescription and precedent, and in no narrow or carping spirit towards men

\* In the "Reflections on the Revolution in France," first published in 1789.

† "Speeches and Letters on Reform, with a Preface by the Right Honourable R. Lowe, M.P." Preface, pp. 4, 5.

for whom and principles for which we, in common, we venture to say, with every educated Englishman, hold in the greatest veneration, we must say it is interesting and amusing on such occasions to observe the assumptions they are compelled to make, and the expedients to which they are forced to resort. This is especially noticeable in cases affecting religious liberty. The principle embodied in the formula first, if our memory be right, thus expressed by Canning, "civil and religious liberty all over the world," is not to be found in Fortescue's "De Laudibus Legum Angliæ," in Noy's "Maxims," or in any other early treatise on Constitutional Law. In fact, the principle, not only in its application to the world at large, but even to this kingdom, was not known to, and, had it been known, would have been repugnant to not only the framers of, and the earlier writers on, the English law and Constitution, but also to the statesmen and lawyers who arose after the Reformation.

Our historical position in this respect is stated by Cardinal Newman with his usual accuracy. We quote from him *verbatim*, for assuredly none of our readers would forgive us for attempting to express the opinion of the greatest living master of the English tongue in other words than his own.

Replying to Mr. Gladstone's attack on the late Pope's encyclical of 1864, the Cardinal says :—

"Modern Rome is not the only place where the traditions of the Old Empire, its principles, provisions, and practices have been held in honour ; they have been retained, they have been maintained in substance, as the basis of European civilization down to this day, and notably among ourselves. In the Anglican establishment the King took the place of the Pope ; but the Pope's principles kept possession when the Pope was ignored, the relations between Pope and King were ignored too, and therefore we had nothing to do any more with the old imperial laws which shaped those relations ; but the old idea of a Christian policy was still in force. It was a first principle with England that there was one true religion, that it was inherited from an earlier time, that it came of direct revelation, that it was to be supported to the disadvantage, to say the least, of other religions, of private judgment, of personal conscience.

"The Puritans held these principles as firmly as the School of Laud. As to the Scotch Presbyterians, we read enough about them in the pages of Mr. Buckle. The Stuarts went, but still their principles suffered no dethronement ; their action was restrained, but they were still in force, when this century opened."

We here remark in passing that these statements have lately received noteworthy illustrations in the petition against the admission of Atheists to Parliament from the Wesleyan Conference, speaking as the governing body of the largest of Noncon-

forming Churches, in similar utterances by some ecclesiastical bodies in Scotland, and in the feeling on the same subject, displayed at recent bye elections among some of the Scottish constituencies reversing the Liberal vote given by them at the general election. This change of vote is said to be in part due also to the appointment of Romanists to office under the Crown in India and England.

"It is curious to see" (the Cardinal goes on to say) "how strikingly in this matter the proverb has been fulfilled 'out of sight, out of mind.' Men of the present generation, born in the new civilization, are shocked to witness in the abiding Papal system the words, ways, and works of their grandfathers. In my own lifetime has that old world been alive."

He goes on to establish his position by various citations from Blackstone, and then after noticing "the great revolution in the state of the law which has taken place since 1828," when the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts gave the first blow to the Church as by law established, he suggests "that Englishmen who within fifty years kept up the Pope's system, are not exactly the parties to throw stones at the Pope for keeping it up still."\*

In the course of this revolution the demand for religious equality extended beyond even the remotest extent of the pale of Christianity, and the first constituency of England, the City of London, chose as one of its four members a gentleman who, to use Lord Beaconsfield's periphrastic phraseology, "believed only in the first part of the Christian religion." It is curious to observe the constitutional ground which Lord Lyndhurst assumed in support of his argument for admitting Jews to Parliament.

"I say that it is utterly against the principles of the Constitution to exclude the Jews from Parliament on any such ground (*i.e.* the accidental operation in their case of the oath of abjuration). I say it is the mainspring of our glorious Constitution that no British subject—no natural born subject of the Queen—ought to be deprived of the rights enjoyed by his fellow subjects, unless he has committed some crime, or unless he is excluded by some positive enactment of the Legislature directed against him or against the class to which he belongs. None can be rightfully excluded unless by the concurrent voice of the two Houses of Parliament and with the assent of the Crown. If you exclude them by the casual operation of a clause which was never directed against them or the class to which they belong *you unjustly deprive them of their birthright.*"†

\* "Letter to the Duke of Norfolk," pp. 75 to 81.

† Speech on Jewish Disabilities, 1853, quoted in Campbell's "Lives of the Chancellors," vol. viii. p. 181; also 127 Hansard, 833.

The Jews' right to sit in Parliament, it will be observed, is claimed not as one of the so-called "natural rights of man," but on Burke's principles as a "birthright under the Constitution."

It is well said by Lord Macaulay, that a Constitution of the Middle Ages, as is ours, is not like "a Constitution of the eighteenth or nineteenth century, created entirely by a single Act and fully set forth in a single document."\*

It follows from this, that

"Applied to the Government of England, the word 'Constitution' is pre-eminently indeterminate and unmeaning. As a designation of the collective securities for any specific mode of government, the word is perfectly precise; but, in England, no definite plan of government has ever been drawn up or established. . . ."

"It is needless to say that no such record of our Constitution has ever appeared, and that the word as applied to the English Government can denote no settled form of polity."†

Accordingly, there are few questions so open to argument and dispute as whether any proposed measure be or be not constitutional. With regard to the Jews, it was perfectly true that no statute could be found by which they were excluded from sitting in Parliament by a positive enactment directed against them as a class, for the simple reason that until recent times the idea of their right to sit there had not occurred, either to the Jews or any one else. In early times their only relation to the law was not only exclusion from all magistracies and honours, but banishment and imprisonment, loss of goods, and all other varieties of outrage and oppression. "Three hundred years ago," said Lord Macaulay in his maiden speech in Parliament, "the Jews had no legal right to be in England, and six hundred years ago they had no legal right to the teeth in their heads."‡

Nothing is more significant of the estimation in which the claims to the civil rights of the Jews were held little more than a century ago than the tone in which Blackstone speaks of them. Referring to the privileges to which Protestants and Jews born within the kingdom are entitled, he continues:—

"What those privileges are with respect to Jews in particular was the subject of very high debates about the time of the famous Jew Bill, which enabled all Jews to prefer bills of naturalization in Parliament without receiving the Sacrament, as ordained by Statute 7,

\* "History of England," vol. i. p. 30.

† "Disestablishment: Is it Unconstitutional?" published by the Liberation Society.

‡ Quoted in Trevelyan's "Life of Macaulay," vol. i. p. 161; *vide* also Macaulay's Essays, "Civil Disabilities of the Jews," p. 140, people's edition, 1874, the principle of the argument of which is equally applicable to the case under discussion.

Jac. 1. It is not my intention to revive this controversy again; for the act lived only a few months, and was then repealed, therefore peace be now to its *manes*.\*

This was published in 1765.

"In 1785, the Court of Aldermen decided that even Jews who had adopted the principles of Christianity should not be admitted to the freedom of the City. The rule which was thus laid down was followed for more than forty years; and during the whole of that period, even converted Jews were excluded from the rights of citizenship."†

A century before the date at which Lord Lyndhurst set up for the Jews the claim to be admitted to Parliament as their birth-right that claim would have been met with nothing but ridicule.

A new question of the same nature has now arisen. The right to a seat in Parliament is claimed by one who not only stands without the pale of all the churches, orthodox and unorthodox, but is an avowed unbeliever in all religion, natural or revealed. Supporters of his claim feel compelled, by Parliamentary usage and tradition, to seek a Constitutional argument in its support. One of the few members of the new Parliament who have shown any power of Parliamentary speaking and given promise of future usefulness, expressed the constitutional argument in these words; following, it will be seen, Lord Lyndhurst's view of a "birthright."

"It is widely held that throughout the debates on this question there has been a want of clearness in distinguishing between complicity with a man's views and the maintenance of his rights; between active participation in (nay, mere recognition of) the course of such a speculative agitator and the duty of upholding the right of every English citizen to the benefit of election by his fellow men. With the former, Parliament has nothing in the world to do; while in giving effect to the latter it is simply exercising its natural and necessary, its ordinary and proper function. It is true there has been good cause for such a confusion of ideas. It is a great anomaly indeed when we find a man of no religion attempting, in the name of religious liberty, to treat any precedent of Parliament as a thing of none effect; but a far greater anomaly would it be for the representatives of the English people, in the name of a precedent of Parliament, to deny to any English citizen a right which is his by birth."‡

Cardinal Manning, in his weak and foolish "Englishman's Protest," comforts himself with the assurance "that there is no

\* "Commentaries," vol. i. p. 375. Twelfth edition.

† Walpole, "History of England from 1815," vol. iii. p. 77.

‡ Mr. Wm. Copeland Borlase, one of the newly-elected members for East Cornwall. It is a fortunate omen that the hon. member's maiden speech, as was Lord Macaulay's, was one in favour of liberty of conscience. *Vide* Hansard, vol. 253 (Session, 1880), 1291. Dr. Arnold, inconsistently with his generally liberal views, denied the title of the Jews to civil rights on the ground merely that "they were littered within our shores."—*Vide* "Life," by Stanley.



law which says that a man who publicly denies the existence of God is a fit and proper person to sit in Parliament."\* This is true, but it is equally true—and it would be more accurate—to say that, as in the case of the Jew, so also in the case of the Atheist, no Act of Parliament can be found which affirms the proposition, "An open and avowed Atheist shall not sit in Parliament." This is proved, indeed, by the fact that one of the members for Northampton's opponents gave notice of a motion for leave to bring in a Bill to give that proposition the force of law, and not finding an opportunity, has now on the books an abstract resolution to the same effect as the Cardinal's proposition. Still, in the case of the Atheist as of the Jew, the absence of any such statute arises from the fact of the Atheist's claim never having been contemplated. As in the case of the Jews, the spirit of all early legislation and precedent is against the admission of the Atheist's claim. So far as our knowledge with regard to the statute law and our recollection of decided cases serves us, legislation was directed not against those who denied the fact of God's existence, but against those who erred in belief as to its mode. Men have been convicted at common law—as distinguished from statute law—for publishing libels on the Christian religion, which is said to be "the very foundation of the laws of the land;"† but we remember no penal statute against, or conviction at common law of, any man for simply denying in speech or writing the proposition, "There is a God," or affirming the proposition, "No such being as God exists." But by looking at the manner in which those were treated who only held an erroneous belief as to the mode of God's existence, we may infer how, in earlier times, an Atheist's claim to sit in Parliament would have been met. Even after the Revolution of 1685 it was enacted by the Statute of William III. :—

"That if any person educated in the Christian religion shall, by writing, printing, teaching, or advised speaking, deny any one of the Persons of the Holy Trinity to be God, or maintain that there are more gods than one, he shall on the first offence be rendered incapable to hold any office or place of trust; and for the second, be rendered incapable of bringing any action, being guardian, executor, legatee, or purchaser of lands, and shall suffer three years' imprisonment without bail."‡

\* Vide *Nineteenth Century*, No. 42., August, 1880, p. 181. '.

† *Eg.*, the case in 1793 of the King *v.* Williams for publishing Paine's "Age of Reason."

‡ "Blackstone," quoted by Cardinal Newman *ubi supra*, p. 77. Was the punishment of three years founded on the idea of a year's imprisonment for the offence against each Person of the Trinity?

It would seem as if the penalty of "holding any office or place of trust" was designed to exclude from Parliament non-believers in the Trinity, but it is historically true, and it is a significant fact as to the value of penal laws and test oaths, that while the Statute of William III. was yet unrepealed, and in spite of it, members of Unitarian churches sat in Parliament, and one of them—the late William Smith, so long member for Norwich—proposed and carried the repeal of the penal laws against Unitarians. Cardinal Manning appears also to comfort himself with the belief that this Act is still in force.\* Like many other articles of his belief, this one is quite unfounded.

Had direct legislation for the admission of Unitarians to Parliament been necessary, their admission would no doubt have been hindered and delayed as long as was the admission of Jews. Fortunately for them no Parliamentary oath contained any direct reference to or invocation of the Trinity, nor any words which, undesignedly excluded them, as the words "on the true faith of a Christian," excluded the Jews. To these words and the common formula in all oaths, "So help me, God," Unitarians could and did attach the Unitarian meaning.

Such we believe to be the historical position of the question as to a professed Atheist's right to sit in Parliament. The cause of Jewish emancipation enjoyed the inestimable advantage of having as its leader Lord Russell, who has been well called "one of the most remarkable reformers that have ever lived in this country, and one of the greatest masters of Parliamentary tactics that ever lived; whose great knowledge of the history of England enabled him to adapt, or to persuade others that he was adapting, his measures to the rules of the Constitution, and to impart almost a Conservative complexion to Radical measures."† But Parliament, in the case of the Jews, was swayed less by arguments founded on Constitutional precedents than by one founded on a freer and wider logic; the logic, to use Macaulay's phrase, "not of precedents and technical analogies, but of deep and broad Constitutional principles," which is admirably stated by Lord Holland in one of his protests in the Catholic Emancipation controversy "that the British Constitution and large exclusions cannot subsist together; that the Constitution must destroy them, or they will destroy the Constitution."‡

\* His Eminence shelters himself, *ubi supra*, under the authority of Mr. Commissioner Kerr, quoting as an authority Kerr's "Blackstone," vol. iv. pp. 34, 35. We have not the book to refer to, but, on high authority, we believe its effect is correctly stated. If so, the learned judge is mistaken.

† Walpole's "History of England since 1815," vol. iii. pp. 535, 6.

‡ Quoted in Macaulay's Essays, tit. "Lord Holland," p. 599. Edition 1874, and see "History," vol. i. p. 518.

It is, we think, in conformity with this principle that the House of Commons has acted in Mr. Bradlaugh's case. "The contemplative Atheist," says Lord Bacon, "is rare," but doubtless in the long course of our Parliamentary history not a few such, as well as of the far larger class whom Bacon describes as "the great Atheists who indeed are hypocrites, which are ever handling holy things, but without feeling, so they must needs be cauterized in the end,"\* have, as a condition precedent to taking their seats, without hesitation taken not only the Oath of Allegiance, but also the Oaths of Supremacy and Abjuration. It is another and a different class of Atheist with which Parliament has now to deal. Looking at the valuable time consumed in the debates on the case, the unfavourable light in which in this, as in other such discussions, Parliament appears, and the difficulties and perplexities connected with it which we fear await in the future both the House and the country, many sympathizers with Mr. Bradlaugh regret that the discussion has arisen, and that he did not act on the same principle as the Atheist mentioned by Cardinal Newman, who, with a view "of hedging for eternity," offered up the safe but conditional prayer, "Oh God, if there be a God, save my soul, if I have a soul!"† and following the examples of his fellow unbelievers, Gibbon and John Mill, take the oath without raising any question.

Still, as the question has arisen, we are glad to reiterate our conviction as to the folly and uselessness of requiring the oath to be taken. Readers of this REVIEW scarcely need to be reminded of Bentham's ground of objection to oaths in general—viz., that they transfer the idea of guilt from the breach of a prior and paramount obligation to the ceremony by or with which the person sworn promises to perform that obligation. In the case of a witness, his prior and paramount duty, whether his evidence be given with or without an oath, is to speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth; but the breach of that duty is not punishable by law. The crime of perjury consists in the disregard by the witness of the ceremony by or with which he promised to perform his prior obligation. Every student of Bentham will remember his exposition of the ill effect on witnesses of this confusion of ideas. In like manner in the case of the Parliamentary oath the prior and paramount obligation of the member elected is allegiance to the Sovereign: the oath is the mere ceremony in or by which he promises to fulfil it.‡ The question cannot be better summed up than in the words of Helvetius:—

\* *Vide* "Essay on Atheism." † "Apologia pro Vita sua," p. 78.

‡ *Vide Edinburgh Review, ubi post.*

"The oath is an empty formality which is not binding upon rogues, and which in no wise adds to the engagements of honourable men."

"If (we still follow the guidance of Bentham) we refer to that authority which, with Christians, is the highest of all, not a doubt would remain. 'Swear not at all,' says the Teacher. 'Let your communication be Yea, yea, Nay, nay; for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.' No precept can be more formal, and it shows clearly that Christ attributed to an oath an immoral effect—those of corrupting Christian veracity by introducing subtle and sophistical distinctions which men use to palliate or excuse falsehood."

The great majority of professing Christians persist in disregarding the plain teaching of Him whom they "call Master and Lord," and also the fact, equally patent and undeniable, "that those societies of Christians whose tenets do not allow the use of an oath are the most strict in everything relating to veracity." They prefer to discuss the oath question on grounds where we are perfectly willing to meet them—those of usefulness and expediency. Thus the very latest of the orthodox champions of the Parliamentary oath, Cardinal Manning, says:—

"The purity of Parliament depends, therefore [he is reasoning from premises taken from Blackstone], upon the eminent probity, fortitude, and knowledge of its members, and these qualifications are tested, so far as is in man, by the oath or solemn declaration of allegiance by which every man entrusted with a share in the supreme power of legislation binds himself, by a sanction higher than that of any mere human authority, *to be faithful to the Commonwealth*. The oath of the Catholic members of Ireland, and of the Christian members of England and Scotland, the affirmation of the members of the Hebrew religion, and the affirmation of the members for Birmingham and for Manchester, all alike bind their conscience by the highest sanctions of the Divine Law."\*

We seldom, if ever, saw more mistakes crowded into so small a compass. To deal, first, with those of less importance. Members professing "the Jewish religion" do *not* affirm, like other members—they swear. Is the distinction drawn between the "*Christian* members for England and Scotland" and "the members for Birmingham and for Manchester" intentional, implying that those members are not Christians? If so, why is not one of the Conservative members for the City of London—Mr. Alderman Fowler, who gave notice of the Bill as to atheists, before adverted to—classified with the members for Birmingham and Manchester, for he is equally, as either of them,

---

\* *Ubi supra*, p. 179. *Vide* the Rothschild Cases. Reports of Select Committee, June 16, 1880. Appendix, pp. 31-33.

a member of the Society of Friends? Or do his services in opposing the admission of the member for Northampton entitle him, in the judgment of Cardinal Manning, to the name of Christian, though he also be unbaptized?

Again, the oath now prescribed to be taken by members of Parliament is not one of fidelity to the Commonwealth, but of personal allegiance to the Sovereign. It is feudal alike in idea and expression:—

“I do swear,” are its words, “that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Victoria, her heirs and successors, according to law.”\*

In America the oath or affirmation is prescribed to be in this form:—

“That to the best of my knowledge and ability I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me, God!”

In Italy, the President of the Chamber of Deputies, seeing a new member in his place, says:—

“I invite the honourable gentleman to take the oath in the form following:

“I swear to be faithful to the King, and to observe loyally the fundamental statute and the other laws of the State with a single view to the inseparable welfare of the King and country.”

The new deputy then, in his place, stretches out his right hand, and pronounces the one word, “Giuro!” (I swear).

In Holland every new member of the States-General, except those to whom affirmation is permitted, is called on to take the following oath:—

“I swear fidelity to the Constitution, so help me God Almighty!”

Since 1868 the standing orders of the Austrian Reichsrath prescribe that new members—

“On entering either of the two Houses have, on the President’s challenge, in place of taking an oath, to promise loyalty and obedience to the Emperor, inviolable observance of the Constitution, as well as of all other laws, and conscientious fulfilment of their duties.”

Upon the President reading words to this effect, the new member simply replies, “I promise.”

\* *Ibid.* p. 15.

Not to multiply instances, the members of the German Parliament neither take any oath or make any affirmation. Nor, since the establishment of the French Republic of 1870, has any oath, affirmation, or any equivalent ceremony been required of any member of the legislature.

The distinction between the form of oath prescribed in England and that in use in other countries is not merely verbal. A more practical question is whether the functions of the legislative bodies are less well discharged where the form prescribed is not an oath but a simple promise, or where, as in the cases of the German Empire and the French Republic, all such ceremonies are omitted altogether.

Sir G. Cornwall Lewis, in narrating the History of the Roman Catholic Relief Bill, refers to the differences as to the omission from the oath of the King's supremacy of the words relating to the spiritual and ecclesiastical power of the Pope which arose between that most religious and gracious king, George IV., and those "who seemed to be the pillars" of the Church as well as of the State—Wellington, Lyndhurst and Peel,—and he adds this pregnant comment—

"It may be remarked, that the attaching of importance to declaratory oaths, as a political security, is an indication of minds of a certain stamp, and of a certain amount of intelligence which is nearly infallible.\*

Bentham has pointed out that the efficacy of an oath depends on three sanctions—the religious sanction, the legal sanction, and the sanction of honour, and has clearly established that the whole efficacy of the oath consists in the legal sanction and in the sanction of honour, and that they are deceived who attribute any part of it to the religious ceremony. If that ceremony had that effect it would always have it; but it is not so; and he adduces, in proof of his assertion, the statutes of the English universities, to which students, at their matriculation, had to swear they would conform. Among them was one which absolutely prohibited "the use of the herb *nicotiana*, or tobacco," while another enjoined on undergraduates that they should always be "apparelled in garments of a dark or obfuse hue." Long before the repeal of these statutes they were, in practice, daily violated with absolute impunity.

"It cannot be denied (is Bentham's comment) that we have here the religious sanction entire, but the two other sanctions are deficient; the oath has scarcely been taken, when it's forgotten—it is a form, and nothing more. Consider (he continues) the oaths which are used as political instruments to confirm the adherence of the people to this or

---

\* "Essays on Administrations," &c., p. 462, note

that Government, to this or that Sovereign. Circumstances change; the power which imposed the ceremony is no longer the same, and the value of the oath is no longer thought of. The religious sanction, therefore, is totally inefficient whenever the two other sanctions disappear.\*

In the manner in which the oath of the Queen's supremacy has been dealt with we have a significant illustration of the value really attached to such oaths by Parliament and by all parties, political and religious, except when political capital may be made by supporting and maintaining them. Before 1866, the oath of supremacy was prescribed by law to be taken by every member of Parliament on his election, by every person admitted as an attorney, and by the same person again on his admission as a solicitor, and by many other officials. The Rubric in the service in the Book of Common Prayer "for the ordering of deacons" enjoined that after the reading of the Epistle, "and before the Gospel, the Bishop sitting in his chair, shall cause the oath of the Queen's Supremacy, and against the power and authority of all foreign potentates, to be ministered unto every one of them that are to be ordered." The same oath was also enjoined by the Rubric to be taken by every one who is to be ordered a priest or to be consecrated a bishop. This oath, which was what Dean Stanley calls "a sulphurous document," was in these words:—

"I, A. B., do swear that, I do from my heart abhor, detest and abjure, as impious and heretical, that damnable doctrine and position, that Princes excommunicated or deprived by the Pope or any authority of the See of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects or any other whatsoever; and I do declare that no foreign princes, person, prelate, State or potentate, hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm, *so help me God.*"

The injunction to administer this oath has now disappeared from the Rubric in all the three services referred to, and so little discussion did it excite,† that we cannot give the date of any discussion in Parliament respecting its abrogation, or refer our readers to the statute which authorizes its omission. Whatever we may think of the policy which dictated that oath, its

---

\* Our quotations from Bentham are taken from Bentham's MSS., which were translated into French by M. Dumont, and by him published under the title "*Traité des Preuves Judiciaires,*" and by him also into English, and published under the title "*Treatise on Judicial Evidence.*" The passages quoted will be found in the chapter entitled "Of the Oath considered as a Security."

† It may be that some of the A. P. U. C., as we think they call themselves, were not sorry to get rid of the words as to the Pope's supremacy which George IV. wished to retain.

object was to exclude Romanists from Parliament, and no Romanist could take it. It was effective for its purpose, but in the only oath now retained in the case of members of Parliament\*—that of allegiance—what security have we for the probity, fortitude and knowledge of any one who takes it? and it is on this ground alone that Cardinal Manning defends its retention. Any member may, for all that this oath will hinder him, be or become a fraudulent bankrupt, a coward, and as ignorant, not to be personal, as the most stupid member of "the party of stupidity," leaving our readers to say who shall be "by merit raised to that bad eminence."

The religious formula contained in the oath is so attenuated that we are at a loss to conceive how even its defenders can see any use in retaining it. It would be matter of curious inquiry to ascertain what meaning each of the six hundred and fifty odd members of the House of Commons attach to the word "God." Without going so far as to say that every member would assign to it a different meaning, we think that if we could learn the facts we should find assigned to the word every possible shade of meaning, from that of the school of the strictest orthodoxy to that of the school of the vaguest latitudinarianism. To make our meaning clear we will cite a passage from the writings of a foremost representative of each school. As the representative of orthodoxy, we select Cardinal Newman. His fourteenth University Sermon contains the following passage:†—

"It is true that God is without beginning, *if* eternity may worthily be considered to imply succession; in every place, *if* He who is a Spirit can have relations with space. "It is right to speak of His Being and Attributes, *if* He be not rather super-essential; it is true to say that He is wise or powerful *if* we consider Him as other than the most simple Unity. He is truly Three, *if* he is truly One. He is truly One, *if* the idea of Him falls under earthly number. He has a triple personality in the sense in which the Infinite can be understood to have personality at all. *If* we know anything of Him, if we may speak of Him in any way, if we may emerge from Atheism or Pantheism into religious faith—*if* we would have any saving hope, any life of truth or holiness within us, this only do we know, with this only confession we must begin and end our worship—that the Father is the one God; the Son the one God; and the Holy Ghost the one God, and that the Father is not the Son—the Son not the Holy Ghost, and the Holy Ghost not the Father."‡

---

\* See the form quoted, *ante*.

† Written and published while the author was yet a Protestant, but we have no reason to doubt that it still represents his views on the subject of the passage.

‡ "University Sermon," p. 186.



We can understand many orthodox believers, both in the Established Church and in the Dissenting Churches, disliking and disputing the hypothetical nature of this definition of the fundamental proposition in theology, its dependence, as is said by Dr. Martineau, "on assumptions which not our vision, but our blindness, compels us to make," but it is certain that Jewish and Unitarian members would repudiate it altogether.

Let us now turn to the latest utterances of the most skilful and accomplished representative of Latitudinarianism. Dean Stanley, in his recently published article on "The Creed of the Early Christians," puts this gloss on the simple words "I believe in God" :—

"Wherever we are taught to know and understand the real nature of the world in which our lot is cast, there is a testimony, however humble, to the name of the Father; wherever we are taught to know and admire the highest and best of human excellence, there is a testimony to the name of the Son; wherever there is implanted in us a presence of purity, freedom, and love, there is a testimony to the name of the Holy Ghost."\*

If—of which we are by no means certain—we rightly understand the Dean, his theory is, that whoever knows and understands the real nature of this world; who feels admiration of the highest human excellence, and also feels within him purity, freedom, and love—is a believer, not only in God's existence, but in His Triune nature. If this be so, we see no reason why any one, including Mr. Bradlaugh himself, should not take the oath including the words "So help me God." Every man must judge for himself whether he possesses the threefold qualification, and there are few so modest as to say "It is not in me." The practical question is, what is the worth of a formula to which such not only contrary but irreconcilable meanings can be attached?

We have seen it said that promissory oaths have not any effect whatever on political conduct, an axiom which received abundant illustration in the case of Talleyrand, who, at the time of the Revolution of 1830, openly said that he was taking his thirteenth oath of allegiance. A former lord chancellor, referring to the vague proposition that "Christianity is part and parcel of the law of England," said it might be true, but for his own part he did not know how to frame an indictment against a man for not loving his neighbour as himself,† and we think he would have found it equally difficult, if not impossible, to frame an indictment for perjury against a member of parliament solely on the ground

\* *The Nineteenth Century*, No. 42, Aug. 1850, p. 217.

† This was said by Lord Cranworth to the late H. Crabb Robinson.

that he had forsworn himself by breaking his oath of allegiance, and yet, unless that can be done and punishment inflicted, what is the value of the oath?

There is a story told of David Hume which shows, by a *reductio ad absurdum*, the worthlessness of all tests imposed for political and religious purposes. Towards the close of his life, Hume was walking in a newly-made road in the outskirts of Edinburgh, and got into a "Slough of Despond" from whence, owing to his then obese and infirm state, he could not move. He called to "a godly matron from the Canongate" to come and help him, but received the admonition, "Na, na, David, bide where ye are till ye say the Lord's Prayer." Hume immediately took the required test, and the lady felt compelled to help so eminent a believer out of his distress. Many a man before and since, has, for practical purposes and with as much sincerity, taken tests and repeated Shibboleths as did, on this occasion, the great philosopher and historian.

A practical commentary on the value attached by Parliament—except for party purposes—to taking the oath, is the fact that a peer, who is also a bishop of the dis-established Church of Ireland, voted against the Irish Evictions Bill without having taken the oath. The Lords, at the instance of the Government, in one sitting, passed through all its stages a Bill of Indemnity in his favour, and the Commons would gladly have done the same, but the Home Rulers, who, for purposes of obstruction, would equally have opposed a Bill declaring that two and two make four, insisted on the Bill proceeding in the regular course. We have seen it stated that Earl Fortescue, who for many years has been a member of both Houses in succession, said that if he had been asked his opinion off-hand he should have said it was not necessary to take the oath at the beginning of a new parliament.

With regard to the manner in which the House of Commons has dealt with Mr. Bradlaugh's case, we would remind our readers of some of the old legal dicta and maxims on the question of parliamentary privilege, which, if we may venture to say so, were not, during recent discussions, sufficiently present to the minds of the House and its Committees.

"The whole of the law and custom of parliament (says Blackstone, following the guidance of Coke) has its original from this one maxim, 'that whatever matter arises concerning either House of Parliament, ought to be examined, discussed and adjudged in that House to which it relates and not elsewhere.'"

In conformity with this maxim, when, so far back as the reign of Henry VI., the House of Lords propounded to the judges a

question on a matter of privilege, Chief Justice Fortescue, in the name of all his brethren, declared "that they ought not to make answer to that question, for it hath not been used afore-time that the justices should in anywise determine the privileges of the High Court of Parliament."\* To pass at once from the time of the Plantagenets to those of the House of Brunswick, we find, in 1837, the Commons, under the united guidance of Lord John Russell and Sir Robert Peel, agreeing to the following resolution, which, it will be seen, is in strict conformity to the dicta of Fortescue and Coke :—

"Resolved, That by the law and privileges of Parliament, this House has the sole and exclusive jurisdiction upon the existence and extent of its privileges; that the institution of any suit for the purpose of bringing them under discussion before any other court is a high breach of such privilege; and that for any court or tribunal to decide upon matters of privilege inconsistent with the determination of either House of Parliament is a breach and contempt of the privileges of Parliament."†

The question which Mr. Bradlaugh raised need not have been raised at all. The second Committee says, in its report :—

"As to the right and jurisdiction of the House to refuse to allow the form of the oath prescribed to be taken by duly elected members to be taken by them, your Committee are of opinion that there is and must be an inherent power in the House to require that the law by which the proceedings of the House and of its members in reference to the taking of the parliamentary oath is regulated be duly observed. But this does not imply that there is any power in the House to interrogate any member desirous to take the oath of allegiance upon any subject in connection with his religious belief, or as to the extent the oath will bind his conscience, or that there is any power in the House to hear any evidence in relation to such matters."

But Mr. Bradlaugh brought to the knowledge of the House the fact that the oath would have no binding effect upon his conscience, and the Committee were, therefore, forced to consider whether, under these circumstances, his compliance with the enjoined form would be the taking of an oath within the true meaning of the statutes, and the Committee could not avoid coming to the conclusion that the House could, and in the opinion of the Committee ought, to prevent Mr. Bradlaugh going through the form.‡

\* "Commentaries," vol. i. pp. 163-4. Twelfth edition.

† "Hansard," vol. xxxviii. p. 1134, quoted in Spencer Walpole's "History of England since 1815," vol. iii. p. 504. The Resolution had reference to the case of *Stockdale v. Hansard*, to which we shall hereafter advert.

‡ "Report of the Second Committee," pp. iv, v.

As Mr. Bradlaugh created the difficulty, it is fair to let him state, in his own words, his reason for taking the course he did. In the letter which, pending his case, he published, he says :—

“The oath, although to me including words of idle and meaningless character, was and is regarded by a large number of my fellow-countrymen as an appeal to Deity to take cognizance of their swearing. It would have been an act of hypocrisy to voluntarily take this form, if any other form had been open to me, or to take it without protest, as though it meant in my mouth any such appeal.”

And, he adds, in reference to the words, “So help me God,”—

“I have, scores of times, declared they are to me sounds conveying no clear and definite meaning. Again, no such religious scruple prevents me from taking the oath as prevented John Archdale and Joseph Pease.”

This being so, we cannot see why Mr. Bradlaugh did not make up his mind at once, as he did after the report of the first Committee to “comply with the forms of the House.”\*

In the case of members of the Society of Friends, they cannot swear by Him whose word they believe forbids them to swear at all. Jews could not, without profanation and injury to their conscience, repeat the words, “on the true faith of a Christian ;” but, spite of Mr. Bradlaugh’s assertion “that it was clearly his moral duty to make the affirmation,” we cannot see the existence of the alleged duty. Certainly there can be “no wounding of tender consciences” any more than there is any hypocrisy where no religious scruple intervenes in repeating words “of an idle and meaningless character.” We have referred to the example of John Stuart Mill, but we can give another example—where a whole class, without scruple or reluctance, repeated words which were to them “of an idle and unmeaning character.” Up to 1866 every person admitted as an attorney, and again on being admitted as a solicitor, in addition to the oaths of allegiance, supremacy, and abjuration, was compelled to make the following declaration :—

Romanists were, of later years, exempt from the obligation to make this declaration, but we never could learn that either the

“I, A. B., do declare that I do believe that there is not any transubstantiation in the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, or in the elements of bread and wine at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever.”

---

\* Statement on the Oath Question by Mr. Bradlaugh, printed as Appendix No. III. to the “Report of the Second Committee,” pp. 36, 37.

obligation or the exemption made the declarants or the excepted persons better attorneys or solicitors. To an overwhelming majority of the scores of young Protestants who every year went through the farce of making this declaration, its words were as idle and meaningless as are the words, "So help me God," to the member for Northampton: they did not, with Macaulay, regard it "as a kind of proof charge—a faith which stands which test, will stand any test." Nor did they say, with Cardinal Newman, "Why should not it be? What's to hinder it? What do I know of substance and matter? just as much as the greatest philosophers—that is, nothing at all."\* Probably not one in a hundred of them could have logically defined "transubstantiation." They had made themselves familiar with questions of estates for life, estates tail, chattel interests, personalty savouring of the realty, and such like, but they had not ventured within reach of the wind of the commotion caused by such questions as substance, essence, and other such notions, which Bacon calls "unsound, not clear, fantastical, and ill defined." They regarded this declaration and the "damnable doctrine and position" against which the oath of abjuration was directed, as mere turnpikes through which they must pass into the status of an attorney, and gladly went through them to the haven where they would be. And the member for Northampton has not shown why, if, on the 3rd of May, when he first presented himself at the table of the House, it was, as he says, "clearly his moral duty to make the affirmation," it was less his moral duty to do so on the 21st of May, when he claimed to take and subscribe the oath. If the moral obligation existed, it could not be done away by the accident of the first Select Committee deciding that he had no right to affirm.

The Government has been blamed for their management of the case; they have been called weak for referring the matter to a Committee and for not at once calling on the House to decide the matter; but such questions are more usually and properly referred to select committees, where they can be more calmly and closely considered than in the House itself, and in the case which most resembles that of Mr. Bradlaugh—the case, namely, of Mr. Pease—the matter was so referred, and the House was guided in its decision by the Report of the Select Committee.†

---

\* "Apologia," pp. 374–6.

† See Appendix No. I. to "Report of the Second Committee," p. 30.

Again, in 1857, when Lord John Russell, on behalf of the Jews, raised the question whether the House of Commons was included in the section of the Act of William IV., which empowered all bodies authorized to administer or receive an oath to allow a declaration to be made in lieu of any oath. The matter was referred to a Select Committee, who refused to adopt Lord John's proposal to substitute a declaration for an oath.

With regard to the Report of the first Select Committee, we cannot see that it was open to them to come to any other conclusion than that at which they arrived. Mr. Bradlaugh claimed the right to affirm in lieu of swearing, not by virtue of the general powers and privileges of the House, but under two specific Acts of Parliament, "The Evidence further Amendment Act, 1869," and "The Evidence Amendment Act, 1870." We think Mr. Walpole's statement of the effect of these Acts conclusive:—

"Every line refers to courts of justice, and to courts of justice alone, which allow the particular form in which the honourable member for Northampton desires to affirm. In every criminal and civil proceeding, in every court where the person satisfies the presiding judge, for the purposes of justice, that his oath is not binding upon him, then, in order to promote the administration of justice, you make the exception, but not in any other case; and in every one of these cases the form of the affirmation is distinctly embodied in the Act of Parliament that allows it. Now what is the form of the affirmation in the 'Evidence Amendment Acts?' It is this: 'I, A. B., do solemnly and truly declare that the evidence I give shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. You cannot substitute another form of affirmation, unless you are authorized by an Act of Parliament to do so, and this very Act of Parliament distinctly points out the form in which an affirmation is to be made. I feel very strongly that I cannot do otherwise than vote against the motion.'\*

This seems to us to establish, beyond question, that the Acts under which Mr. Bradlaugh claimed, only refer to oaths taken in judicial proceedings, and in no wise refer to the oath of allegiance or any other promissory oath; and as the Parliamentary Oaths Act enacts, in the most explicit terms, that the oath thereby appointed shall be made and publicly subscribed by every member of the House of Commons, at the table of the House, except by those who are permitted to substitute a declaration, the House could not, by its mere resolution alone, permit

---

\* In the debate of the 21st of June, 1880, *vide the Times*, the 22nd of June, and Hansard, vol. ccliii. Session, 1880.

Mr. Bradlaugh to affirm. To have done so would have been to substitute another and wholly different affirmation for that prescribed by the Evidence Amendment Acts, under the authority of which Acts the House would have assumed to be acting.

Mr. Bradlaugh is responsible for raising the question in the first instance, but for what occurred after the 21st of May we think him in no degree responsible. Though dissenting from the decision of the Select Committee, he would have submitted to it and was willing to take the oath, and the matter would have been settled without further difficulty but for the ill-timed and uncalled-for interference of Sir H. Drummond Wolff. We think the course pursued by the Government in defeating Sir H. Drummond Wolff's motion by the appointment of the second Select Committee was the only course open to them.

It was, in our opinion, a misfortune that the Government did not make Mr. Labouchere's Resolution a Government question, and it is to be regretted that the amendment of Sir Hardinge Giffard was allowed to find its way into the journals. We do not for this blame the Government, but the Opposition, whose conduct throughout the case has been signally factious and unprincipled. The course ultimately taken by the Government in passing the Resolution of July the 2nd, and permitting Mr. Bradlaugh to affirm, at his own risk of being sued for the statutory penalty, though for the present it removed a scandal and an obstruction in the way of public business, yet, we fear, has not permanently removed the difficulty, it has only adjourned it.

The Resolution introduces a pernicious innovation into the law and custom of Parliament contrary to the fundamental maxim that "whatever matter arises concerning either House of Parliament, ought to be examined, discussed and decided in that House to which it relates and not elsewhere," and equally contrary to the Resolution passed in 1837, which we have before quoted. It refers a question of parliamentary law and custom to the decision of the courts of law, the effect of which, in the opinion of one of the greatest authorities on parliamentary questions, Lord Colchester (Speaker Abbott) is, "that there is an end of *all authority of the House of Commons*, for a jury as well as a court of law would have an immediate control over them, and ultimately, by appeal, the House of Lords would, in error, have to decide upon the rights and privileges and acts and votes of the House of Commons."\* It was also the opinion of the same learned person that for any Court *out of Parliament*

---

\* *Vide* his "Diary," vol. ii. p. 263; and see the opinion of Mr. Ponsoby and others to the same effect, p. 269.

to question any proceeding in Parliament is contrary to the Bill of Rights, 1 William and Mary, cap. ii. article 8.\*

Had the House of Commons been now led by a statesman like Lord John Russell, deeply versed in parliamentary lore and attached to parliamentary privileges—because they are what our old lawyers call them, “the privileges of the people of England”—this perilous innovation would not have been made. Mr. Gladstone, however, was expressly warned of the consequences of the course he has pursued. They were clearly and forcibly pointed out by Mr. Walpole, in the speech from which we have before quoted :—

“Is the House (said Mr. Walpole) knowingly to sanction and encourage the member for Northampton when he takes his seat and incurs hundreds and hundreds of pounds of penalty, which, in consequence of the provisions of the House itself, he will be forced to pay? Would any one think it reasonable that he should not be indemnified if we allow him to sit, after having really promoted the conduct that involves him in these penalties? . . . The defence will be that he was entitled to affirm. Another defence will be that he was acting under the authority of the House, and that the House had the right and the jurisdiction to determine this question—nay, that it was the duty of the House to determine it. Is that a consequence we are prepared to accept? Are we to bring ourselves into collision with the courts of law, or are we so incapable of determining what is the construction to be put upon the Act of Parliament that we are to hand it over to the courts of justice, which may take any view irrespective of the point upon which we want to have a decision? I do not like the House to enter into any controversy with the courts of law, nor do I think it right that this House should shrink from the duty thrown upon it by Parliament—the statutory obligation to see that its members are rightly seated.”†

Many of our readers have, like ourselves, the melancholy privilege of being old enough to remember the case of *Stöckdale v. Hansard*. Those who are not will find the story of it told with great clearness and conciseness, but with hardly sufficient consideration for the difficulties of the situation in which the leaders of the House were placed, by Mr. Spencer Walpole in his “History of England.”‡ Seeing the confusion that case led to, the hindrance it occasioned to the progress of ordinary business both in the House of Commons and the law courts, and the hardship to individuals which it involved, all will agree with Mr. Walpole in his dislike of the House of Commons entering into another

---

\* *Ibid.* pp. 264, 5.

† *Vide the Times*, June 22nd, 1880, and *Hansard*, *ubi supra*.

‡ Vol. iii. pp. 504-510.



controversy with the courts of law. If they do so we foresee a repetition of *Stockdale v. Hansard* looming in the future. According to the Resolution of 1837, which we have quoted, the persons who have commenced penal actions against Mr. Bradlaugh, have committed—and any courts which decide these actions will commit—high breaches of parliamentary privilege. If, as Mr. Walpole anticipates—and we do not see how it can be otherwise—one of the defences set up by Mr. Bradlaugh is, that he acted under a Resolution of the House of Commons, the rights and privileges of the House will be at once involved, and the House cannot do otherwise than it did in the *Stockdale* case—instruct the Attorney-General to defend the action—and should, as we anticipate, the decision be against Mr. Bradlaugh, then the House will be again in the dilemma in which it found itself in *Stockdale's* case. The House could not appeal from the decision against *Hansard*—since the ultimate court of review is the House of Lords, and the Commons cannot submit their privileges to the decision of the Lords—and the same reasons would prevent an appeal in Mr. Bradlaugh's case. It seems to us, therefore, that to relieve the House from these difficulties, recourse must be had, as was done in *Stockdale's* case, to legislation. The Government wisely abstained from proposing legislation in the first instance, knowing that any measure which can be made out to be directly for the relief of avowed atheists would give the House of Lords a safe opportunity of showing their invincible intolerance, and would be rejected for as many or more years as were the Roman Catholic and Jewish Disabilities Bills.\*

There is no reason, however, why the Government should not learn a lesson from their opponents. When it was seen that the Jews were determined to persist in their claim to sit in Parliament, and that the constituencies were equally determined to choose Jews as their members, the sounder advisers of the Tory party sought a way to escape from the mess into which the obstinacy of the late Earl of Derby and the bishops had led them. Accordingly a highly respectable cavalry officer† was set up in the House of Lords to propose a measure by which either House was enabled to admit Jews by Resolution. The proposal was incongruous and absurd, and was open to the criticism thus coarsely expressed by Lord Campbell, that it was “as much as to say to the Commons, ‘We know that we should be damned if we agreed to admit a Jew to sit among us, but we give you authority to allow Jews to sit among you, and if you please you

---

\* *Vide* Mr. Gladstone's speech of July 1st. *Hansard*, vol. ccliii. Session 1880, p. 1270.

† The Earl of Lucan.

may do so and be damned to you.'"\* But Lord Lucan's Bill passed, and settled the Jewish question, after more than ten years' of discussion.

If a Bill were brought in, founded on Mr. Gladstone's Resolution of July the 1st—but the terms of which might be extended so as to permit either House, by Resolution, to admit any person who shall prefer, instead of taking the oath, to make and subscribe a declaration or affirmation in the form prescribed by the Parliamentary Oaths Act, 1866, as amended by the Parliamentary Oaths, 1868—the Lords could hardly refuse to follow the precedent initiated by themselves, and this question might be settled by one of those incongruous and illogical compromises which abound among our parliamentary and constitutional precedents. One thing we are glad to think—that the oath is doomed. When we find the most cautious and Whiggish of our contemporaries declaring that Mr. Bradlaugh's case "serves to illustrate a very important truth—namely, that promissory oaths, imposed solely for the purpose of binding the consciences of men to perform a public duty, are misapplied, and should be abolished altogether,"† we may be certain that a shrewd French writer is right when he says, "the end of this controversy is certain, viz., the abolition of the oath."‡

\* "Lives of the Chancellors," vol. viii. p. 206. Lord Lucan's Act is entitled "An Act to Provide for the Relief of Her Majesty's Subjects professing the Jewish Religion." It received the Royal assent July the 23rd, 1858.

† *Vide* the *Edinburgh Review*, No. 311, July, 1880, p. 295, *et seq.*, Art., The New Parliament in Session.

‡ M. Lemoine, in the *Journal des Débats*.

ART. III.—CAROLINE VON LINSINGEN AND  
KING WILLIAM IV.

1. *Caroline von Linsingen, die Göttin eines Englischen Prinzen.* Ungedruckte Briefe und Abhandlungen aus dem Nachlasse des Freiherrn K. von Reichenbach, herausgegeben und mit einer Einleitung versehen. Von . . . Leipzig: Verlag von Duncker und Humblot. 1880. London: Trübner and Co.
2. *Caroline von Linsingen and King William the Fourth.* Unpublished Love Letters discovered among the Literary Remains of Baron Reichenbach. Translated, with the German Editor's Introduction, and Baron Reichenbach's Account of the Letters, by THEOPHILUS G. ARUNDEL. London: W. Swan Sonnenschein and Allen, Paternoster Square. 1880.

**B**ETWEEN twenty and twenty-five years ago the public mind was transiently excited by the publication of the "Life" or "Memoirs" of a "Mrs. Elliot," who had been mysteriously and illicitly connected with George IV. The *Times*, in its review of the work, said that its publishers were bound to account for its origin, and to give the history of a book published so long after the happening of the events it professed to record, affecting the reputations of persons deceased, and given to the world without the sanction of the name of a responsible editor.

This book professes to reveal, as a fact hitherto almost universally unknown, a clandestine marriage between William IV., when Duke of Clarence, and Caroline von Linsingen. But as regards any guarantee of its authenticity—except so far forth as the title-page tells us the name of the English translator, a gentleman, so far as we know, hitherto unknown to literary or other fame—we may apply to this volume the remarks of the *Times* as to the "Memoirs of Mrs. Elliot." \* The translator, in the outset of his Preface, admits—

"That some words in substantial explanation may be looked for from a translator of letters so singular as are those in this book. Yet, so far (he continues) I can offer nothing beyond an apology, and this a personal one. It is that I cannot pretend to appear as their editor. I do not champion their genuineness, do not vouch for their truth; to such a task, indeed, the sound conviction brought by strenuous research is absolutely wanting. I can only put them before Englishmen in the English tongue just as they stand." Elsewhere he adds, "In a translation which I shall hope is as accurate and as intelligible as the extraordinary fervour of the original will allow it to be, with all the

arguments used by Baron Reichenbach and the German editor in their support. No note of assent or dissent shall be added by me."

And, accordingly, our translator leaves it to others to develop or to destroy what germ of truth may seem to underlie the whole romance. "Many," he continues, "will observe how both Reichenbach and the other editor are chiefly at pains to set forth its sentiment and its poetry, while as an unwritten page of history they give it less regard."\* The German editor says: "Here we have a romance, one which it would be hard for the most fertile imagination to excel in point of interest; moreover, this romance is history, it is truth."† Yes, but is it history in the sense of a sober narration of facts, or a romance so like reality that the tale might have been history. We wish all concerned in the production of this book had been more precise in stating whether they wish it to be considered as historical or poetical—a true account of the relations which actually existed between the English prince and the German lady, or a mere poetical account written—whether by the lady herself or some other person is, in this view, immaterial—of what those relations might have been, or the writer imagined them to be, having no more foundation in fact than the "Loves of the Triangles."

The German editor is not more willing than the English translator personally to guarantee the genuineness of the tale he edits:—

"How then," he says in his Introduction, "as will in justice be asked, how comes it that the editor has gained possession of facts and information of such a nature as to deserve belief? And who may the editor be? On what grounds does he withhold his name? To this latter question I shall at once give answer. If I now appear anonymously it will not be for long; of that I am convinced. For the present I would crave permission to retain the mask, in order that the effect of what is said from behind it may suffer no damage. Judgment being passed upon the subject matter, and upon that only, the verdict will be more likely to be an impartial one. When that shall have been given, I will readily set my name upon the title-page. With regard to the former question, the matter will meet with a detailed exposition at my hands."†

On reading this, the question at once arises, supposing the judgment passed upon the subject is that the story is a fabrication, will the editor as readily set his name on the title-page as if the judgment be in favour of the credibility of the story? His reasons for withholding his name are not, to our mind, satisfactory. If the story be true, he admits that "thereby a shadow is cast upon "an otherwise noble prince, who in his day

---

\* *Vide* the Translator's Preface. † Editor's Introduction, p. 3.

was (in our editor's opinion) both a popular statesman and righteous king ;"\* and any man who undertakes publicly to cast this shadow on the deceased's memory should have the manliness to give his name. It is not one of those cases "where the mask may be used in order that the effect of what is said from behind it may suffer no damage." It is not a matter of opinion or argument where prejudice against the writer or speaker may interfere with a candid hearing of what he has to say, and the shield of secrecy be therefore lawfully used ; but it is a matter of fact on which the public have a right to have the name of every person who aids in circulating the story.

It is fair to the editor to quote his statement—

"That it is no part of his plan to gain notoriety by dint of any racy disclosures, but that he has striven to rescue the majestic portrait of a noble German woman from unmerited oblivion ; one who, for her high-mindedness, lofty culture, and poetic sensibilities, no less than by her truly tragic fate, should have claim to the pity or at least the appreciative sympathy of posterity."†

We do not presume to express an opinion on the question whether, so far as Germany and German opinions are concerned, it is judicious to publish this volume, but we are confident that until its publication here, the name of Caroline von Linsingen was wholly unknown to Englishmen of this day and generation— if, indeed, it were ever known in England, except it may be to some members of the family and of the Court of George III.

The editor confesses that in a work, our ignorance of which and of its author we fully admit, but which he calls "Vehse's sound and thorough work," not even the slightest allusion is made to this story of a clandestine marriage of the Duke of Clarence.‡ But the translator asserts that the "fact alone that a great and respected firm of Leipzig publishers (whom, by the way, he does not name)§ should have first chosen to give the book to Europe, is no slight argument in its favour," and that he has had assurance "both from them and from others (equally unnamed) whose word carries weight, that the letters are really what the German editor says they are ; that the story is no stupid fabrication, but perfectly true." He further says that "in Germany the story has met with very general belief."|| This being so, and as the story professes to be that of an actual occurrence in the life of one of our sovereigns, it is a matter, if not of great importance, yet of sufficient interest to warrant an investigation into its credibility.

\* Editor's Introduction, p. 4. † Ibid. ‡ Ibid. p. 3.

§ Their names, however, are given on the title-page of the original (the German) edition, which is transcribed at the head of this Paper.

|| Translator's Preface.

The alleged fact being the clandestine marriage of William IV., when Duke of Clarence, to Caroline von Linsingen, we propose to discuss its credibility under two heads of inquiry: 1st. Who are the witnesses who assert the fact of the marriage? 2nd. What are the facts, real or alleged, which they bring forward to prove that such a marriage did in fact take place.

1. First as to the witnesses. The cloud of secrecy which hangs over the editor hides also the person through whom he became possessed of the Letters of Caroline von Linsingen which contain and preserve this story. We are told: "Some time back I received from a gentleman, a personal friend of mine, a packet of letters and papers which had been bequeathed to him, or rather to his wife," whom the editor elsewhere describes as "a lady of high intellectual gifts, by Freiherr Dr. Karl von Reichenbach, as a valuable legacy." Permission was granted to the editor, or, as we elsewhere gather, a trust was laid upon him to bring to light "these literary treasures." At first his expectations were modest, he thought probably they would "only be some extravagances in pen and ink by Reichenbach himself;" but on opening "the little packet, with its fastening of black ribbon, the Letters of Caroline von Linsingen lay before him, and there went forth a quaint perfume, mixed with an odour of decay," which produced on the editor these remarkable effects:—"To me," he says, "it seemed as if a tomb was opened, whence issued the wraiths of those long since dead, who were come to tell me of secrets until now buried in oblivion, of strange stories never yet heard by man." A calmer examination of the papers showed that "there was many a serious gap between them as a whole; in fitting together the shattered mosaic, here and there a block was missing." However, "the commentaries, biographical and critical," of Baron von Reichenbach, "a valuable and an enthusiastic guide" which accompanied the Letters, brought our editor into a path "that was in the main a sure one, along which he could go forward, if not without effort, without anxiety." "All research in printed books yielded no reliable data" in verification of these hitherto buried secrets and strange tales. When, lo! *Deus ex machina* appears on the scene. "As luck would have it," says our editor, "I then happened to form the acquaintance of a certain Baron von Linsingen living in Vienna. At first, as was natural, he showed all proper reticence; yet on learning the motives by which I was actuated, he with much willingness and courtesy proceeded to furnish me with the needed information to the best of his power." For this purpose the Baron wrote to a nebulous group of persons called "his relations at home," and "received an answer bearing the Gastdorf post-mark," which letter "reached the editor in due course." These relations do not, however, seem to have been able

to say more than that "during the final decade of the last century the Duke of Clarence had been a constant visitor at the house of 'Freiherr von Linsingen.'" This is of course important, as, if true, it would show a connection between the Duke and the Von Linsingen family. The editor also learned from this letter, "that Reichenbach had put himself in communication with the Von Linsingen family, and notably that he had corresponded with one Adolf von Linsingen, uncle to the editor's friend, then living in Vienna. This also is important, inasmuch as it shows Reichenbach to have been in communication with the Von Linsingen family; and, as we may assume, for the purpose of inquiry into the authenticity of these Letters and the truth of the story they tell.\*

Here our editor for the time disappears, and we are introduced to the story of the Letters as told by Reichenbach in his own words, and under the title chosen by himself—viz., "concerning the history of these Letters, by Karl Freiherr von Reichenbach." This forms the second division of the volume.

Reichenbach is the first known and definite person having any connection with these Letters and the story they tell, with whom we are brought into contact, and as he appears, saying, like Ancient Pistol, "Tidings do I bring," we mentally replied, with Falstaff, "I pry'thee now deliver them like a man of this world." We were, therefore, disappointed on reading the opening sentence of his narrative, which at the outset seems intended to repel all inquiry as to the genuineness of the Letters. "Is there any one," he says, "who, having read the contents of these Letters, will demand to know their origin? I doubt it." But to such sceptics, if any such there be, and "to the unquestioning also," he is "glad to offer explanation." His explanation is simple—that it is also truthful we doubt not, but we can scarcely call it satisfactory. "For three-and-thirty years," he continues, "they have lain locked away in my desk; to no one have I ever granted a sight of them; and before that they formed the profoundest of family secrets." Who and what, then, was Reichenbach? From his own account of himself it appears that during the years 1815 to 1817 he was engaged either in or in learning the business of mining and iron smelting, and with this object travelled far and wide in Germany. A wish to observe the application of charcoal-burning to the smelting process led him to stay for some time at a place called Blansko, where the charcoal system had been tried and failed. "If, thought I (are his own words), one cannot be taught *how* charcoal furnaces ought to be constructed, at the least one will learn how they should *not* be built; a tremendous gain,

---

\* Editor's Introduction, pp. 3-8.

forsooth, in matters of a practical kind ! It was from the bitter losses sustained by others that I looked to draw my wisdom." But it was not only lessons of practical wisdom on the question, How *not* to do it? that he gained. His sojourn at Blansko in the end led to his becoming the possessor of these "literary treasures," which, miser-like, he hoarded for thirty-three years. During his stay at Blansko he grew more or less intimate with some of the mining officials, and he was "specially friendly with the family of Herr Teubner, the mining superintendent, who, with his charming young wife, showed him every hospitality." The mother of the charming Madame Teubner had not long been dead. She often formed the subject of conversation in the family circle, and was "always mentioned in terms of reverence ; her great culture, the rank of her ancestors, her excellences of mind and heart—all these were dwelt upon, it is true, yet always with a certain reticence about which," he adds, "I was never troubled to inquire." An occasional Sunday visitor to the Teubner's was "a tall, graceful man," who was introduced to Reichenbach as Dr. Meineke, the father of Madame Teubner.

As a variation from his mining and smelting pursuits, Reichenbach went from Blansko to Lettowitz, three miles distant, to learn something of cotton spinning, or as much of it as could be learned in a two days' visit. Here, to his delight, he again met Meineke. "He was," to use Reichenbach's own words, "capital company, infusing life and spirit into all of us by the jovial stories and anecdotes that he knew how to relate with such telling effect." "The powers which erring man calls fate and chance" decreed that on one memorable night Reichenbach and Meineke should occupy adjoining bedrooms. This led to a conversation, of which we must give the narrative in Reichenbach's own words:—

• "Before retiring for the night we went on to talk at some length, and from Meineke's wide knowledge, as also from his thorough acquaintance with the whole history of the Blansko charcoal furnaces the conversation bid fair to be an instructive one for me. As a young man of seven-and-twenty, I had a universal thirst for knowledge. Yet Meineke kept to the track of science for but a short time together. He was for ever breaking aside from it to lapse into reminiscences of his wife, which were apparently the source of much painful embarrassment. I as yet knew little of him ; of his wife nothing whatever ; our mutual enthusiasm for chemistry was all that we had in common ; and thus I was not particularly inclined to respond to all that he confided to me respecting his bereavement. If I listened it was less from sympathy than from politeness ; I did not foresee how intense would be my subsequent interest in the matter ; thus all he had told me was soon forgotten. Yet I can still recollect being struck at the utter difference that there



was between Meineke the brilliant conversationalist of the dinner-table, and him who formed my solitary companion in the night-time. His fun, his humour had vanished, his features betrayed a grave melancholy, which was discernible also in the tone of his voice. It was plain that some weight lay at his heart, which seemed impelled to seek a kindred one to share its load. He appeared to fancy that in his nature and my own there existed an affinity of sympathies; and more than once he made as though he would have told me all. But my temperament just then was not one which could yield encouragement to confidential disburthenings of this kind.\*

Notwithstanding the repulse of Meineke's confidences which he received at the hands of his companion,

"Something from within forced him, as it were, to unburden himself respecting his wedded life. His wife's history, so he termed it, was a novel of the most exciting kind. At any rate, he could not resist telling me this much, that in her he had possessed a charming and cultivated woman whom he had never rightly understood until, after her death, he had read her *posthumous* papers. It was a matter of ceaseless remorse to him that he was now powerless ever to undo the results of his ignorance and utter want of appreciation."

Meineke's midnight maunderings not unnaturally gave rise to dark suspicions in the mind of the unwilling recipient of his confidences. "His remorse," says Reichenbach, "was the remorse of a murderer, so keen was it; and I, knowing nothing to the contrary, harboured the dread that some actual crime might really be at the root of all this mysterious conduct. To make such a discovery was wholly distasteful to me; if anything, I sought to avoid doing so."† He therefore apologizes to his readers for his want of foresight in not anticipating the value to the present work of those deeper confidences on the part of Meineke, which he always met "by systematic rebuffs." Soon after this memorable night Reichenbach pursued his journey, "ever in quest of smelting furnaces and forges. Meineke, with all his mysteries, was speedily forgotten. I thought that I should probably never again set eyes upon all these people. The Fates, however, had willed it otherwise. From my interest in coal furnaces there had sprung up a link of union."

A few years later he returned to Blansko, to build for a Count Salm "several furnaces designed on principles of his own, he being careful to keep out such errors of construction as his former stay at Blansko had taught him to avoid." He now lived under the same roof as the Teubners; their daily intercourse ripened "into hearty friendship." Meineke *père*, now curator of the Brünn Museum, once more appeared upon the scene, often

\* Reichenbach's "History," &c., pp. 9-16.

† Ibid. p. 17.

paying Reichenbach a visit. The friendship between Reichenbach's wife and Madame Teubner was specially close; death only put an end to it.

"It was during this period, then" (we prefer here to give the Baron's own words), "in about the year 1826, that Madame Teubner, who in confidence had often told my wife about her mother's misfortunes in a disconnected sort of way, gave her these posthumous Letters of hers to read. They both wished me to read them too. Increasing pressure of work, however, formed a hindrance. Years went on before I was able to do so. During this period, when the Teubners came to leave Brünn for Graz, Madame Teubner, as a memento of herself and of our many days of friendship, made me a present of the Letters. For thrice ten years and more they lay in my desk."

At the date—which is not given—when he composed this history, "something," he says, "now urges me to speak forth to the world;"\* but he remained silent, and, dying, bequeathed these "literary treasures" to the wife of the unnamed friend of our anonymous editor.

With this statement of Reichenbach's unfulfilled purpose of speaking to the world on Caroline von Linsingen and her history, his history of these Letters ends, and the editor resumes his Introduction. The witnesses therefore are—the anonymous editor, the anonymous friend and his wife—who knew nothing about the Letters but that they received them as a legacy from Reichenbach, who knew no more of them, their writer, or their origin than that they were given to him by Madame Teubner, who said she was the daughter of Caroline von Linsingen, and that the Letters were written by her mother. The fact of the alleged marriage depends entirely on the genuineness of the Letters. Before examining the story the Letters tell, we must point out that they are inaccurately described in the English title-page: on first reading the words "Love Letters" we were led to suppose that the book contained a lover's correspondence between Caroline and the Duke of Clarence, of the ordinary kind which delights those who study the literature of breach of promise of marriage; but of the letters, nine in number, one only is from the lady to the Duke, written in 1795, after the connection between them—whatever may have been its nature—was at an end, and she was about to become the wife of Meineke; and after, also, the Duke's connection with Mrs. Jordan had begun, and the birth of the first child of that connection.† This is not a love letter, but a letter of dismissal, or, perhaps, it would be more accurate to say, farewell. Parenthetically, we

---

\* Reichenbach's "History," pp. 18-21.

† George, born 1794, afterwards created Earl of Munster.

may observe that it contains a passage which undesignedly shows that it is not genuine, in this sense—that though it may have been written by the person by whom, yet it was not written to the person to whom, it purports to have been written. “I send you,” says the writer, “a letter I received from your uncle, the worthy Duke of Gloucester, in the spring. Your wretchedness touched him, and he tried to persuade me to unsay my renouncement. You will see in what glowing colours he paints the happiness he enjoys at the side of his Marie, the daughter of Sir Horace Walpole.”\* One of the marriages which led to the passing of the Royal Marriage Act was that of the Duke of Gloucester, George III.’s brother, with Lady Waldegrave, who was an illegitimate daughter of Sir Edward—not Horace—Walpole. We lay no stress upon a foreigner’s confusion between English names and titles, but why should the writer tell the Duke of Clarence whom his uncle had married. The excitement the marriage caused in the Royal Family, in the Court, and in society, made such information quite unnecessary. In a letter written as a narrative to be read by strangers it is a very natural explanatory reference. Of the remaining eight letters, one only is, or purports to be, from the Duke to the lady in reply to hers. Its authenticity, for reasons to which we shall hereafter advert, we unhesitatingly deny. Of the seven others, four are from Caroline to her son-in-law Teubner, the first undated, but evidently written after his marriage to her daughter—the date of that marriage we are not told. The second, dated “Aug. 20, 18—;” the third, “Nov. 9, 18—;” the last “Jan. 21st,” no year being given. The remaining three letters are from Caroline to her brother Ernst; the first dated “11th Aug. 179—;” the second simply “181—,” and the last printed in the series, “3rd May, 1806;” but this would seem in date to have preceded the second.†

These Letters, therefore, are not love letters, but letters about a love story, and as the evidence of its truth they are open to the weighty objection that they were not written at the time when the events occurred which they profess to relate. “Letters written at the time,” as was said by a great critic now no more, “like journals, entered day by day, have this advantage over other memoirs, that they exhibit faithfully the impression of the moment;” but in letters written weeks or months, or, still more, as in this case, years after the events have occurred, as in all other narratives so written, the writer is tempted to forget the

---

\* Letters, p. 153.

† A note at p. 46 says “that the letters have been arranged, not in strict chronological order, but in accordance with the course of the events which they narrate.”

real order in which facts occurred, and to rearrange them according to his theory of how they ought to be.\*

Another error in the description of the Letters occurs more than once. In the body of the book they are styled "Posthumous Letters."† The accurate meaning of "posthumous letters" would be letters written after the death of their writer. We apprehend those who in this case misapply the term meant to express no more than that the letters were not revealed or published till after the writer's death; unless, indeed, we suppose that those who produced these letters had brought themselves to believe, and wished others to believe, that they were communications from "the spirit world." If our supposition be true, it would account for their rhapsodical character.

We now turn from the witnesses to the story they set up. Of this the letters are the primary source. They are supplemented by the editor's second Introduction, which consists of a sort of gloss or commentary on them, derived, we suppose—for we are not precisely told—from Reichenbach's "Commentaries, Biographical and Critical," his obligation to which the editor in his earlier Introduction acknowledges.

Of those comments the evidential value, so far as their statements exceed or vary from those of the letters, depends on the source whence they were derived; and if we are right in supposing that they are derived from Reichenbach, then their value depends on what information he obtained from his communications with the Von Linsingen family, as to which we have no precise information.‡ And if they be Reichenbach's, it must be borne in mind that the editor admits that he was, if a "valuable," yet "an enthusiastic guide." Beyond these comments the only fact corroborative of the story is that learned by the editor, through his Vienna acquaintance, from the nebulous group at Gastdorf, "that during the final decade of the last century the Duke of Clarence had been a constant visitor at the house of Freiherr von Linsingen."§ The letters themselves show that the intercourse between the Duke and the Linsingen family was confined to so much of the decade as comprised the years 1790 to 1792. This Baron von Linsingen held the rank of Lieutenant-General, and commanded the 12th Hanoverian Infantry. By his marriage with a kinswoman he became the father of eight children, of whom Caroline was the second.|| She

\* *Conf.* Sir G. C. Lewis "Essays on Administrations of Great Britain," &c., pp. 157, 8; and J. A. Froude's "Lives of the English Saints." Introduction to Life of St. Neot.

† *Vide* pp. 17, 20. ‡ *Vide* Introduction, p. 8. § *Ibid.* pp. 7, 8.  
 || *Vide* p. 24, but at p. 25 she is called his "youngest daughter."

was born 27th Nov. 1768. Her father was on terms of the closest intimacy with the Grand Ducal House of Mecklenburgh-Strelitz, and on the marriage of George III. to the Princess Sophia Charlotte, he accompanied the bride to England.

Writing in one of the remotest villages in England, we are unable to make an exhaustive search into the names of the suite which accompanied the Princess. All we are able to discover is that in the very full account of her departure from Germany and her arrival in England, given in the Annual Register for 1761, among the names given there is no mention of any one called "Von Linsingen." Our heroine tells us that her father

"Remained in England for three years, and was in such high favour with the good-natured George III. that it was with reluctance that he could obtain permission to return to Hanover; indeed, as long as he lived he was the recognized favourite of the whole family. He used to stop in London three months at a time, and it was during one of these visits that he promised Queen Charlotte to entrust his youngest daughter (Caroline) entirely to her care. Caroline had scarcely reached her fourteenth year when the Queen begged that she might be sent to her."\*

It seems scarcely probable that the Queen, with her own large family, should have wished to adopt the child of a stranger, but, if she ever entertained any such purpose, it was never fulfilled. At no time in her life did Caroline visit England. According to her own account, "she had often to keep up a correspondence with Her Majesty, who still had an affection for everything German. Her spirited and kindly letters," she continues, "helped much to add to my youthful pleasure and to form my character, for I was at great pains to come up to her idea of what she would wish me to be."†

The date at which the story fixes the beginning of the acquaintance between Caroline and the Duke is important, as supplying a means of testing its truth.

"On one of my father's last visits to London," says our heroine, writing at an ungiven date, "the royal parents entrusted him with the care of their third son, William Henry, the pet of his family, the pet of the nation."‡ The lady fixes the date of her first seeing the Duke as the 13th of April. She does not give the year; according to the editor it was 1790.§

There is, to say the least, great obscurity over this part of the story. Madame D'Arblay was an uninterrupted resident with Queen Charlotte from 1786 to May 1790, and her Court life did

\* *Vide* Introduction, pp. 24, 25.

‡ Introduction, pp. 24-26.

Letters, pp. 47, 48.

§ Letters, pp. 48, 49.

† *Ibid.*

not end until the summer of 1791. It was with her and her colleague that visitors to the palace dined or had tea, and there is no mention in her diary, which is full and exact as to the visitors entertained, of any visitor named Von Linsingen, or of any one unnamed who can be identified with him. A visit from "the recognized favourite of the whole family," Madame D'Arblay would surely not have failed to mention. Our heroine speaks of the King and Queen entrusting her father with "the care of the pet of the family—the pet of the nation," as if the Duke of Clarence had then been still a child or in early youth, but in 1790 he was in his 25th year.\* He had for some years been in the navy, and had held the rank of captain since 1786. In his later years he said of himself: "When I was a young man I believed in nothing but pleasure and folly, nothing at all."† When he visited America as a young naval officer, he was looked upon by the Americans as one of the least favourable specimens of our countrymen who had ever visited their shores.‡ A witness, who can scarcely be deemed impartial, but whose evidence is by no means unsupported, said of him: "He had little of that peculiar pride which is called dignity; he was at times half-crazy, and at no time fit to be left to his own guidance."§

However this may have been, a passage in Madame D'Arblay's diary for 1789 shows that, at all events, he was not in the least likely to submit to be "entrusted to the care of any one:"—

"On the 2nd of May I met Colonel Manners waiting at the corner of a passage leading towards the Queen's apartments. 'Is the King, ma'am,' he cried, 'there? Because Prince William is come.' I heard he was arrived in town, and with much concern, since it was without leave of the King. It was in the illness, indeed, of the King he sailed to England, and when he had probably all the excuse of believing his royal father incapable of further governance.|| How did I grieve for the feelings of that royal father in this idea! Yet it certainly offers for Prince William his best apology.¶

\* He was born 21st August, 1765; created Duke of Clarence, 1784; Captain R.N., 10th April, 1786; Rear-Admiral, 2nd Dec., 1790.

† Quoted in Torrens's "Memoirs of Melbourne," vol. ii. p. 205.

‡ Lord Teignmouth's "Reminiscences of Many Years," vol. ii. p. 187.

§ "MS. Political Narratives," by Francis Place, i. p. 32. Quoted in Torrens's "Memoirs of Melbourne," vol. i. p. 332. *Conf.* Lord Colchester's Diary, quoted *post.* Place's "Narratives" we are glad to find are in the British Museum.

|| In 1790, the printer of *The Times* was convicted for a libel on the Duke of Clarence. The alleged libel was a statement that the Duke had left his vessel without the orders of his commanding officer.

¶ George III. had then (May, 1789) lately recovered from one of his attacks of insanity.

"In the evening, while Mrs. Schwellenberg, Mrs. Zackary, and myself were sitting in the eating parlour, the door was suddenly opened by Mr. Alberts, the Queen's page, and 'Prince William' was announced.

"He came to see Mrs. Schwellenberg. He is handsome, as are all the Royal Family, though he is not of a height to be called a good figure. He looked very hard at the two strangers, but made us all sti very civilly, and drew a chair for himself, and began to discourse with the most unbounded openness and careless ease of everything that occurred to him.

"Mrs. Schwellenberg said she had pitied him for the grief he must have felt at the news of the King's illness. 'Yes,' cried he, 'I was sorry for His Majesty, very sorry indeed. No man loves the King better, of that be assured. But all sailors love their king. And I felt for the Queen, too; I did, faith. I was horridly agitated when I saw the King first. I could hardly stand.'

"Then Mrs. Schwellenberg suddenly said, 'Miss Berner, now you might see his Royal Highness; you wanted it so much, and now you might do it. Your Royal Highness, that is Miss Berner.'

"He rose very civilly, and bowed to this strange freak of an introduction; and of course I rose and courtesied low, and waited his commands to sit again, which were instantly given with great courtesy.

"'Ma'am,' cried he, 'you have a brother in the service?'"

"Yes, sir," I answered, much pleased with this professional attention.

"'He had not,' he civilly said, 'the pleasure to know him, but he had heard of him.'

"Then turning suddenly to Mrs. Schwellenberg, 'Pray,' cried he, 'what is become of Mrs.—Mrs.—Mrs. Hogentot?'"

"'Oh, your Royal Highness!' cried she, stifling much offence, 'do you mean the poor Haggerdorn? Oh, your Royal Highness, have you forgot her?'"

"'I have, upon my word!' cried he plumply, 'upon my soul, I have!' Then turning again to me, 'I am very happy, ma'am,' he cried, 'to see you here; it gives me great pleasure the Queen should appoint the sister of a sea-officer to so eligible a situation. As long as she has a brother in the service, ma'am,' cried he to Mrs. Schwellenberg, 'I look upon her as one of us. O, faith, I do! I do, indeed! She is one of the corps.'

"Then he said he had been making acquaintance with a new princess, one he did not know nor remember—Princess Amelia. 'Mary, too,' he said, 'I had quite forgot; and they did not tell me who she was; so I went up to her, and without in the least recollecting her, she's so monstrously grown, I said: 'Pray, ma'am, are you one of the attendants?'"

"Princess Sophia is his professed favourite. 'I have had the honour,' he cried, 'of about an hour's conversation with that young lady, in the old style, though I have given up my mad frolics now. To be sure, I had a few in that style formerly. Upon my word, I am almost ashamed. Ha! ha! ha!'"

"Then, recollecting particulars, he laughed vehemently; but Mrs. Schwollenberg eagerly interrupted his communications. I fancy some of them might have related to her own sacred person.

"'Augusta,' he said, 'looks very well. A good face and countenance. She looks interesting. She looks as if she knew more than she would say, and I like that character.'

"He stayed a full hour, chatting in this good-humoured and familiar manner.'\*

So undistinguished were the early years of William IV., and so little was it then anticipated that he would be King of England, that little attention was paid to his movements, and there is some difficulty in finding out precisely where he was at any given date. So far as we know, no authentic biography of him has ever been published. From the scanty particulars given in a brief memoir in Rose's "Biographical Dictionary,"† we learn that during the years 1783 to 1785, he travelled on the Continent. That he ever revisited it, is not mentioned. "The records connected with the Admiralty Department show that he was appointed to the command of the *Valiant* on the 10th of May, 1790. If, therefore, he was in Hanover on the 13th of April in that year, his stay there must have been of the shortest. Rose states that the *Valiant* was paid off in the course of the same year. If the couple did meet at the time alleged, the Duke was in his twenty-fifth and the lady in her twenty-second year. The editor, on the authority, we presume, of Reichenbach, describes her—

"As a remarkable psychological phenomenon. Even had she not been joined to a Royal Prince by tender ties, she would yet have a high claim to our interest, and her individuality would always be a marked one. Her poems charged with the Klopstock spirit; her letters full of soul if full of sentiment, harking back to the Werther period; her strange illnesses, somnambulism and trance. The tragic contrast of her sensitive nature to the stern reality of outward circumstances. All this, we say, yields over-abundant material for a most interesting psychological study."

We are not concerned to deny this, but when we read "Caroline's marriage with the Duke of Clarence, afterwards King William IV. of England, sets all our knowledge of her in quite a new light; it gives a higher meaning to her letters; the background to her whole life becomes an extraordinary one—in a word, her character gains historical importance,"‡ we are compelled to express our dissent. The lady's character never had

\* Vol. v. p. 24.

† Vol. xii. p. 499.

‡ Editor's Introduction, pp. 22, 23.



any! "historical importance," for, whatever might have been the relation in which she stood to the Duke, marriage between them, we shall show, was impossible. According to the lady, the Duke was accompanied to Hanover "by her father's youngest brother and a certain Englishman, Lord Dutton." These two acted as the Duke's equerries, and besides them there were "other English and Hanoverian nobles whom her father had recommended to form the suite."\* According to the editor, the suite consisted of a younger brother of Caroline herself—not, as she says, "of her father, a Lord Dutton, and some other English and Hanoverian nobles.†

We know the "invincible ignorance" of foreigners on all things relating to English names, ranks, and titles. We do not, therefore, think that the story is much affected by the fact that, after a careful search in Burke's "Peerage," we fail to find any proof of a peerage of the name of Dutton existing, dormant or extinct. The family name of Baron Sherborne is Dutton, but there would be no *Lord* Dutton of that family, and the record in Burke shows no connection of any of them with any member of the family of George III.

We think that the editor is right in saying it was a brother of the lady, and not of her father, who was on the Duke's suite. At any rate, her brother Frederick Ernst Jacob, whom the editor describes as "Caroline's favourite brother, and the Prince's bosom friend," took, as the Letters show, in concert with Dutton, the most active part in the arrangements for the marriage ceremony. This Ernst was the grandfather of the editor's Vienna acquaintance. He survived until June 21, 1853; he held the rank of a general of cavalry and adjutant to the King of Hanover. "This great man," says the editor, "was a party to the secret, and could have given the minutest evidence respecting it, had not his lips been sealed by the bonds of friendship no less than by a solemn vow."‡

We are equally at a loss to discover why Ernst von Linsingen is entitled to be called a "great man," and why, if he knew that the ceremony of a marriage had been gone through between the English Prince and his sister, and especially if he believed in its validity, he did not bear his testimony to the fact. If he did not believe in its validity, we see abundant reason for his silence during the lives of the Duke and his sister; but Caroline died in 1813, and William IV. in 1837. After the death of the survivor, at any rate, there could have been no reason for secrecy. "No one," says Reichenbach, "will think it strange that a young girl

---

\* Letter to Teubner, p. 49.

† Introduction, pp. 24, 25.

‡ Ibid., p. 26.

and an uncorrupted youth like the Prince should, when brought into daily contact, show signs of mutual ardour.\* It was on the 13th April that the lady first saw the Duke. "In July," she says, "we already know that by death alone our love could have its end."† The father, alarmed at what he saw, communicated with Queen Charlotte, who, if the story be true, received the news in a manner wholly inconsistent with the moral austerity generally attributed to her. "Yet she," writes the heroine, "who was so fearful for the ardent blood of her son William, took the matter but lightly. She knew nothing of love, and begged my father to let this dallying continue. She rather rejoiced that her son's fancy for me at this most critical period of his youth should serve to keep his virtue intact."‡ Bearing in mind Madame D'Arblay's account of the Duke's youth, and the well-known incidents of his later life, we may be pardoned for doubting whether, in 1790, he was an "uncorrupted youth with virtue intact." "A year later," our heroine continues, "I finally yielded to William's irresistible entreaties, and in the presence of Ernst and Dutton we were made one at the altar by a Scotch minister, who afterwards went to Washington, and who was greatly attached to William."§ The date fixed for the marriage ceremony is 21st August, 1791, being the Duke's twenty-sixth birthday. The editor alleges that "George, the Duke of York, Jackson, a confidential servant of the Duke of Clarence, and some other persons, were also present at the wedding."

The editor is inaccurate in calling the Duke of York, George; his name was Frederick. We can hardly believe that the Duke of York, knowing the feelings of his father as to marriages in the Royal Family, would have been present at this pretended marriage. If he were present, he knew, and so equally did all the other English concerned, that they were acting in a farce. The editor admits that "the evidence of a marriage certificate is wanting," but he would have us credit the validity of the marriage on account of the Duke of Clarence's "subsequent vacillation when in England," but of such vacillation he gives no syllable of proof. Elsewhere he says, "All documents having legal worth found their way to England, there to meet with the strictest concealment, if not with actual destruction." This statement, like that as to the Duke's vacillation, rests solely on the editor's unsupported assertion.

\* Introduction, p. 3.

† But during part of this time the Duke must have been with the *Valiant*, of which he was then in command.

‡ Letter to Teubner, p. 50.

§ Introduction, pp. 1, 35.

Had we no other evidence than this book, we should have inferred that the lovers were together during the whole period between their first meeting on 13th April, 1790, and the ceremony of 21st August, 1791. But it was not so. Madame D'Arblay gives us another of her lifelike sketches of the Duke in the spring of 1791, which we beg our readers to compare with the following ideal sketch by our editor:—

“By the joy which this love brought him, the Prince, great as he was, seemed even to gain in greatness. His every action, as Caroline remarks, then bore such thorough witness to ‘his great, noble, kingly heart’—at this juncture he seemed a very god—that she marvelled at the good fortune which empowered her to call this man—aye, this man—her own.”\*

So much for the ideal; now for the real. Under date of June 4, 1791, Madame D'Arblay writes:—

“At dinner Mrs. Schwellenberg presided, attired magnificently. Miss Goldsworthy, Mrs. Stainforth, Messrs. De Luc and Stanhope dined with us; and while we were still eating fruit the Duke of Clarence entered.

“He was just risen from the King's table, and waiting for his equipage to go home and prepare for the ball. To give you an idea of the energy of his Royal Highness's language, I ought to set apart a general objection to writing, or rather intimating, certain forcible words, and beg leave to show you in genuine colours a royal sailor.

“We all rose, of course, upon his entrance, and the two gentlemen placed themselves behind their chairs, while the footmen left the room; but he ordered us all to sit down, and called the men back to hand about some wine. He was in exceeding high spirits, and in the utmost good humour. He placed himself at the head of the table, next Mrs. Schwellenberg, and looked remarkably well, gay, and full of sport and mischief, yet clever withal, as well as comical.

“Well, this is the first day I have ever dined with the King at St. James's on his birthday. Pray, have you all drunk His Majesty's health?”

“No, your Roy'l Highness. Your Roy'l Highness might make dem do dat,” said Mrs. Schwellenberg.

“Oh, by —— will I! Here, you (to the footman), bring champagne. I'll drink the King's health again if I die for it! Yet I have done pretty well already; so has the King, I promise you. I believe his Majesty was never taken such good care of before. We have kept his spirits up, I promise you. We have enabled him to go through his fatigues, and I should have done more still, but for the ball and Mary. I have promised to dance with Mary.’

---

\* Introduction, p. 31. Letters, p. 71.

"Champagne being now brought for the Duke, he ordered it all round. When it came to me I whispered to Westèrhaults to carry it on.

"The Duke slapped his hand violently on the table, and called out, 'O, by —, you shall drink it!'

"There was no resisting this. We all stood up, and the Duke sonorously gave the royal toast.

"'And now,' cried he, making us all sit down again, 'where are my rascals of servants? I sha'n't be in time for the ball; besides, I've got a deuced tailor waiting to fix on my epaulette. Here you, go and see for my servants. D'ye hear? Scamper off!'

"Off ran William.

"'Come, let's have the King's health again. De Luc, drink it. Here, champagne to De Luc!'

"I wish you could have seen Mr. de Luc's mixed simper—half-pleased, half-alarmed. However, the wine came and he drank it, the Duke taking a bumper for himself at the same time.

"'Poor Stanhope,' cried he; 'Stanhope shall have a glass too. Here, champagne! What are you all about? Why don't you give champagne to poor Stanhope?'

"Mr. Stanhope with great pleasure complied, and the Duke again accompanied him.

"'Come hither, do you hear?' cried the Duke to the servants, and on the approach, slow and submissive, of Mrs. Stanforth's man, he hit him a violent slap on the back, calling out, 'Hang you, why don't you see for my rascals?'

"Away flew the man, and then he called out to Westèrhaults, 'Hark'ee, bring another glass of champagne to Mr. de Luc!'

"Mr. de Luc knows these royal youths too well to venture at so vain an experiment as disputing with them, so he only shrugged his shoulders and drank the wine. The Duke did the same.

"'And now, poor Stanhope,' cried the Duke, 'give another glass to poor Stanhope, d'ye hear?'

"'Is not your Royal Highness afraid,' cried Mr. Stanhopo, displaying the full circle of his borrowed teeth, 'I shall be apt to be rather up in the world, as the folks say, if I tope on at this rate.'

"'Not at all! you can't get drunk in a better cause. I'd get drunk myself if it was not for the ball. Here, champagne! Another glass for the philosopher! I keep sober for Mary.'

"'O your Royal Highness!' cried Mr. De Luc, gaining courage as he drank, 'you will make me quite droll if you make me go on—quite droll!'

"'So much the better! so much the better! it will do you a monstrous deal of good. Here, another glass of champagne for the Queen's philosopher!'

"Mr. De Luc obeyed, and the Duke then addressed Mrs. Schwellenberg's George. 'Here you! you! why, where is my carriage? Run and see, do you hear?'

"Off hurried George, grinning irrepressibly. 'If it was not for that

deuced tailor, I would not stir. I shall dine at the Queen's house, on Monday, Miss Goldsworthy; I shall come to dine with the Princess Royal. I find she does not go to Windsor with the Queen."

"He then said it was necessary to drink the Queen's health.

"The gentlemen here made no demur, though Mr. De Luc arched his eyebrows in expressive fear of consequences.

"'A bumper,' cried the Duke, 'to the Queen's gentleman usher.'

"They all stood up and drank the Queen's health.

"'Here are three of us,' cried the Duke, 'all belonging to the Queen: the Queen's philosopher, the Queen's gentleman usher, and the Queen's son; but thank Heaven, I'm nearest!'

"'Sir,' cried Mr. Stanhope, a little affronted, 'I am not now the Queen's gentleman usher; I am the Queen's equerry, sir.'

"'A glass more of champagne here! What are you all so slow for? Where are all my rascals gone? They've put me in one passion already this morning. Come, a glass of champagne for the Queen's gentleman usher!' laughing heartily.

"'No, sir,' repeated Mr. Stanhope, 'I am equerry now, sir.'

"'And another glass to the Queen's philosopher!'

"Neither gentlemen objected, but Mrs. Schwellenberg, who had sat laughing and happy all this time, now grew alarmed, and said, 'Your Royal Highness, I am afraid for the ball!'

"'Hold you your potato jaw, my dear,' cried the Duke, patting her; but recollecting himself, he took her hand and pretty abruptly kissed it, and then, flinging it hastily away, laughed aloud, and called out, 'There! that will make amends for anything, so now I may say what I will. So here! a glass of champagne for the Queen's philosopher and the Queen's gentleman usher! Hang me if it will not do them a monstrous deal of good!'

"Here news was brought that the equipage was in order. He started up, calling out, 'Now, then, for my deuced tailor.'

"'O, your Royal Highness!' cried Mr. De Luc, in a tone of exposition, 'now you have made us droll, you go!'

"Off, however, he went. And is it not a curious scene? All my amaze is, how any of their heads bore such libations."\*

We must give, though in an abridged form, in the lady's own words, her account of the evening before the wedding, and of the ceremony itself, that our readers may judge how she was "charged with the Klopstock spirit, and even harking back to the Werther period." It is taken from her letters to Teubner, professing to be written on the 20th and 21st August of a year not fixed, being the anniversaries of the events of which she writes:—

"On the day before the ceremony my father gave a dinner party and a ball. . . . During dinner I sat between my two groomsmen,

Dutton and Ernst, with William as my *vis-d-vis*. On leaving the table we at once went to the theatre, where *Don Carlos* was given. William kept close to me, and oh! what enjoyment we had! When the Princess Eboli exclaimed, '*Once only can I give, yet 'tis for aye,*' our eyes, dizzy with love, met, and it was hard for each to refrain from falling into the other's arms. But our guardian angels stood beside us. Dutton and Ernst kept unceasing watch, for they both loved us, and loved us passionately. They screened us at the proper moment, and by laughing and whispering managed to draw the attention of the company upon themselves. What recked they if they, the very flowers of *haut ton*, were looked upon as slightly intoxicated?"

At another passage in the tragedy—

"The first inkling of my dark, dark future loomed before me. I trembled violently, and could scarcely contain myself."

From the theatre they went to the ball, the lady being—

"Clothed in pure white, my only ornament being a green coronet beset with pearls and the beautiful cross of my Order, which I wore only on festive occasions—never before at a dance."

And which—she is particular in mentioning—she

"wore over the left breast, thereby attracting the gaze of all to that enticing spot. By the laws of etiquette my father took me up to William; and when the worthy old man seized my hand, and, placing it in his, pressed both violently together, can you not imagine our mutual feelings? As my father withdrew his hand I stooped to kiss it, saying in a low tone, 'You are giving him to me for life!' He saw my emotion, and half seemed to understand me. 'Would that ye could have your wish, but it cannot be!' As he left us, William glanced half ardently, half sadly towards me, and said [our readers will not fail to contrast this speech put in the mouth of the Duke with his vernacular utterances reported by Madame D'Arblay]—'How charmingly has the dear bride clad herself; quite as I should wish, and yet how like a sacrificial lamb she looks! There is that in your soul to-day which I know not yet. Is it that you rue it? Can you not make the sacrifice?' I said to him that as it was the only day on which I could with right put on my wreath and cross, I had not been able to resist the temptation of wearing them once again. To this he passionately rejoined—'Even as matron, the wreath of purity can serve you as adornment, for until death comes will your heart keep unstained and guileless; and this Order, to which only as maiden you have right, shall be changed for one such as kings' daughters only wear.'"

At this point there was nearly a quarrel between the two royal dukes; "and thus," adds the lady, "how different might have been my lot. But the quarrel being averted, the lovers went out to walk under the trees, and "we renewed our vows to live everlastingly for love and virtue, and on my breast he swore

that, so far as he was able, he would help on humanity to happiness, and ever be brave, and good, and noble." Lovers' vows are proverbially false, but in this case, if such vows were ever made, we doubt if ever there was a case in which they were worse kept.

When we read what follows, which is so repugnant to all that is known of William IV. throughout his life, we hesitate whether to reject the whole narrative as unhistorical, or to believe that on this memorable evening he was in a maudlin state, in which, according to De Quincey, "men shake hands, swear eternal friendship, and shed tears, no one knows why." The narrative proceeds:—

"At one time Ernst and Dutton were with us, and under the linden tree, where we had sat the night before he clasped *us* to his heart, and we all swore sacred vows of love, of friendship, and of probity. 'Oh, think on this hour, if ever ye are prone to go astray,' he said softly, yet gently. 'For myself, in the arms of this angel I am safe; but you two, be to me my Posas\* if, by cruel chance, I am torn from my wife.' A shudder went through us. He cast himself upon his knees, and, glancing heavenwards, the moonlight fell upon the handsome features of his noble face. Mutely pressing me to him, he sprang up, and we went back in silence along the avenue. When at the last we found ourselves alone, I said—'But William, say now, if we should one day be parted, what then?' 'Then,' rejoined he, 'grief and misery and woe will be our lot through life; yet we shall love each other to the end.' Tearing open his vest, he pressed my face to his bosom, adding, 'Here you live for evermore, and here, too,' as he hastily imprinted a glowing kiss upon my breast. 'Oh, forgive what I do. A few hours more and you will be my wife by the rites of the Church, but I renew my pledge of yesternight.' Then, as we knelt there, both of us registered a vow, one which I, even when another man's wife, have loyally kept."

One may be pardoned for expressing the wish to know how the lady reconciled her vow to her royal lover with the vows she gave when she afterwards became the wife of Meineke. That to him, during all their married life, she remained, as he said, "*une femme incomprise*"† we perfectly understand.

Under pretext of going to see the sun rise next morning, Caroline rode with her brother Ernst to a chapel where the form of marriage was gone through. From the cloud of rhapsody in which the narrative is enveloped we will condense the alleged facts it contains:—

"In a short half-hour I sink into William's arms; in silence he

\* This refers apparently to the passage from Schiller's "Don Carlos," quoted letters, p. 56.

† *Vide ante*, Reichenbach's Introduction, p. 17.

clasp me to his bosom. . . . He shows me the clothes that had been sent on before me for me for a few minutes, then leaves me, but no sound escapes our lips. What earthly blessedness can match this godlike rapture! I hurriedly dress myself. I was forced to leave to William the choice of my apparel. A robe of dazzling whiteness, a broad gold belt with diamond clasp—this formed my whole bridal adornment. William now returns. He rushes to my arms, but what we then said to each other no tongue, no pen, may ever repeat. With words such as those seraphs might greet one another! Ernst enters; he has a wreath of fresh myrtle in his hand. William springs forward to crown me with it. This my brother forbids, and a friendly dispute ensues. At last Ernst says, with emotion in his voice, ‘To my gratification, you both forgot this beautiful emblem: no daughter of our house can wed without it. It is for Caroline, this crown; yet is it not yours as well, beloved Prince? William, brother,’ he continued in broken tones, ‘to-day you are giving her all, are leading her into a paradise of bliss. Oh, let me, too, do something for the beautiful one whom I to-day give wholly to your keeping—she of whom I rob myself, whom I entrust to you.’ Oh, Teubner, what sweet tears did I shed at this affectionate strife, thus lightening my heart, that could scarce bear its excess of joy! William then led Ernst to me (it was as if I saw my father), and he pressed the wreath upon my brow, moistened, as it was, by his and William’s tears. And now they both raised me up (for I was kneeling before Ernst), and I lay for a few seconds in their arms. My brother signalled William to withdraw. Dutton now enters. Half kneeling and in silence he kisses my hand, and leads me and Ernst to the chapel hard by, where I found William, Parsons, George,\* and Jackson, the Prince’s faithful attendant. Ernst, taking the place of father, gave me away; he led me to the altar, and, with Ernst and Dutton on either side, we knelt down before the minister. William’s responses were uttered in a clear and solemn tone, yet he trembled no less violently than myself. Indescribable were my feelings as in the grey haze of morning (it was between five and six o’clock) I gave up myself wholly to my beloved. Was it the sacred ceremony that kept me from perishing from my mingled anguish and bliss? All onlookers wept with emotion. We rose, and now, as in this peaceful house of God, William took me to his arms as wife, pressing his picture to my breast, reiterating his vows of eternal love.”†

Here our extract must close, but there is more in abundance of like rhapsodies for any readers who have taste for them. Supposing the story to be true, the question is, Had the lady any right to consider herself the wife of the Duke of Clarence, with the right to share the throne in the event of his succeeding to it?

---

\* Whether by “George” is meant the servant mentioned at p. 67, or the Duke of York, seems doubtful. According to the editor it was the Duke of York. *Vide* p. 31.

† Letters, pp. 55-80.



and would any children of this couple have had the right of succession to the British Crown?

The lady boldly asserts the legality of the marriage. "Without my voluntary renouncement," she says, "a separation was impossible. I was a foreigner, married by a Scottish clergyman in a foreign country, and Lord Dutton, faithful as he was, had been careful to see that nothing should be left wanting to make our marriage a valid one in the eye of the English law."\* And the editor, with equal confidence, asserts, that the lady "was the dupe of a scandalous trick is out of the question: the marriage was valid according to English rite." Whether this mock marriage was "a scandalous trick" is, so far from being out of the question, that, to say the least, grave suspicion that it was intended to be so attaches to all the persons concerned. Whoever the person here called Lord Dutton may have been; he was, we may assume, a member of the English aristocracy, and in some way connected with the Court and family of George III. If so, he would know, or, if he was ignorant on the subject, the Duke of York, who is said to have also acted in the farce, could have informed him, of the feelings of George III. as to marriages in the Royal Family. The history of the then recent Royal Marriage Act was known to all connected with the Court or with the world of politics or fashion. It was passed† at the special instance and request of the King, and reluctantly adopted by his Ministers of that day. "I expect," he wrote to the Premier (Lord North) every nerve to be strained to carry the Bill. *It is not a question relating to administration, but personally to myself*; therefore I have a right to expect a hearty support from every one in my service, and I shall remember defaulters."‡ On this determination the King acted. It was for speaking and voting against this Bill that Charles Fox was turned out of the Ministry, and the unrelenting hatred commenced in which, disastrously for the country, George III. held him till the year of his death.§

According to this tyrannical statute, "No descendant of the body of King George II. is capable of contracting matrimony without the previous consent of the King, signified under the Great Seal, and any marriage contracted without such consent is

---

\* Introduction, p. 51. The lady was, we presume, a Lutheran, the Duke an Anglican. Whether Parsons, a Scotchman, was a Presbyterian of an Episcopalian is not stated. What the law would be as to the marriage of two Protestants of different communions by a minister of a third, we do not venture to say.

† In 1772.

‡ Sir G. C. Lewis, "Essays on Administrations of Great Britain," p. 7.  
§ 12 Geo. III. c. ii.

void." Then follows a proviso applicable to the case of the Duke of Clarence, who was twenty-six on the day of his so-called wedding:—

"Provided, that such of the said descendants as are above the age of 25, may, after a twelvemonth's notice given to the King's Privy Council, contract and solemnize marriage without the consent of the Crown; unless both Houses of Parliament shall, before the expiration of the said year, expressly declare their disapprobation of such intended marriage. And all persons solemnizing, assisting, or being present at any such prohibited marriage shall incur the penalties of the Statute of Premunire."

No such notice as this proviso requires was given by the Duke of Clarence, and there being no consent under the Great Seal, the marriage was *ipso facto* void. Belief in the story involves belief also that the Duke of York and the so-called Lord Dutton voluntarily incurred the serious penalties of premunire, involving, it may be, in the case of the Duke of York, and perhaps also in that of his brother, a forfeiture of the Crown for the sake of bringing about a marriage which they knew to be void.

As to its validity we have the highest judicial authority. Every one knows that another son of George III., the Duke of Sussex, went through a similar farce with an English lady at Rome. Their son, it is said, on the faith of an opinion he had obtained from so eminent a civilian as Dr. Lushington that the marriage was valid, on the ground that the Royal Marriage Act only applied to marriages contracted here, whereas the Duke of Sussex's marriage was contracted at Rome,\* presented a petition to the Queen, claiming, as of right, the Dukedom of Sussex and all other his father's hereditary honours. The petition was heard before the Lords' Committee of Privileges, who consulted the judges. They, by the mouth of that eminently learned lawyer, Chief Justice Tindal, told the lords that it was their unanimous opinion that the "Act was in force in foreign countries as well as in England, and that a marriage at Rome, if otherwise valid when contracted between individuals who did not come within the scope of the Royal Marriage Act, became of no effect if one of the contracting parties was included within the provisions of the Act, and had married without the consent of the King." With this opinion the Committee unanimously concurred, and reported to the House that the petitioner had not made out his claim.† It follows from this, a decision of the highest court in the land—

---

\* Greville's Journal, vol. ii. p. 194.

† *Vide* Clarke and Fennelly's "House of Lords' Reports, 1844-45," and the *Times* and other newspapers of the day.

which indeed was to all lawyers a foregone conclusion, for no one with the slightest inkling of legal knowledge could doubt on the subject—that the assertions of the heroine and her editor of the validity of her pseudo marriage with the Duke of Clarence, *contracted under precisely the same circumstances as that of his brother of Sussex,\** are made in ignorance and error.

We must compress what remains of the story, and pass over many of our heroine's rhapsodies. During the twelve months following the ceremony the couple lived, if not together, yet in each other's neighbourhood. "Caroline," we are told by the editor, "obtained the Prince's solemn promise that the marriage should remain merely nominal for a year." And Reichenbach adds "that she exacted an whole and entire fulfilment of this vow."† But to use her own words:—

"When the year of probation was at an end I released him of his vow—only until that day I had asked him to spare me. As I saw him enter I shuddered in a transport of mingled love and fear. A flash of lightning just at that moment lit up his figure. I did not rush to him as was my wont. . . . I had not the . . . O God! O God! what folly is this I am saying."

To this last remark there will be not only *a catena*, but *a consensus* of assent on the part of the lady's readers.

Within a month of this period "Caroline perceived that she was likely to become a mother." The whole story was now told to her father, who, if all that is told us be true, must have been singularly blind if he did not know what had been going on. He separated the lovers, and wrote to England. The Duke was recalled to England, and hereupon he, it is said, "attempted to commit suicide, and was only saved by the interference of General von Linsingen." On his arriving in England if, like Gibbon on a similar occasion, "he sighed as a lover," he too, like Gibbon, "obeyed like a son."

"It was," says Reichenbach, "urged upon him by all the means that lie at the disposal of the great, to decide upon what course of action he would adopt towards Caroline; he pleaded that he was 'not an oak in the storm.' No, indeed! he was weak; so weak that instead of manfully standing up in defence of his wife, and claiming his right to protect her, he yielded to pressure, and cast the decision upon herself. With calmness he promised to agree to a separation, if Caroline freely renounced her rights! His excuse was that he thought it impossible that she would consent to this; but it simply was an unpardonable disregard of Caroline, exposing her to what his affection should certainly have spared her."‡

\* Introduction, pp. 32, 33.

† Ibid., p. 42,

‡ Ibid., p. 40.

We do not believe this statement, which is quite unsupported. The plain truth is, that it becoming clear to the lady that there was no hope of her being recognized in England as the Duke's wife, she determined to make a virtue of necessity, and to give him up altogether. Both she and her editor regard this conduct as noble. "She determined," says the editor "upon an heroic sacrifice, nothing less than to separate herself from the Prince." She herself says, "Without my voluntary renouncement a separation was impossible."\* We have already shown that this assertion is founded in ignorance and error as to her legal rights and position. She had nothing to give up. There being no valid marriage, any formal legal separation was both needless and impossible.

Once again the lovers met at Duburg, where the lady's father seems to have taken her for the purpose of a secret confinement: a miscarriage took place, and the couple parted for ever.

We have not space to transcribe the lady's account of the separation, which is given with as much detail and effusion as her account of the wedding ceremony. They never met again; but there are, in the letters, hazy and indefinite references to communications between them through Ernst. The lady, in writing to her brother nearly twenty years after the separation, ventures to assert that Queen Charlotte "promised to take the Duke's part with his father." And she goes on to say: "I have never read that letter of the Queen's to him (the Duke), but to me she wrote that she, trusting fully the promise of one honourable woman to another, had sent her son to me without fear; for she knew that I should faithfully send him back again to his mother, to his duties, to his country."† It is utterly inconsistent with the characters and tempers both of George III. and Queen Charlotte, and with their known conduct in reference to the Duke of Sussex's *pseudo* marriage, that the Queen would either have made such a promise or written in the friendly style, it is here pretended she did, to a woman who had dared to marry one of the Royal Family without the King's consent.

After the separation the lady had a severe illness, and fell into a trance, which continued nearly three weeks. She was laid out, and arrangements for her funeral made; but one of the physicians (Dr. Meineke) was not satisfied that the act of dissolution had taken place; the burial was postponed, and in the end she recovered and became the wife of the physician who had saved her life.

The marriage was as happy as might have been expected in a case where the lady, on its eve, writes to another man that she

\* Letters, p. 51.

† Ibid., pp. 130, 1.

is "the wife of his soul," and asserted that "their love was immortal, as immortal as its purity; it can never end."\* Although Reichenbach found Meineke after he had become a widower "capital company," yet during his married life he was not so agreeable. "Oh!" writes the lady to her son-in-law, "Meineke will yet be my death with the ill-temper which he vents upon me in the most distressing manner. . . . If only my good Meineke knew how miserable this sullen humour of his makes me, whose one aim in life is to bring him happiness, oh, I am sure he would act otherwise."†

We have already referred to the one letter in the series which purports to be written to the heroine by the Duke of Clarence. We have no hesitation in expressing our utter disbelief in its genuineness. Whoever will take the trouble to compare the lady's letter of farewell (pp. 145-159) with the supposed letter in reply of the Duke (pp. 159-165), can scarcely, we think, fail to come to the conclusion that both are written by the same hand. The writing of letters was never one of the Duke's accomplishments,‡ and we do not think he had sufficient ability or education to write such a rhetorical effusion as the one here assigned to him. That the Duke was sincerely attached to Mrs. Jordan, with whom his connection was at that time formed, there can be no doubt, and he would scarcely at that time write to the other lady: "Wife surpassed by none. Wife that alone filled, and will for ever fill my heart. Wife with a soul of fire, *you* love for eternity; and only William, only your earliest love, can suffice for you. . . . I am yours, yours alone, and no god, no devil, can part me from you."

Here is another assertion which, so far as we know, has no foundation in fact:—

"The nation that loved me formerly now adores me; my brother is in my power, and this isle is not my world if it do not worship you as I do. Even better than before we can now attain our desires: *our*, *our* desires I say, for they are still yours as well as mine. . . . If you do not write, nothing shall hold, nothing bind me. I shall come and tear you from the altar, and who will dare to rob me of my wife."§

And after much more to the same effect, the writer thus concludes: "O wife, my wife, I am ever yours; never shall another call your William husband."

Supposing this to have been a genuine letter, the Duke, even before the unfortunate Caroline died, altered this determination.

\* Letters, p. 151.

† Ibid., p. 85. *Vide* also pp. 172-3.

‡ When King, all his letters on business were written by Sir Herbert Taylor.

§ Letters, pp. 160-2.

• "I trust," wrote Lord Auckland to Speaker Abbott in November 1811, "that all the historiettes about the Duke of Clarence are lies and 'waggeries;' but when we are told that he first offered himself to Miss Long, and immediately after to Miss Mercer, and then to Lady Berkeley, and that he has made himself a Reviewing-General of Regiments, and an Inspecting Commissioner of Dockyards, it is difficult not to apprehend that there may be more business for Messrs. R. & T. Willis."\*

He afterwards married the Princess Adelaide of Saxe-Weimar.

Mr. Greville thus describes the Duke's life and career from the time when he formed his connection with Mrs. Jordan, until his accession to the throne. Up to that latter time

"His life had been passed in obscurity and neglect, in miserable poverty, surrounded by a numerous progeny of bastards, without consideration or friends, and he was ridiculous from his grotesque ways and little meddling curiosity. Nobody ever invited him into their house, or thought it necessary to honour him with any mark of attention or respect; and so he went on for above forty years, till Canning brought him into notice by making him Lord High Admiral. In this post he distinguished himself by making absurd speeches, by a morbid official activity, and by a general wildness which was thought to indicate incipient insanity."

After Canning's death, the Duke of Wellington became Prime Minister, and with the brusqueness common to him on such occasions, but with general approbation, dismissed the Duke of Clarence from office, as it was said "He told him that he must go, but that he might resign as of his own accord." The Duke then dropped back into obscurity, but had become by this time somewhat more of a personage than he was before. At the first Council he held as King, his burlesque character began to show itself, and indications of strangeness and oddness peeped out which were not a little alarming. At the late King's funeral he behaved with great indecency: to the end of his reign he exhibited himself the same odd, burlesque, bustling old fellow.† It has been well said of him, "He would have passed in private life for a good-natured sailor. The good-natured sailor was hardly qualified for the throne on which destiny placed him."‡

\* Lord Colchester's (Speaker Abbott) "Diary and Correspondence," vol. ii. p. 247. Messrs. Willis were the medical attendants on George III., who at this date had become hopelessly insane. Miss Mercer was a lady in the household of the Princess Charlotte. Lady Berkeley was the Countess Berkeley whom the celebrated Berkeley Peerage case had at that time brought prominently before the public. See also quotation from "Place's Memoirs," *ante*.

† Greville's "Journal," vol. ii. pp. 1, 2; vol. i. p. 138. The second and third volumes throughout abound in instances of William IV.'s singular habits and actions.

‡ Spencer Walpole, "History of England from 1815," vol. iii. p. 388.

Comparing the accounts of William IV., from his early manhood to his death, given by such well-informed and accurate witnesses as Madame D'Arblay, Lord Auckland, and Mr. Greville, with the sublime, heroic, kingly, and even god-like character with which he is invested in the story of Caroline von Linsingen, we may well believe that that story is not history, but romance. The translator admits that: "Although there is no doubt that the tale needs verification in order to establish its truth, yet, at the outset one cannot wisely set it aside as false."\* We so far agree with him as to allow that there is no antecedent improbability in the story—no reason, *à priori*, for rejecting it as false. On the contrary, looking at the character and education of the Duke of Clarence and his brothers, we see some reasons for giving credence to it. If the assertion of George IV. is to be believed, which is assuming a great deal, and like, to use a phrase of Cardinal Newman's, "taking the word of a professor of lying that he does not lie," he and all his brothers were remarkable for their untruthfulness. "You know," he said to Lady Spencer, "that I don't speak the truth, and my brothers don't. . . . We have been always brought up badly, the Queen having taught us to equivocate."† Equivocation was the practice of William IV. throughout his life. In the great crisis of his reign he equivocated to his chosen advisers, the Duke of Wellington and Lord Lyndhurst, on the question whether he had assented to the creation of peers pressed on him by the Grey Ministry for the purpose of carrying the Reform Bill.‡ It is highly probable that a man with such a bringing up would persuade a lady to go through the form of marriage with him, though he perfectly well knew it was a mere farce. But perhaps it would be more fair to the sons of George III. to say that, whether from superstitious motives or a desire to meet the conscientious scruples, if any such there were, either of themselves or of ladies whose affections they had unfortunately engaged, they were always willing, indeed eager, to go through the form of marriage.

In the case of 'George IV. and Mrs. Fitzherbert—

"It was," Lord Holland tells us, "at the Prince's own earnest and repeated solicitations, not at Mrs. Fitzherbert's request, that any ceremony was resorted to. She knew it to be invalid in law—she thought it nonsense, and told the Prince so. In proof that such had been her uniform opinion, she adduced a very striking circumstance—namely, that no ceremony by a Roman Catholic priest took place at all

\* Preface, p. vi.

† Torrens's "Memoirs of Viscount Melbourne," vol. i. p. 157.

‡ *Vide* Greville's "Journal," vol. iii. p. 43.

—the most obvious method of allaying her scruples, had she had any. I believe, therefore, she spoke with exact truth when she frankly owned ‘that she had given up herself to him, exacted no conditions, trusted to his honour, and set no value on the ceremony which he insisted on having solemnized.’”\*

In this case, moreover, whatever were the Prince’s reasons for the farce being performed—if he did not, by going through the form of marriage with a Papist, forfeit his succession to the Crown, at least he ran the risk of his right to it being impugned.†

The Duke of Sussex also went through a similar mock ceremony with Lady Augusta Murray, and again, subsequently, if we recollect rightly, with the lady who was afterwards created Duchess of Inverness. It is not unlikely, therefore, that a third brother should have induced another lady to go through a similar farce; more especially if the object of his passion was virtuous, and refused compliance with his desires, except upon the terms of a ceremony which she, a woman, and a foreigner ignorant of the English law, was not likely to know was of no validity.

Violent declarations and protestations of affection and constancy, made in order to gain their end, were common to the three brothers alike. Mrs. Fox repeatedly assured Lord Holland that the Prince (George IV.) came down to her house

“More than once to converse with her and Mr. Fox on the subject of his marriage with Mrs. Fitzherbert, that he cried by the hour; that he testified the sincerity and violence of his passion and his despair by the most extravagant expressions and actions—rolling on the floor, striking his forehead, tearing his hair, falling into hysterics, and swearing that he would abandon the country, forego the Crown, sell his jewels and plate, and scrape together a competence to fly with the object of his affections to America.”‡

Even the attempted suicide which the story attributes to the Duke of Clarence was not, we think, without a parallel incident in the case of his eldest brother.§

Those who remember the Sussex Peerage case || will recollect that the letters of the Duke of Sussex to Lady Augusta Murray

\* Lord Holland, “Memoirs of Whig Party,” vol. ii. p. 126.

† See on this Lord Brougham’s “Statesmen of George III.” Tit. George IV.

‡ Lord Holland *ubi supra*, pp. 140, 2. *Conf.* Adolphus “History George III.” vol. iv. p. 217. Had the Prince, as he sometimes did, consulted Lord Thurlow as to his flight to America, the noble lord would probably have told him, as he told George III. when he talked of flying to Hanover, that he would find it very easy to get there, but when he was tired of staying there, not so easy to get back again.

§ A story of the kind is, we think, told in the “Memoirs” of Mrs. Eliot, referred to *ante*, but not having access to the book we cannot positively say that such is the fact.

|| To be found *ubi supra*. *Vide* also the *Times* for 1844.



were as violent and foolish as letters written under such circumstances usually are. The parallel between the cases of the three brothers is completed by each having with equal readiness abandoned, or, to speak more accurately, never made any attempt to maintain the validity of their pseudo-marriages, and by each, with equal facility, forming other connections.

In the mental and moral constitution and education of the Duke of Clarence, therefore, we find reasons for not rejecting the story as *ipso facto* incredible. Our doubts as to its truth arise from the uncertainty of its origin, its unhistorical character and haziness, and the utter want of confirmatory evidence. There is this difference also between the cases of the Duke of Clarence and those of his brother. The silly sayings of George IV., and the silly letters of the Duke of Sussex, were the sayings and letters of Englishmen, and the Duke of Clarence, as we have seen, was excessively vernacular in speech, but the actions and speeches attributed to him in this story are not only unlike the man in the concrete, but the Englishman in the abstract. They are emphatically those of a German, and resemble what Macaulay calls "the fooleries of Kotzebue."

If this story be true—inasmuch as there was no marriage between the parties—the result is damaging to the character of William IV., and in a less degree to that of the lady. There is a hypothesis, however, which, if true, would relieve them both from any stigma—namely, that the story and the Letters which are its proof are the result of a hallucination in the mind of Caroline Von Linsingen. It is probable that she on one occasion, or more than one, saw the then Duke of Clarence when he was on the Continent, that she met him at some ball and danced with him, that she was attracted by his person and manners, or more likely dazzled by his rank. She was evidently one whose imagination was of a very vivid kind. The editor, we have seen, calls her "a remarkable psychological phenomenon." According to the same authority, "she was full of sentiment charged with the spirit of Kotzebue and of Werther." In plain English we should call her "a flighty character," with such a natural disposition fed on such mental food, she may have let her imagination dwell on the man who had attracted her, and in the end wove round the idealized object of her affection, the story which years after the date of its supposed occurrence she told in these Letters. We are strengthened in this belief by a passage in the last letter in the book. From an earlier letter \* it is clear that there never was living issue of the connection between the Duke of

---

\* *Vide Letters*, v. 130 to 134. The letter is dated "181."

Clarence and Caroline Von Linsingen. Yet in 1806 she writes to her brother—"To bring up my darling children in such a way that they may be worthy to rank as William's offspring, to contribute to the well-being of others, this is the sole joy which can now be mine. All else I lost with him *eternally and for ever.*"

In the same letter, referring to her eldest son born after her marriage with Meineke, she writes:—

"I well saw what an impression Heinrich made upon you, and this was the only time in which I might have betrayed myself to Meineke, and laid myself open to his life-long reproaches . . . and afterwards, how often did you glance inquiringly at me and my Heinrich; yet my lips could frame no answer! It was when he was three years old that I first began to notice this extraordinary resemblance. Then a painful affection of the eyes disfigured him for more than a year; but as he grew better again, this likeness so increased that it has now passed into actual reality. It is discernible, not only in every feature, but in his hair, his eyes, in his whole person; that warm, sympathizing, loving heart—is not that his as well? I can never bring myself to say that I love him more than Jettchen,\* though my heart often accuses me of it; still, speaking truthfully, and as you would know me to speak, I can assure you that he has been my favourite ever since he was born. I often ask myself how it is that in Jette there is none of that resemblance, as her birth occurred full fifteen months earlier than his. I often press him to my breast in a paroxysm of grief; I often think that he must have been sent to reward me for my faithful embrace of the trials of duty; his embrace is to me as William's was—yet enough!"†

In the same letter she speaks of an intention in case of her death to leave this boy to the Duke of Clarence as "a legacy." "This confusing resemblance," she says, "will pain him, it will be good for him."‡

This Letter proves that her mind was so possessed with this idea as to her relation with the Duke, that she wished herself to believe, and to persuade others to believe, that her son was, if not her offspring by him, yet possessed of a wonderful and mysterious likeness to him both in mind and body.

In support of this hypothesis of hallucination or self-deception, we can refer to two cases which we happen to remember: the one was of a young lady who lived near the late Earl Ferrers; her family was respectable, but by no means in the same rank as the Earl's, or one where he would have been likely to seek a wife. There was, we think, some slight acquaintance between him and the young lady, and she, attracted either by the man personally or by his rank and fortune, conceived an attachment for him: dwelling on this idea she brought herself to believe in

\* Her daughter, afterwards married to Teubner. *Vide* Letter, p. 142.

† Letters, pp. 170-172. *Vide* also p. 141.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 180.

a promise of marriage on his part, and fabricated and produced what purported to be a correspondence between him and her. An action for breach of promise was brought against the Earl, tried, and ended in a verdict for him. If we recollect rightly, that most able and intrepid of counsel, the present Chief Baron, who appeared for the lady, withdrew from the case, and submitted to an adverse verdict.\*

The other case we refer to is of a similar, but perhaps stronger, kind. We forbear to mention names, as the persons concerned may still be living; but it was reported at the time, about twenty years ago, and may be identified by any one interested in the subject in the newspapers or the reports of the Divorce Court. A lady conceived a violent passion for a medical man, and by allowing her imagination to dwell constantly on him she brought herself to believe that a criminal intimacy had taken place between them. Her husband, believing her statements, commenced proceedings for a divorce against her and the object of her disastrous attachment. The husband had what, in such a case may most truly be said to be *accusatori maxime optandum*, not indeed *confitentes reos*, but at least the confession of the supposed female paramour, and that evidenced not by spoken words only, but by the *litera scripta quæ manet*; for the lady's diary was produced, in which were entered, with much *vraisemblance* and with all detail, the several criminal acts, and the times, places, and circumstances of their occurrence. After long litigation, and if we recollect rightly, more than one trial, the story was found to be a delusion, and the medical man completely exonerated from the charge. Here, then, are two cases, in each of which the self-deception in the mind of its victim was so great that it enabled her to deceive others, and in each case led to judicial proceedings. In this case, looking at all the circumstances, far from us be the desire, *Tantus componere lites*, by expressing any dogmatic judgment. We will simply state that we incline to the belief, which is that to which the judgment of charity leads us, that Caroline von Linsingen was the victim of a similar hallucination.

However this may be, of one thing we are certain, that although by the publication of this book injury may be done to the memories of some who are dead, and annoyance may be given to others who are still living, good can be done to no human being, dead or living. Still, as it has appeared, and its story reflects on the memory of a British Sovereign, and is said "in Germany to have met with very general belief," we have thought it as well not to leave it unnoticed.

---

\* A special report of this case was published by, we think, Mr. Pickering.

## ART. IV.—PLATO AND HIS TIMES.

1. *The Dialogues of Plato Translated into English.* By B. JOWETT, M.A. Second Edition. Oxford, 1875.
2. *Zeller. Die Philosophie der Griechen.* Zweiter Theil, Erste Abtheilung. *Plato und die alte Academie.* Leipzig, 1875.

IN studying the growth of philosophy as an historical evolution repetitions and anticipations must necessarily be of frequent occurrence. Ideas meet us at every step which can only be appreciated when we trace out their later developments, or only understood when we refer them back to earlier and half-forgotten modes of thought. The speculative tissue is woven out of filaments so delicate and so complicated that it is almost impossible to say where one begins and the other ends. Even conceptions which seem to have been transmitted without alteration are constantly acquiring a new value according to the connections into which they enter or the circumstances to which they are applied. But if the method of evolution, with its two great principles of continuity and relativity, substitutes a maze of intricate lines, often returning on themselves, for the straight path along which progress was once supposed to move, we are more than compensated by the new sense of coherence and rationality where illusion and extravagance once seemed to reign supreme. It teaches us that the dreams of a great intellect may be better worth our attention than the waking perceptions of ordinary men. Combining fragments of the old order with rudimentary outlines of the new, they lay open the secret laboratory of spiritual chemistry and help to bridge over the interval separating the most widely contrasted phases of life and thought. Moreover, when we have once accustomed ourselves to break up past systems of philosophy into their component elements, when we see how heterogeneous and ill-cemented were the parts of this and that proud edifice once offered as the only possible shelter against dangers threatening the very existence of civilization, we shall be prepared for the application of a similar method to contemporary systems of equally ambitious pretensions, distinguishing that which is vital, fruitful, original and progressive in their ideal synthesis from that which is of merely provisional and temporary value, when it is not the literary resuscitation of a dead past, visionary, retrograde and mischievously wrong. And we shall also be reminded that the most precious ideas have only been shaped, preserved and transmitted through association with earthy and perishable ingredients. The function of true criticism is, like Robert Browning's

Roman jeweller, to turn on them "the proper fiery spurt" of purifying analysis which dissolves away the inferior metal and leaves behind the gold ring whereby thought and action are inseparably and fruitfully united.

Such, as it seems to us, is the proper spirit in which we should approach the great thinker whose works have been selected for examination in the present Article. No philosopher has ever offered so extended and vulnerable a front to hostile criticism. None has so habitually provoked reprisals by his own incessant and searching attacks on all existing professions, customs and beliefs. It might even be maintained that none has used the weapons of controversy with more unscrupulous zeal. And it might be added that he who dwells so much on the importance of consistency has occasionally denounced and ridiculed the very principles which he elsewhere upholds as demonstrated truths. It was an easy matter for others to complete the work of destruction which he had begun. His system seems at first sight to be made up of assertions one more outrageous than another. The ascription of an objective concrete separate reality to verbal abstractions is assuredly the most astounding paradox ever maintained even by a metaphysician. Yet this is the central article of Plato's creed. That body is essentially different from extension might, one would suppose, have been sufficiently clear to a mathematician who had the advantage of coming after Leucippus and Democritus. Their identity is implicitly affirmed in the *Timæus*. That the soul cannot be both created and eternal; that the doctrine of metempsychosis is incompatible with the hereditary transmission of mental qualities; that a future immortality equivalent to, and proved by the same arguments as, our antenatal existence, would be neither a terror to the guilty nor a consolation to the righteous;—are propositions implicitly denied by Plato's psychology. Passing from theoretical to practical philosophy, it might be observed that respect for human life, respect for individual property, respect for marriage, and respect for truthfulness, are generally numbered among the strongest moral obligations, and those the observance of which most completely distinguishes civilized from savage man; while infanticide, communism, promiscuity, and the occasional employment of deliberate deceit, form part of Plato's scheme for the redemption of mankind. We need not do more than allude to those dialogues where the phases and symptoms of unnameable passion are delineated with matchless eloquence, and apparently with at least as much sympathy as censure. Finally, from the standpoint of modern science, it might be urged that Plato used all his powerful influence to throw back physical speculation into the theological

stage ; that he deliberately discredited the doctrine of mechanical causation which, for us, is the most important achievement of early Greek thought ; that he expatiated on the criminal folly of those who held the heavenly bodies to be, what we now know them to be, masses of dead matter with no special divinity about them ; and that he proposed to punish this and other heresies with a severity distinguishable from the fitful fanaticism of his native city only by its more disciplined and rigorous application.

A plain man might find it difficult to understand how such extravagances could be deliberately propounded by the greatest intellect which Athens ever produced, except on the principle, dear to mediocrity, that genius is but little removed from madness, and that philosophical genius resembles it more nearly than any other. But how much greater would his surprise become on learning that the best and wisest men of all ages have looked up with reverence to Plato ; that thinkers of the most opposite schools have resorted to him for instruction and stimulation ; that his writings have never been more attentively studied than in our own age—an age which has witnessed the destruction of so many illusive reputations ; and that the foremost of English educators has used all his influence to promote the better understanding and appreciation of Plato as a prime element in academic culture—an influence now extended far beyond the limits of his own university through that translation of the Platonic dialogues too well known to need any commendation on our part, which we have chosen for the text of this article side by side with the work of a German scholar, his obligations to whom Professor Jowett has acknowledged with characteristic grace ?

As a set-off against the list of paradoxes cited from Plato, it would be easy to quote a still longer list of brilliant contributions to the cause of truth and right, to strike a balance between the two, and to show that there was a preponderance on the positive side sufficiently great to justify the favourable verdict of posterity. We believe, however, that such a method would be as misleading as it is superficial. Neither Plato nor any other thinker of the same calibre—if any other there be—should be estimated by a simple analysis of his opinions. We must go back to the underlying forces of which individual opinions are the resultant and the revelation. Every systematic synthesis represents certain profound intellectual tendencies derived partly from previous philosophies, partly from the social environment, partly from the thinker's own genius and character. Each of such tendencies may be salutary and necessary, according to the conditions under which it comes into play,

and yet two or more of them may form a highly unstable and explosive compound. Nevertheless, it is in speculative combinations that they are preserved and developed with the greatest distinctness, and it is there that we must seek for them if we would understand the psychological history of our race. And this is why we began by intimating that the lines of our investigation may take us back over ground which has been already traversed, and forward into regions which cannot at present be completely surveyed.

We have this great advantage in dealing with Plato—that his philosophical writings have come down to us entire, while the thinkers who preceded him are known only through fragments and second-hand reports. Nor is the difference merely accidental. Plato was the creator of speculative literature, properly so called: he was the first and also the greatest artist who ever clothed abstract thought in language of appropriate majesty and splendour; and it is probably to their beauty of form that we owe the preservation of his writings. Rather unfortunately, however, along with the genuine works of the master, a certain number of pieces have been handed down to us under his name, of which some are almost universally admitted to be spurious, while the authenticity of others is a question on which the best scholars are still divided. In the absence of any very cogent external evidence, an immense amount of industry and learning has been expended on this subject, and the arguments employed on both sides sometimes make us doubt whether the reasoning powers of philologists are better developed than, according to Plato, were those of mathematicians in his time. The two extreme positions are occupied by Grote, who accepts the whole Alexandrian canon, and Schaarschmidt, who rejects nearly half of it, including several dialogues almost equal in interest and importance to those whose authenticity has never been doubted. The great historian of Greece seems to have been rather indiscriminating both in his scepticism and in his belief; and the exclusive importance which he attributed to contemporary testimony, or to what passed for such with him, may have unduly biassed his judgment in both directions. As it happens, the authority of the canon is much weaker than Grote imagined; but even granting his extreme contention, our view of Plato's philosophy would not be seriously affected by it, for the pieces which are rejected by all other critics have no speculative importance whatever. The case would be far different were we to agree with those who impugn the genuineness of the *Parmenides*, the *Sophist*, the *Statesman*, the *Philebus*, and the *Laws*, for these compositions mark a new departure in Platonism amounting to a complete transformation of its fundamental

principles, which indeed is one of the reasons why their authenticity has been denied. Apart, however, from the numerous evidences of Platonic authorship furnished by the dialogues themselves, as well as by the indirect references to them in Aristotle's writings, it seems utterly incredible that a thinker scarcely, if at all, inferior to the master himself—as the supposed imitator must assuredly have been—should have consented to let his reasonings pass current under a false name, and that, too, the name of one whose teaching he in some respects controverted; while there is a further difficulty in assuming that his existence could pass unnoticed at a period marked by intense literary and philosophical activity. Readers who wish for fuller information on the subject will find a careful and lucid digest of the whole controversy in Zeller's pages leading to a moderately conservative conclusion. Others will doubtless be content to accept Professor Jowett's verdict, that "on the whole not a sixteenth part of the writings which pass under the name of Plato, if we exclude the works rejected by the ancients themselves, can be fairly doubted by those who are willing to allow that a considerable change and growth may have taken place in his philosophy."\* To which we may add that the Platonic dialogues, whether the work of one or more hands, and however widely differing among themselves, together represent a single phase of thought and are appropriately studied as a connected series.

We have assumed in our last remark that it is possible to discover some sort of chronological order in the Platonic dialogues, and to trace a certain progressive modification in the general tenor of their teaching from first to last. But here also the positive evidence is very scanty, and a variety of conflicting theories have been propounded by eminent scholars. Where so much is left to conjecture, the best which can be said for any hypothesis is that it explains the facts according to known laws of thought. It will be for the reader to judge whether our own attempt to trace the gradual evolution of Plato's system satisfies this condition. In making it we shall take as a basis the arrangement adopted by Professor Jowett, with some reservations hereafter to be specified.

Before entering on our task, one more difficulty remains to be noticed. Plato, although the greatest master of prose composition who ever lived, and for his time a remarkably voluminous author, cherished a strong dislike for books, and even affected to regret that the art of writing had ever been invented. A man, he said, might amuse himself by putting down his ideas on paper, and might even find written memoranda useful for private reference, but the only instruction worth speaking of was conveyed

---

\* III. 418.



by oral communication, which made it possible for objections unforeseen by the teacher to be freely urged and answered. Such had been the method of Socrates, and such was doubtless the practice of Plato himself whenever it was possible for him to set forth his philosophy by word of mouth. It has been supposed for this reason that the great writer did not take his own books in earnest, and wished them to be regarded as no more than the elegant recreations of a leisure hour, while his deeper and more serious thoughts were reserved for lectures and conversations, of which, beyond a few allusions in Aristotle, every record has perished. That such, however, was not the case, may be easily shown. In the first place it is evident, from the extreme pains taken by Plato to throw his philosophical expositions into conversational form, that he did not despair of providing a literary substitute for spoken dialogue. Secondly, it is a strong confirmation of this theory that Aristotle, a personal friend and pupil of Plato during many years, should so frequently refer to the dialogues as authoritative evidences of his master's opinions on the most important topics. And, lastly, if it can be shown that the documents in question do actually embody a comprehensive and connected view of life and of the world, we shall feel satisfied that the oral teaching of Plato, had it been preserved, would not modify in any material degree the impression conveyed by his written compositions.

There is a story that Plato used to thank the gods, in what some might consider a rather Pharisaic spirit, for having made him a human being instead of a brute, a man instead of a woman, and a Greek instead of a barbarian; but more than anything else for having permitted him to be born in the time of Socrates. It will be observed that all these blessings tended in one direction, the complete supremacy in his character of reason over impulse and sense. To assert, extend and organize that supremacy was the object of his whole life. Such, indeed, had been the object of all his predecessors, and such, stated generally, has been always and everywhere the object of philosophy; but none had pursued it so consciously before and none has proclaimed it so enthusiastically since then. Now, although Plato could not have done this without a far wider range of knowledge and experience than Socrates had possessed, it was only by virtue of the Socratic method that his other gifts and acquisitions could be turned to complete account; while conversely it was only when brought to bear upon these new materials that the full power of the method itself could be revealed. To be continually asking and answering questions, to elicit information from everybody on every subject worth knowing, and to elaborate the resulting mass of intellectual material into the most convenient form for practical

application or for further transmission, was the secret of true wisdom with the sage of the market-place and the workshop. But the process of dialectic investigation as an end in itself, the intense personal interest of conversation with living men and women of all classes, the impatience for immediate and visible results, had gradually induced Socrates to restrict within far too narrow limits the sources whence his ideas were derived and the purposes to which they were applied. And the dialectic method itself could not but be checked in its internal development by this want of breadth and variety in the topics submitted to its grasp. Therefore the death of Socrates, however lamentable in its occasion, was an unmixed benefit to the cause for which he laboured, by arresting (as we must suppose it to have done) the popular and indiscriminate employment of his cross-examining method, liberating his ablest disciple from the ascendancy of a revered master, and inducing him to reconsider the whole question of human knowledge and action from a remoter point of view. For be it observed that Plato did not begin where Socrates had left off; he rather went back to the germinal point of the whole system, and proceeded to reconstruct it on new lines of his own. The loss of those whom we love habitually leads our thoughts back to the time of our first acquaintance with them, or, if these are ascertainable, to the circumstances of their early life. In this manner Plato seems to have been at first occupied exclusively with the starting-point of his friend's philosophy, and we know, from the narrative given in the *Apologia*, under what form he came to conceive it. On a former occasion\* we have attempted to show that the account alluded to cannot be entirely historical. Nevertheless it seems sufficiently clear that Socrates began with a conviction of his own ignorance, and that his efforts to improve others were prefaced by the extraction of a similar confession of ignorance on their part. It is also certain that through life he regarded the causes of physical phenomena as placed beyond the reach of human reason and reserved by the gods for their own exclusive cognizance, pointing, by way of proof, to the notorious differences of opinion prevalent among those who had meddled with such matters. Thus his scepticism worked in two directions, but on the one side it was only provisional and on the other it was only partial. Plato began by combining the two. He maintained that human nescience is universal and necessary; that the gods had reserved all knowledge for themselves; and that the only wisdom left for men is a consciousness of their absolute ignorance. The Socratic starting-point gave the centre of his agnostic circle; the Socratic theology

---

\* WESTMINSTER REVIEW for July, 1880. Art. "Socrates."

gave the distance at which it was described. Here we have to note two things—first, the breadth of generalization which distinguishes the disciple from the master; and, secondly, the symptoms of a strong religious reaction against Greek humanism. Even before the end of the Peloponnesian War, evidence of this reaction had appeared, and the *Bacchæ* of Euripides bears striking testimony to its gloomy and fanatical character. The last agony of Athens, the collapse of her power, and the subsequent period of oligarchic terrorism, must have given a stimulus to superstition like that which quite recently afflicted France with an epidemic of apparitions and pilgrimages almost too childish for belief. Plato followed the general movement, although on a much higher plane. While looking down with undisguised contempt on the immoral idolatry of his countrymen, he was equally opposed to the irreligion of the New Learning, and, had an opportunity been given him, he would, like the Reformers of the sixteenth century, have put down both with impartial severity. Nor was this the only analogy between his position and that of a Luther or a Calvin. Like them, and indeed like all great religious teachers, he exalted the Creator by enlarging on the nothingness of the creature; just as Christianity exhibits the holiness of God in contrast and correlation with the sinfulness of unregenerate hearts; just as to Pindar man's life seemed but the fleeting shadow of a dream when compared with the beauty and strength and immortality of the Olympian divinities; so also did Plato deepen the shadows of human ignorance that he might bring out in dazzling relief the fulness of that knowledge which he had been taught to prize as a supreme ideal, but which, for that very reason, seemed proper to the highest existences alone. And we shall presently see how Plato also discovered a principle in man by virtue of which he could claim kindred with the supernatural, and elaborated a scheme of intellectual mediation by which the fallen spirit could be regenerated and made a partaker in the kingdom of speculative truth.

Yet if Plato's theology, from its predominantly rational character, seemed to neglect some feelings which were better satisfied by the earlier or the later faiths of mankind, we cannot say that it really excluded them. The unfading strength of the old gods was comprehended in the self-existence of absolute ideas, and moral goodness was only a particular application of reason to the conduct of life. An emotional or imaginative element was also contributed by the theory that every faculty exercised without a reasoned consciousness of its processes and aims was due to some saving grace and inspiration from a superhuman power. It was thus, according to Plato, that poets and artists were able to produce works of which they were not able to render an

intelligent account; and it was thus that society continued to hold together with such an exceedingly small amount of wisdom and virtue. Here, however, we have to observe a marked difference between the religious teachers pure and simple, and the Greek philosopher who was a dialectician even more than he was a divine. For Plato held that providential government was merely provisional; that the inspired prophet stood on a distinctly lower level than the critical self-conscious thinker; that ratiocination and not poetry was the highest function of mind; and that action should be reorganized in accordance with demonstrably certain principles.\*

This search after a scientific basis for conduct was quite in the spirit of Socrates, but Plato seems to have set very little value on his master's positive contributions to the systematization of life. We have seen that the *Apologia* is purely sceptical in its tendency, and we find a whole group of dialogues, probably the earliest of Plato's compositions, marked by the same negative inconclusive tone. These are commonly spoken of as Socratic, and so no doubt they are in reference to the subjects discussed, but they would be more accurately described as an attempt to turn the Socratic method against its first originator. We know from another source that temperance, fortitude and piety were the chief virtues inculcated and practised by Socrates; while friendship, if not strictly speaking a virtue, was equally with them one of his prime interests in life. It is clear that he considered them the most appropriate and remunerative subjects of philosophical discussion, that he could define their nature to his own satisfaction, and that he had, in fact, defined them as so many varieties of wisdom. Now Plato has devoted a separate dialogue to each of the conceptions in question,† and in each instance he represents Socrates, who is the principal spokesman, as professedly ignorant of the whole subject under discussion, offering no definition of his own (or at least none that he will stand by), but asking his interlocutors for theirs and pulling them to pieces when they are given. We do, indeed, find a tendency to resolve the virtues into knowledge, and so far either to identify them with one another, or to carry them up into the unity of a higher idea. To this extent Plato follows in the footsteps of his master, but a result which had completely satisfied Socrates became the starting-point of a new investigation with his successor. If virtue is knowledge, it must be knowledge of what we most desire—of the good. Thus the original difficulty returns under another form, or rather we have merely restated it in different

\* See Zeller's note on the *θεία μοίρα*, p. 497, 3rd ed.

† The *Charmides* *Laches* *Euthyphro* and *Lysis*.

terms. For to ask what is temperance or fortitude, is equivalent to asking what is its use. And this was so obvious to Socrates, that apparently he never thought of distinguishing between the two questions. But no sooner were they distinguished than his reduction of all virtue to a single principle was shown to be illusive. Unless the highest good were one, the means by which it was sought could not converge to a single point; nor according to the new ideas could their mastery come under the jurisdiction of a single art.

We may also suspect that Plato was dissatisfied not only with the positive results obtained by Socrates, but also with the Socratic method of constructing general definitions. To rise from the part to the whole, from particular instances to general notions, was a popular rather than a scientific process; and sometimes it only amounted to taking the current explanations and modifying them to suit the exigencies of ordinary experience. The resulting definitions could never be more than tentative, and a skilful dialectician could always upset them by producing an unlooked-for exception, or by discovering an ambiguity in the terms by which they were conveyed.

Before ascertaining in what direction Plato sought for an outlet from these accumulated difficulties, we have to glance at a dialogue belonging apparently to his earliest compositions, but in one respect occupying a position apart from the rest. The *Crito* tells us for what reasons Socrates refused to escape from the fate which awaited him in prison, as, with the assistance of generous friends, he might easily have done. The aged philosopher considered that by adopting such a course he would be setting the Athenian laws at defiance, and doing what in him lay to destroy their validity. Now we know that the historical Socrates held justice to consist in obedience to the law of the land, and here for once we find Plato agreeing with him on a definite and positive issue. Such a sudden and singular abandonment of the sceptical attitude merits our attention. It might, indeed, be said that Plato's inconsistencies defy all attempts at reconciliation, and that in this instance the desire to set his maligned friend in a favourable light triumphed over the claims of an impracticable logic. We think, however, that a deeper and truer solution can be found. If the *Crito* inculcates obedience to the laws as a binding obligation, it is not for the reasons which, according to Xenophon, were adduced by the real Socrates in his dispute with the Sophist Hippias; general utility and private interest were the sole grounds appealed to then. Plato, on the other hand, ignores all such external considerations. True to his usual method, he reduces the legal conscience to a purely dialectical process. Just as in an argument the disputants are, or ought to be, bound by

their own admissions, so also the citizen is bound by a tacit compact to fulfil the laws whose protection he has enjoyed and of whose claims his protracted residence is an acknowledgment. Here there is no reference to a transcendent foundation for morality, none but logical considerations come into play. And it also deserves to be noticed that, where this very idea of an obligation based on acceptance of services had been employed by Socrates, it was discarded by Plato. In the *Euthyphro*, a dialogue devoted to the discussion of piety, the theory that religion rests on an exchange of good offices between gods and men is mentioned only to be scornfully rejected. Equally remarkable, and equally in advance of the Socratic standpoint, is a principle enunciated in the *Crito*, that retaliation is wrong, and that evil should never be returned for evil. And both are distinct anticipations of the earliest Christian teaching, though both are implicitly contradicted by the so-called religious services celebrated in Christian churches, and by the doctrine of a divine retribution which is only not retaliatory because it is infinitely in excess of the provocation received.

If the earliest of Plato's inquiries, while they deal with the same subjects and are conducted on the same method as those cultivated by Socrates, evince a breadth of view surpassing anything recorded of him by Xenophon, they also exhibit traces of an influence disconnected with and inferior in value to his. On more than one occasion\* Plato reasons, or rather quibbles, in a style which he has elsewhere held up to ridicule as characteristic of the Sophists with such success that the name of sophistry has clung to it ever since. Indeed, some of the verbal fallacies employed are so transparent that we can hardly suppose them to be unintentional, and we are forced to conclude that the young despiser of human wisdom was resolved to maintain his thesis with any weapons, good or bad, which came to hand. And it seems much more likely that he learned the eristic art from Protagoras or from his disciples than from Socrates. Plato spent a large part of his life in opposing the Sophists—that is to say, the paid professors of wisdom and virtue; but in spite of, or rather perhaps because of, this very opposition, he was profoundly affected by their teaching and example. It is quite conceivable, although we do not find it stated as a fact, that he resorted to them for instruction when a young man, and before coming under the influence of Socrates, an event which did not take place until he was twenty years old; or he may have been directed to them by Socrates himself. With all its originality, his style bears traces of a rhetorical training in the

---

\* *Charmides*, 161 E; *Lysis*, 212 C.

more elaborate passages, and the Sophists were the only teachers of rhetoric then to be found. His habit of clothing philosophical lessons in the form of a myth seems also to have been borrowed from them. It would, therefore, not be surprising that he should cultivate their argumentative legerdemain side by side with the more strict and severe discipline of Socratic dialectics.

Plato does, no doubt, make it a charge against the Sophists that their doctrines are not only false and immoral, but that they are put together without any regard for logical coherence. It would seem, however, that this style of attack belongs rather to the later and constructive than to the earlier and receptive period of his intellectual development. The original cause of his antagonism to the professional teachers seems to have been their general pretensions to knowledge which, from the standpoint of universal scepticism, were, of course, utterly illusive, together with a feeling of aristocratic contempt for a calling in which considerations of pecuniary interest were involved, heightened in this instance by a conviction that the buyer received nothing better than a sham article in exchange for his money. Here, again, a parallel suggests itself with the first preaching of the Gospel. The attitude of Christ towards the scribes and Pharisees, as also that of St. Paul towards Simon Magus, will help us to understand how Plato in another order of spiritual teaching must have regarded the hypocrisy of wisdom, the intrusion of fraudulent traders into the temple of Delphic inspiration, and the sale of a priceless blessing whose unlimited diffusion should have been its own and only reward.

Yet throughout the philosophy of Plato we meet with a tendency to ambiguous shiftings and reversions of which here also due account must be taken. That curious blending of love and hate which forms the subject of a mystical lyric in Mr. Browning's *Pippa Passes*, is not without its counterpart in purely rationalistic discussion. If Plato used the Socratic method to dissolve away much that was untrue because incomplete in Socratism, he used it also to absorb much that was deserving of development in Sophisticism. If in one sense the latter was a direct reversal of his master's teaching, in another it served as a sort of intermediary between that teaching and the unenlightened consciousness of mankind. The shadow should not be confounded with the substance, but it might show by contiguity, by resemblance and by contrast where the solid reality lay, what were its outlines and how its characteristic lights might best be viewed.

Such is the mild and conciliatory mode of treatment at first adopted by Plato in dealing with the principal representative of the Sophists—Protagoras. In the dialogue which bears his

name the famous humanist is presented to us as a professor of popular unsystematized morality, proving by a variety of practical arguments and ingenious illustrations that virtue can be taught, and that the preservation of social order depends upon the possibility of teaching it, but unwilling to go along with the reasonings by which Socrates shows the applicability of rigorously scientific principles to conduct. Plato has here taken up one side of the Socratic ethics, and developed it into a complete and self-consistent theory. The doctrine inculcated is that form of utilitarianism to which Mr. Sidgwick has given the name of egoistic hedonism. We are brought to admit that virtue is one because the various virtues reduce themselves in the last analysis to prudence. It is assumed that happiness in the sense of pleasure and the absence of pain is the sole end of life. Duty is identified with interest. Morality is a calculus for computing quantities of pleasure and pain, and all virtuous action is a means for securing a maximum of the one together with a minimum of the other. Ethical science is constituted; it can be taught like mathematics; and so far the Sophists are right, but they have arrived at the truth by a purely empirical process, while Socrates, who professes to know nothing, by simply following the dialectic impulse strikes out a generalization which at once confirms and explains their position; yet from self-sufficiency or prejudice they refuse to agree with him in taking their stand on its only logical foundation.

That Plato put forward the ethical theory of the Protagoras in perfect good faith cannot, we think, be doubted, although in other writings he has repudiated hedonism with contemptuous aversion; and it seems equally evident that this was his earliest contribution to positive thought. Of all his theories it is the simplest and most Socratic; for Socrates, in endeavouring to reclaim the foolish or vicious, often spoke as if self-interest was the paramount principle of human nature, although, had his assumption been formulated as an abstract proposition, he too might have shrunk from it with something of the uneasiness attributed to Protagoras. And from internal evidence of another description we have reason to think that the dialogue in question is a comparatively juvenile production, remembering always that the period of youth was much more protracted among the Greeks than among ourselves. One almost seems to recognize the hand of a boy just out of college, who delights in drawing caricatures of his teachers, and who, while he looks down on classical scholarship in comparison with more living and practical topics, is not sorry to show that he can discuss a difficult passage from Simonides better than the professors themselves.



Our survey of Plato's first period is now complete, and we have to enter on the far more arduous task of tracing out the circumstances, impulses and ideas by which all the scattered materials of Greek life, Greek art and Greek thought were shaped into a new system and stamped with the impress of an imperishable genius. At the threshold of this second period the personality of Plato himself emerges into greater distinctness, and we have to consider what part it played in an evolution where universal tendencies and individual leanings were inseparably combined.

Plato was born in the year 429, or according to some accounts 427, and died 347 B.C. Few incidents in his biography can be fixed with any certainty, but for our purpose the most general facts are also the most interesting, and about these we have tolerably trustworthy information. His family was one of the noblest in Athens, being connected on the father's side with Codrus, and on the mother's with Solon; while two of his kinsmen, Critias and Charmides, were among the chiefs of the oligarchic party. It is uncertain whether he inherited any considerable property, nor is the question one of much importance. It seems clear that he enjoyed the best education Athens could afford, and that through life he possessed a competence sufficient to relieve him from the cares of material existence. Possibly the preference which he expressed, when far advanced in life, for moderate health and wealth arose from having experienced those advantages himself. If the busts which bear his name are to be trusted, he was remarkably beautiful, and, like some other philosophers, very careful of his personal appearance. Perhaps some reminiscences of the admiration bestowed on himself may be mingled with those pictures of youthful loveliness and of its exciting effect on the imaginations of older men which give such grace and animation to his earliest dialogues. We know not whether as lover or beloved he passed unscathed through the storms of passion which he has so powerfully described, nor whether his apparently intimate acquaintance with them is due to divination or to regretful experience. We may pass by in silence whatever is related on this subject, with the certainty that, whether true or not, scandalous stories could not fail to be circulated about him.

It was natural that one who united a great intellect to a glowing temperament should turn his thoughts to poetry. Plato wrote a quantity of verses—verse-making had become fashionable just then—but wisely committed them to the flames on making the acquaintance of Socrates. It may well be doubted whether the author of the *Phædrus* and the *Symposium* would ever have attained eminence in metrical composition, even had

he lived in an age far more favourable to poetic inspiration than that which came after the flowering time of Attic art. It seems as if Plato, with all his fervour, fancy and dramatic skill, lacked the most essential quality of a singer; his finest passages are on a level with the highest poetry, and yet they are separated from it by a chasm more easily felt than described. Aristotle, whom we think of as hard and dry and cold, sometimes comes much nearer to the true lyric cry. And, as if to mark out Plato's style still more distinctly from every other, it is also deficient in oratorical power. The philosopher evidently thought that he could beat the rhetoricians on their own ground; if the *Menexenus* be genuine, he tried to do so and failed; and even without its testimony we are entitled to say as much on the strength of shorter attempts. We must even take leave to doubt whether dialogue, properly so called, was Plato's forte. Where one speaker is placed at such a height above the others as Socrates or the Eleatic Stranger, or the Athenian in the *Laws*, there cannot be any real conversation. The other interlocutors are good listeners, and serve to break the monotony of a continuous exposition by their expressions of assent or even by their occasional inability to follow the argument, but give no real help or stimulus. And when allowed to offer an opinion of their own, they, too, lapse into monologue. In fact, the longer speeches give one more the idea of improvised lectures than of anything else. Yet if Plato's style is neither exactly poetical, nor oratorical, nor conversational, it has affinities with each of these three varieties; it represents the common root from which they spring, and brings us better than any other species of composition into immediate contact with the mind of the writer. The Platonic Socrates has eyes like those of a portrait which follow us wherever we turn, and through which we can read his inmost soul, which is no other than the universal reason of humanity in the delighted surprise of its first awakening to self-conscious activity. The poet thinks and feels for us; the orator makes our thoughts and feelings his own; Plato removes every obstacle to the free development of our faculties, he teaches us by his own example how to think and to feel for ourselves. If Socrates personified philosophy, Plato has reproduced the personification in artistic form with such masterly effect that its influence has been extended through all ages and over the whole civilized world. This portrait stands as an intermediary between its original and the far-reaching effects indirectly due to his dialectic inspiration, like that universal soul which Plato himself has placed between the supreme artificer and the material world, that it might bring the fleeting contents of space and time into harmony with uncreated and everlasting ideas.

To paint Socrates at his highest and his best it was necessary to break through the narrow limits of his historic individuality, and to show how, had they been presented to him, he would have dealt with problems outside the experience of a home-staying Athenian citizen. The founder of idealism—that is to say, the realization of reason, the systematic application of thought to life—had succeeded in his task because he had embodied the noblest elements of the Athenian Dêmos, orderliness, patriotism, self-control, and publicity of debate, together with a receptive intelligence for improvements effected in other states. But just as the impulse which enabled those qualities to tell decisively on Greek history at a moment of inestimable importance came from the Athenian aristocracy, with its Dorian sympathies, its adventurous ambition and its keen attention to foreign affairs, so also did Plato, carrying the same spirit into philosophy, bring the dialectic method into contact with older and broader currents of speculation, and employ it to reorganize the whole spiritual activity of his race.

A strong desire for reform must always be preceded by a deep dissatisfaction with things as they are; and if the reform is to be very sweeping the discontent must be equally comprehensive. Hence the great renovators of human life have been remarkable for the severity with which they have denounced the failings of the world where they were placed, whether as regards persons, habits, institutions, or beliefs. Yet to speak of their attitude as pessimistic would either be unfair or would betray an inexcusable incapacity to discriminate between two utterly different theories of existence. Nothing can well be more unlike the systematized pusillanimity of those lost souls, without courage and without hope, who find a consolation for their own failure in the belief that everything is a failure, than the fiery energy which is drawn into a perpetual tension by the contrast of what is with the vision of what yet may be. But if pessimism paralyses every generous effort and aspiration by teaching that misery is the irremediable lot of animated beings or even in the last analysis of all being, the opposing theory of optimism exercises as deadly an influence when it induces men to believe that their present condition is, on the whole, a satisfactory one, or that at worst wrong will be righted without any criticism or interference on their part. Even those who believe progress to have been, so far, the most certain fact in human history, cannot blind themselves to the existence of enormous forces ever tending to draw society back into the barbarism and brutality of its primitive condition; and they know also, that whatever ground we have won is due to the efforts of a small minority, who were never weary of urging forward their more sluggish companions, without caring what angry susceptibi-

lities they might arouse—risking recrimination, insult and outrage, so that only, under whatever form, whether of divine mandate or of scientific demonstration, the message of humanity to her children might be delivered in time. Nor is it only with immobility that they have had to contend. Gains in one direction are frequently balanced by losses in another; while at certain periods there is a distinct retrogression along the whole line. And it is well if, amid the general decline to a lower level, sinister voices are not heard proclaiming that the multitude may safely trust to their own promptings, and that self-indulgence or self-will is the only sure law of life. It is also on such occasions that the rallying cry is most needed, and that the born leaders of civilization must put forth their most strenuous efforts to arrest the disheartened fugitives and to denounce the treacherous guides. It was in this aspect that Plato viewed his age, and he set himself to continue the task which Socrates had attempted, but had been trampled down in endeavouring to achieve.

The illustrious Italian poet and essayist Leopardi has somewhere observed that the idea of the world as a vast confederacy banded together for the repression of everything good and great and true, originated with Jesus Christ. It is surprising that so accomplished a Hellenist should not have attributed the priority to Plato. It is true that he does not use the word itself in Leopardi's sense, because to him it meant something different—a divinely created order which it would have been blasphemy to revile; but the thing is everywhere present to his thoughts under other names, and he pursues it with relentless hostility. He looks on the great majority of the human race, individually and socially, in their beliefs and in their practices, as utterly corrupt, and blinded to such an extent that they are ready to turn and rend any one who attempts to lead them into a better path. The many "know not wisdom and virtue, and are always busy with gluttony and sensuality. Like cattle, with their eyes always looking down and their heads stooping, not, indeed, to the earth, but to the dining-table, they fatten and feed and breed, and in their excessive love of these delights they kick and butt at one another with horns and hoofs which are made of iron; and they kill one another by reason of their insatiable lust."\* Their ideal is the man who nurses up his desires to the utmost intensity, and procures the means for gratifying them by fraud or violence. The assembled multitude resembles a strong and fierce brute expressing its wishes by inarticulate grunts, which the popular leaders make it their business to understand and to comply with. A statesman of the nobler kind who should attempt to benefit the people

---

\* Republic, 586 A. Jowett, III. p. 481.

by thwarting their foolish appetites will be denounced as a public enemy by the demagogues, and will stand no more chance of acquittal than a physician if he were brought before a jury of children by the pastry-cook.

That an Athenian, or, indeed, any Greek gentleman, should regard the common people with contempt and aversion was nothing strange. A generation earlier such feelings would have led Plato to look on the overthrow of democracy and the establishment of an aristocratic government as the remedy for every evil. The upper classes, accustomed to decorate themselves with complimentary titles, had actually come to believe that all who belonged to them were paragons of wisdom and goodness. With the rule of the Thirty came a terrible awakening. In a few months more atrocities were perpetrated by the oligarchs than the Dêmos had been guilty of in as many generations. It was shown that accomplished gentlemen like Critias were only distinguished from the common herd by their greater impatience of opposition and by the more destructive fury of their appetites. With Plato, at least, all illusions on this head came to an end. He now "smiled at the claims of long descent," considering that "every man has had thousands and thousands of progenitors, and among them have been rich and poor, kings and slaves, Hellenes and barbarians, many times over;" and even the possession of a large landed property ceased to inspire him with any respect when he compared it with the surface of the whole earth.

There still remained one form of government to be tried, the despotic rule of a single individual. In the course of his travels Plato came into contact with an able and powerful specimen of the tyrant class, the elder Dionysius. A number of stories relating to their intercourse have been preserved, but the different versions disagree very widely, and none of them can be entirely trusted. It seems certain, however, that Plato gave great offence to the tyrant by his freedom of speech, that he narrowly escaped death, and that he was sold into slavery, from which condition he was redeemed by the generosity of Anniceris, a Cyrenæan philosopher. It is supposed that the scathing description in which Plato has held up to everlasting infamy the unworthy possessor of absolute power—a description long afterwards applied by Tacitus to the vilest of the Roman emperors—was suggested by the type which had come under his own observation in Sicily.

Of all existing constitutions that of Sparta approached nearest to the ideal of Plato, or, rather, he regarded it as the least degraded. He liked the conservatism of the Spartans, their rigid discipline, their haughty courage, the participation of their daughters in gymnastic exercises, the austerity of their manners and their respect for old age; but he found much to censure both in their

ancient customs and in the characteristics which the possession of empire had recently developed among them. He speaks with disapproval of their exclusively military organization, of their contempt for philosophy, and of the open sanction which they gave to practices barely tolerated at Athens. And he also comments on their covetousness, their harshness to inferiors, and their haste to throw off the restraints of the law whenever detection could be evaded.

So far we have spoken as if Plato regarded the various false polities existing around him as so many fixed and disconnected types. This, however, was not the case. The present state of things was bad enough, but it threatened to become worse wherever worse was possible. The constitutions exhibiting a mixture of good and evil contained within themselves the seeds of a further corruption, and tended to pass into the form standing next in order on the downward slope. Spartan timocracy must in time become an oligarchy, to oligarchy would succeed democracy, and this would end in tyranny, beyond which no farther fall was possible. The degraded condition of Syracuse seemed likely to be the last outcome of Hellenic civilization. We know not how far the gloomy forebodings of Plato may have been justified by his own experience, but he sketched with prophetic insight the future fortunes of the Roman Republic. Every phase of the progressive degeneration is exemplified in its later history, and the order of their succession is most faithfully preserved. Even his portraits of individual timocrats, oligarchs, demagogues and despots are reproduced to the life in the pages of Plutarch, of Cicero and of Tacitus.

If our critic found so little to admire in Hellas, still less did he seek for the realization of his dreams in the outlying world. The lessons of Protagoras had not been wasted on him, and, unlike the nature-worshippers of the eighteenth century, he never fell into the delusion that wisdom and virtue had their home in primæval forests or in corrupt Oriental despotisms. For him, Greek civilization, with all its faults, was the best thing that human nature had produced, the only hearth of intellectual culture, the only soil where new experiments in education and government could be tried. He could go down to the roots of thought, of language and of society; he could construct a new style, a new system, and a new polity, from the foundation up; he could grasp all the tendencies which came under his immediate observation; and follow them out to their utmost possibilities of expansion; but his vast powers of analysis and generalization remained subject to this restriction, that a Hellene he was and a Hellene he remained to the end.

A Hellene, and an aristocrat as well. Or, using the word in

its most comprehensive sense, we may say that he was an aristocrat all round, a believer in inherent superiorities of race, sex, birth, breeding and age. Everywhere we find him restlessly searching after the wisest, purest, best, until at last, passing beyond the limits of existence itself, words fail him to describe the absolute ineffable only good, not being and not knowledge, but creating and inspiring both. Thus it came to pass that his hopes of effecting a thorough reform did not lie in an appeal to the masses, but in the selection and seclusion from evil influences of a few intelligent youths. Here we may detect a remarkable divergence between him and his master. Socrates, himself a man of the people, did not like to hear the Athenians abused. If they went wrong, it was, he said, the fault of their leaders.\* But according to Plato, it was from the people themselves that corruption originally proceeded, it was they who instilled false lessons into the most intelligent minds, teaching them from their very infancy to prefer show to substance, success to merit, and pleasure to virtue; making the study of popular caprice the sure road to power, and poisoning the very sources of morality by circulating blasphemous stories about the gods—stories which represented them as weak, sensual, capricious beings, setting an example of iniquity themselves, and quite willing to pardon it in men on condition of going shares in the spoil. The poets had a great deal to do with the manufacture of these discreditable myths, and towards poets as a class Plato entertained feelings of mingled admiration and contempt. As an artist he was powerfully attracted by the beauty of their works; as a theologian he believed them to be the channels of divine inspiration, and sometimes also the guardians of a sacred tradition; but as a critic, he was shocked at their incapacity to explain the meaning of their own works, especially when it was coupled with ridiculous pretensions to omniscience; and he regarded the imitative character of their productions as illustrating, in a particularly flagrant manner, that substitution of appearance for reality which, according to his philosophy, was the deepest source of error and evil.

If private society exercised a demoralizing influence on its most gifted members, and in turn suffered a still farther debasement by listening to their opinions, the same fatal interchange of corruption went on still more actively in public life, so far, at least, as Athenian democracy was concerned. The people would tolerate no statesman who did not pamper their appetites, and the statesmen, for their own ambitious purposes, attended solely to the material wants of the people, entirely neglecting their

---

\* Xenophon, Mem. III. cap. 5, 18.

spiritual interests. In this respect, Pericles, the most admired of all, had been the chief of sinners; for "he was the first who gave the people pay and made them idle and cowardly, and encouraged them in the love of talk and of money." Accordingly, a righteous retribution overtook him, for "at the very end of his life they convicted him of theft, and almost put him to death." So it had been with the other boasted leaders, Miltiades, Themistocles, and Cimon; all suffered from what is falsely called the ingratitude of the people. Like injudicious keepers, they had made the animal committed to their charge fiercer instead of gentler, until its savage propensities were turned against themselves. Or, changing the comparison, they were like purveyors of luxury, who fed the State on a diet to which its present "ulcerated and swollen condition" was due. They had "filled the city full of harbours, and docks, and walls, and revenues and all that, and had left no room for justice and temperance." One only among the elder statesmen, Aristides, is excepted from this sweeping condemnation, and, similarly, Socrates is declared to have been the only true statesman of his time.\*

On turning from the conduct of State affairs to the administration of justice in the popular law courts, we find the same tale of iniquity repeated, but this time with more telling satire, as Plato is speaking from his own immediate experience. He considers that, under the manipulation of dexterous pleaders, judicial decisions had come to be framed with a total disregard of righteousness. That disputed claims should be submitted to a popular tribunal and settled by counting heads was, indeed, according to his view, a virtual admission that no absolute standard of justice existed; that moral truth varied with individual opinion. And this is how the character of the lawyer had been moulded in consequence:—

"He has become keen and shrewd; he has learned how to flatter his master in word and indulge him in deed; but his soul is small and unrighteous. His slavish condition has deprived him of growth and uprightness and independence; dangers and fears which were too much for his truth and honesty came upon him in early years, when the tenderness of youth was unequal to them, and he has been driven into crooked ways; from the first he has practised deception and retaliation, and has become stunted and warped. And so he has passed out of youth into manhood, having no soundness in aim, and is now, as he thinks, a master in wisdom."†

\* *Gorgias*, 515 C. ff. Jowett, II. 396-400.

† *Theatétus*, 173 A. Jowett, IV., p. 322.



To make matters worse, the original of this unflattering portrait was rapidly becoming the most powerful man in the State. Increasing specialization had completely separated the military and political functions which had formerly been discharged by a single eminent individual, and the business of legislation was also becoming a distinct profession. No orator could obtain a hearing in the assembly who had not a technical acquaintance with the subject of deliberation, if it admitted of technical treatment, which was much more frequently the case now than in the preceding generation. As a consequence of this revolution, the ultimate power of supervision and control was passing into the hands of the law courts, where general questions could be discussed in a more popular style, and often from a wider or a more sentimental point of view. They were, in fact, beginning to wield an authority like that exercised until quite lately by the press in modern Europe, only that its action was much more direct and formidable. A vote of the Ecclēsia could only deprive a statesman of office; a vote of the dicastery could deprive him of civil rights, home, freedom, property, or even life itself. Moreover, with the loss of empire and the decline of public spirit, private interests had come to attract a proportionately larger share of attention, and unobtrusive citizens, who had formerly escaped from the storms of party passion, now found themselves marked out as a prey by every fluent and dexterous pleader who could find an excuse for dragging them before the courts. Rhetoric was hailed as the supreme art, enabling its possessor to dispense with every other study, and promising young men were encouraged to look on it as the most paying line they could take up. Even those whose civil status or natural timidity precluded them from speaking in public could gain an eminent and envied position by composing speeches for others to deliver. Behind these, again, stood the professed masters of rhetoric, claiming to direct the education and the whole public opinion of the age by their lectures and pamphlets. Philosophy was not excluded from their system of training, but it occupied a strictly subordinate place. Studied in moderation, they looked on it as a bracing mental exercise and a repertory of sounding commonplaces, if not as a solvent for old-fashioned notions of honesty; but a close adherence to the laws of logic or to the principles of morality seemed puerile pedantry to the elegant stylists who made themselves the advocates of every crowned filibuster abroad while preaching a policy of peace at any price at home.

It is evident that the fate of Socrates was constantly in Plato's thoughts, and greatly embittered his scorn for the multitude as well as for those who made themselves its ministers and

minions. It so happened that his friend's three accusers had been respectively a poet, a statesman and a rhetor, thus aptly typifying to the philosopher's lively imagination the triad of charlatans in whom public opinion found its appropriate representatives and spokesmen. Yet Plato ought consistently to have held that the condemnation of Socrates was, equally with the persecution of Pericles, a satire on the teaching which, after at least thirty years' exercise, had left his auditors more corrupt than it found them. In like manner the ostracism of Aristides might be set against similar sentences passed on less puritanical statesmen. For the purpose of the argument it would have been sufficient to show that in existing circumstances the office of public adviser was both thankless and dangerous. We must always remember that when Plato is speaking of past times he is profoundly influenced by aristocratic traditions, and also that under a retrospective disguise he is really attacking contemporary abuses. And if, even then, his denunciations seem excessive, their justification may be found in that continued decay of public virtue which, not long afterwards, brought about the final catastrophe of Athenian independence.

To illustrate the relation in which Plato stood towards his own times, we have already had occasion to draw largely on the productions of his maturer manhood. We have now to take up the broken thread of our systematic exposition, and to trace the development of his philosophy through that wonderful series of compositions which entitle him to rank among the greatest writers, the most comprehensive thinkers and the purest religious teachers of all ages. In the presence of such glory a mere divergence of opinion must not be permitted to influence our judgment. High above all particular truths stands the principle that truth itself exists, and it was for this that Plato fought. If there were others more completely emancipated from superstition, none so persistently appealed to the logic before which superstition must ultimately vanish. If his schemes for the reconstruction of society ignore many obvious facts, they assert with unrivalled force the necessary supremacy of public welfare over private pleasure; and their avowed utilitarianism offers a common ground to the rival reformers who will have nothing to do with the mysticism of their metaphysical foundation. Those, again, who hold, like the youthful Plato himself, that the ultimate interpretation of existence belongs to a science transcending human reason, will here find the doctrines of their religion anticipated as in a dream. And even those who, standing aloof both from theology and philosophy, live, as they imagine, for beauty alone, will observe with interest how the spirit of Greek art survived in the denunciation of its

idolatry, and "the light that never was on sea or land," after fading away from the lower levels of Athenian fancy, came once more to suffuse the frozen steeps of dialectic with its latest and divinest rays.

The glowing enthusiasm of Plato is, however, not entirely derived from the poetic traditions of his native city, or perhaps we should rather say that he and the great writers who preceded him drew from a common fount of inspiration. Mr. Emerson, in one of the most penetrating criticisms ever written on our philosopher,\* has pointed out the existence of two distinct elements in the Platonic dialogues—one dispersive, practical, prosaic; the other mystical, absorbing, centripetal. The American scholar is, however, as we think, quite mistaken when he attributes the second of these tendencies to Asiatic influence. It is extremely doubtful whether Plato ever travelled farther east than Egypt; it is probable that his stay in that country was not of long duration, and it is certain that he did not acquire a single metaphysical idea from its inhabitants. He liked their rigid conservatism; he liked their institution of a dominant priesthood; he liked their system of popular education, and the place which it gave to mathematics made him look with shame on the "swinish ignorance" of his own countrymen in that respect;† but on the whole he classes them among the races exclusively devoted to money making, and in aptitude for philosophy he places them far below the Greeks. Very different were the impressions brought home from his visits to Sicily and Southern Italy. There he became acquainted with modes of thought in which the search after hidden resemblances and analogies was a predominant passion; there the existence of a central unity underlying all phenomena was maintained as against sense and common opinion with the intensity of a religious creed; there alone speculation was clothed in poetic language; there first had an attempt been made to carry thought into life by associating it with a reform of manners and beliefs. There, too, the arts of dance and song had assumed a more orderly and solemn aspect; the chorus received its final constitution from a Sicilian master; and the loftiest strains of Greek lyric poetry were composed for recitation in the streets of Sicilian cities or at the courts of Sicilian kings. Then, with the rise of rhetoric, Greek prose was elaborated by Sicilian teachers into a sort of rhythmical composition, combining rich imagery with studied harmonies and contrasts of sense and sound. And as the hold of Asiatic civilization on eastern Hellas grew

---

\* The lecture on Plato in *Representative Men*.

† *Laws*, 819 D. Jowett, V. p. 390.

weaker, the attention of her foremost spirits was more and more attracted to this new region of wonder and romance. The stream of colonization set thither in a steady flow; the scenes of mythical adventure were rediscovered in Western waters; and it was imagined that, by grasping the resources of Sicily, an empire extending over the whole Mediterranean might be won. Perhaps, without being too fanciful, we may trace a likeness between the daring schemes of Alcibiades and the more remote but not more visionary kingdom suggested by an analogous inspiration to the idealizing soul of Plato. Each had learned to practise, although for far different purposes, the royal art of Socrates—the mastery over men's minds acquired by a close study of their interests, passions, and beliefs. And for each a cup of victory was mingled from the deepest fountains of Hellenic life; but the one saw it dashed untasted from his lips, while in the golden bowl of the other still sparkles, fresh and pure as at first, under a protecting surface of Attic oil, the fiery Sicilian wine.

It will be remembered that in an earlier part of this Article we accompanied Plato to a period when he had provisionally adopted a theory in which the Protagorean contention that virtue can be taught was confirmed and explained by the Socratic contention that virtue is knowledge; while this knowledge again was interpreted in the sense of a hedonistic calculus, a prevision and comparison of the pleasures and pains consequent on our actions. We have now to trace the lines of thought by which he was guided to a different conception of ethical science.

After resolving virtue into knowledge of pleasure, the next questions which would present themselves to so keen a thinker were obviously, What is knowledge? and What is pleasure? The *Theatetus* is chiefly occupied with a discussion of the various answers already given to the first of these inquiries. It seems, therefore, to come naturally next after the *Protagoras*; and our conjecture receives a further confirmation when we find that here also a large place is given to the opinions of the Sophist after whom that dialogue is named; the chief difference being that the points selected for controversy are of a speculative rather than of a practical character. There is, however, a close connection between the argument by which Protagoras had endeavoured to prove that all mankind are teachers of virtue and his more general principle that man is the measure of all things. And perhaps it was the more obvious difficulties attending the latter view which led Plato after some hesitation to reject the former along with it. On a former occasion\* we gave some

\* WESTMINSTER REVIEW for April, 1880: Art. "The Greek Humanists."

reasons for believing that Protagoras did not erect every individual into an arbiter of truth in the sweeping sense afterwards put upon his words. He was probably opposing a human to a theological or a naturalistic standard. Nevertheless, it does not follow that Plato was fighting with a shadow when he pressed the Protagorean dictum to its most literal interpretation. There are plenty of people still who would maintain it to that extent. Wherever and whenever the authority of ancient traditions is broken down, the doctrine that one man's opinion is as good as another's immediately takes its place, or rather the doctrine in question is a survival of traditionalism in an extremely pulverized form. And when we are told that the majority must be right—which is a very different principle from holding that the majority should be obeyed—we may take it as a sign that the loose particles are beginning to coalesce again. The substitution of an individual for a universal standard of truth is, according to Plato, a direct consequence of the theory which identifies knowledge with sense-perception. It is at any rate certain that the most vehement assertors of the former doctrine are also those who are fondest of appealing to what they and their friends have seen, heard or felt; and the more educated among them place enormous confidence in statistics. They are also fond of repeating the adage that an ounce of fact is worth a pound of theory, without considering that theory alone can furnish the balance in which facts are weighed. Plato does not go very deep into the rationale of observation, nor in the infancy of exact science was it to be expected that he should. He fully recognized the presence of two factors, an objective and a subjective, in every sensation, but lost his hold on the true method in attempting to trace a like dualism through the whole of consciousness. Where we should distinguish between the mental energies and the physical processes underlying them, or between the elements respectively contributed to every cognition by immediate experience and reflection, he conceived the inner and outer worlds as two analogous series related to one another as an image to its original.

At this last point we touch on the final generalization by which Plato extended the dialectic method to all existence, and readmitted into philosophy the earlier speculations provisionally excluded from it by Socrates. The cross-examining elenchus at first applied only to individuals had been turned with destructive effect on every class, every institution and every polity until the whole of human life was made to appear one mass of self-contradiction, instability and illusion. It had been held by some that the order of nature offered a contrast and a correction to this bewildering chaos. Plato, on the other hand, sought to show that

the ignorance and evil prevalent among men were only a part of the imperfection necessarily belonging to derivative existence of every kind. For this purpose the philosophy of Heraclitus proved a welcome auxiliary. The pupil of Socrates had been taught in early youth by Cratylus, an adherent of the Ephesian school, that movement, relativity and the conjunction of opposites are the very conditions under which Nature works. We may conjecture that Plato did not at first detect any resemblance between the Heraclitean flux and the mental bewilderment produced or brought to light by the master of cross-examination. But his visit to Italy would probably enable him to take a new view of the Ionian speculations by bringing him into contact with schools maintaining a directly opposite doctrine. The Eleatics held that existence remained eternally undivided, unmoved and unchanged. The Pythagoreans arranged all things according to a strained and rigid antithetical construction. Then came the identifying flash. Unchangeable reality, divine order, mathematical truth—these were the objective counterpart of the Socratic definitions, of the consistency which Socrates introduced into conduct. The Heraclitean system applied to phenomena only, and it faithfully reflected the incoherent beliefs and disorderly actions of uneducated men. We are brought into relation with the fluctuating sea of generated and perishing natures by sense and opinion, and these reproduce in their irreconcilable diversity the shifting character of the objects with which they are conversant. Whatever we see and feel is a mixture of being and unreality; it is, and is not, at the same time. Sensible magnitudes are equal or greater or less according as the standard of comparison is chosen. Yet the very act of comparison shows that there is something in ourselves deeper than mere sense; something to which all individual sensations are referred as to a common centre, and in which their images are stored up. Knowledge, then, can no longer be identified with sensation, since the mental reproductions of external objects are apprehended in the absence of their originals, and since thought possesses the further faculty of framing abstract notions not representing any sensible objects at all.

We need not follow Plato's investigations into the meaning of knowledge and the causes of illusion any further, especially as they do not lead, in this instance, to any positive conclusion. The general tendency is to seek for truth within rather than without, and to connect error partly with the disturbing influence of sense-impressions on the higher mental faculties, partly with the inherent confusion and instability of the phenomena whence those impressions are derived. Our principal concern here is to note the expansive power of generalization which

was carrying philosophy back again from man to Nature—the deep-seated contempt of Plato for public opinion—and the incipient differentiation of demonstrated from empirical truth.

A somewhat similar vein of reflection is worked out in the *Cratylus*, a dialogue presenting some important points of contact with the *Theætétus*, and probably belonging to the same period. There is the same constant reference to Heracleitus, whose philosophy is here also treated as in great measure, but not entirely, true; and the opposing system of Parmenides is again mentioned, though much more briefly, as a valuable set-off against its extravagances. The *Cratylus* deals exclusively with language, just as the *Theætétus* had dealt with sensation and mental imagery, but in such a playful and ironical tone that its speculative importance is likely to be overlooked. Some of the Greek philosophers seem to have thought that the study of things might advantageously be replaced by the study of words, which were supposed to have a natural and necessary connection with their accepted meanings. This view was particularly favoured by the Heracleiteans, who found, or fancied that they found, a confirmation of their master's teaching in etymology. Plato professes to adopt the theory in question, and supports it with a number of derivations which to us seem ludicrously absurd, but which may possibly have been transcribed from the pages of contemporary philologists. At last, however, he turns round and shows that other verbal arguments, equally good, might be adduced on behalf of Parmenides. But the most valuable part of the discussion is a protest against the whole theory that things can be studied through their names. Plato justly observes that an image, to be perfect, should not reproduce its original, but only certain aspects of it; that the framers of language were not infallible; and that we are just as competent to discover the nature of things as they could be. One can imagine the delight with which he would have welcomed the modern discovery that sensations, too, are a language, and that the associated groups into which they most readily gather are determined less by the necessary connections of things in themselves than by the exigencies of self-preservation and reproduction in sentient beings.

Through all his criticisms in the popular sources of information—sense, language and public opinion—Plato refers to an ideal of perfect knowledge which he assumes without being able to define it. It must satisfy the negative condition of being free from self-contradiction, but further than this we cannot go. Yet, in the hands of a metaphysician, no more than this was required to reconstruct the world. The demand for consistency explains the practical philosophy of Socrates. It also explains under

another form the philosophy, both practical and speculative, of his disciple. Identity, and the correlative of identity, difference, gradually came to cover with their manifold combinations all knowledge all life, and all existence.

It was from mathematical science that the light of certainty first broke. Socrates had not encouraged the study of mathematics either pure or applied, nor, if we may judge from some disparaging allusions to Hippias and his lectures in the *Protagoras*, did Plato at first regard it with any particular favour. He may have acquired some notion of arithmetic and geometry at school, but the intimate acquaintance with and deep interest in them, manifested throughout his later works, probably dates from his visits to Italy, Sicily, Cyrênê and Egypt. In each of these places the exact sciences were cultivated with more assiduity than at Athens; in southern Italy they had been brought into close connection with philosophy by a system of mystical interpretation. The glory of discovering their true speculative significance was reserved for Plato. Just as he had detected a profound analogy between the Socratic scepticism and the Heracleitean flux, so also, by another vivid intuition, he saw in the definitions and demonstrations of geometry a type of true reasoning, a particular application of the Socratic logic. Thus the two studies were brought into fruitful reaction, the one gaining a wider applicability, and the other an exacter method of proof. The mathematical spirit ultimately proved too strong for Plato, and petrified his philosophy into a lifeless formalism; but no extraneous influence helped so much to bring about the complete maturity of his constructive powers, in no direction has he more profoundly influenced the thought of later ages.

Both the *Theætetus* and the *Cratylus* contain allusions to mathematical reasoning, but its full significance is first exhibited in the *Meno*. Here the old question, whether virtue can be taught, is again raised to be discussed from an entirely new point of view, and resolved into the more general question, Can anything be taught? The answer is, yes and no. You may stimulate the native activity of the intellect, but you cannot create it. Take a totally uneducated man, and, under proper guidance, he shall discover the truths of geometry for himself, by virtue of their self-evident clearness. Being independent of any traceable experience, the elementary principles of this science, of all science, must have been acquired in some antenatal period, or rather they were never acquired at all, they belong to the very nature of the soul herself. The doctrine here unfolded had a great future before it, and it has never, perhaps, been discussed with so much eagerness as during the last half-century among ourselves. The masters of English thought have placed the issue first raised by



Plato in the very front of philosophical controversy, and the general public have been brought to feel that their dearest interests hang on its decision. The subject has, however, lost much of its adventitious interest to those who know that the *a priori* position was turned, a hundred years ago, by Kant. The philosopher of Königsberg showed that, granting knowledge to be composed of two elements, mind adds nothing to outward experience but its own forms, the system of connections according to which it groups phenomena. Deprive these forms of the content given to them by feeling, and the soul will be left beating her wings in a vacuum. The doctrine that knowledge is not a dead deposit in consciousness or memory, but a living energy whereby phenomena are, to use Kant's words, gathered up into the synthetic unity of apperception, has since found a physiological basis in the theory of central innervation. And the experiential school of psychology have simultaneously come to recognize the existence of fixed conditions under which consciousness works and grows, and which in the last analysis resolve themselves into the apprehension of resemblance, difference, coexistence and succession. The most complex cognition involves no more than these four categories; and it is probable that they all co-operate in the most elementary perception.

The truths here touched on seem to have been dimly present to the mind of Plato. He never doubts that all knowledge must in some way or other be derived from experience; and accordingly he assumes that what cannot have been learned in this world was learned in another. But he does not (in the *Meno* at least) suppose that the process ever had a beginning. It would seem that he is trying to express in figurative language the distinction, lost almost as soon as found, between intelligence and the facts on which intelligence is exercised. An examination of the steps by which Meno's slave is brought to perceive, without being directly told, the truth of the Pythagorean theorem, will show that his share in the demonstration is limited to the intuition of certain numerical equalities and inequalities. Now to Plato the perception of sameness and difference meant everything. He would have denied that the sensible world presented examples of these relations in their ideal absoluteness and purity. In tracing back their apprehension to the self-reflection of the soul, the consciousness of personal identity, he would not have transgressed the limits of a legitimate inquiry. But self-consciousness involved a possible abstraction from disturbing influences, which he interpreted as a real separation between mind and matter, and, to make it more complete, an independent pre-existence of the former. Nor was this all. Since knowledge is of likeness in difference, then the central truth of things, the

reality underlying all appearance must be an abiding identity recognized by the soul through her previous communion with it in a purer world. The inevitable tendency of two identities, one subjective and the other objective, was to coalesce in an absolute unity where all distinctions of time and space would have disappeared, carrying the whole mythical machinery along with them, and Plato's logic is always hovering on the verge of such a consummation without being able fully to accept it. Still the mystical tendency, which it was reserved for Plotinus to carry out in its entirety, is always present, though restrained by other motives, working for the ascertainment of uniformity in theory and for the enforcement of uniformity in practice.

We have accompanied Plato to a point where he begins to see his way towards a radical reconstruction of all existing beliefs and institutions. On a future occasion we shall attempt to show how far he succeeded in this great purpose, how much, in his positive contributions to thought is of permanent, and how much of merely biographical or literary value.



#### ART. V.—CHASTITY : ITS DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE.

OUR subject is aside from the discussion of the Origin of the Species. Three undisputed facts are postulated :—(1) there are species ; (2) the typical characteristics of such species are usually transmitted ; and (3) variation occurs in the entailment. Two presumptions are provisionally accepted, neither of which are certain, but both of which are scientifically tenable. The first, that a correlation exists between physiological and psychological phenomena, and that the application of the doctrine of entailment to these correlations is chiefly confined to determining the respective limits of heredity and variation, and the relative distribution of the one over the other at alternate points. The second, that man, rising from a savage state, has conquered civilization through a long series of ethnical and social transformations, covering ages of time. The power of parent to transmit, not only the essentials of his species, but also his own idiosyncrasies, is so persistent a force, that no modern inquiry into social phenomena can satisfy which fails to take into account the breadth and significance of this constructive and preservative endowment. But the doctrine of heredity does not explain the

causes of variations which occur so frequently, and which, though they mostly die off with the individual exception, sometimes survive in reproductive progeny when favouring conditions intervene. At first sight variation seems to oppose heredity; a better interpretation makes them correlatives of the persistence of life. Variation is the plastic form of persistence. It enables a species to accept, by adaptation, an environment which otherwise threatens extinction. Heredity is the organized form of persistence, which maintains the typical characteristics through ephemeral variations of environment, or fixes a favourable variation as a permanent variety, and the succession of generations favours the perpetual possibility of change, and discloses the law of this reciprocal relation. (1) If a type is fixed, its permanence is inseparably connected with and dependent upon an equally fixed environment. (2) If a feature is mutable, easily subverted, or difficult to maintain, the environment related to it is equally fickle, and the new feature fails to secure that repetition through ages, not inaptly called "an eternal memory," which constitutes the essential of an hereditary quality.

It is due to this law that the degree of certitude of entailment differs so greatly in different orders of phenomena, that physiological traits are more profound than intellectual or moral ones. Indeed, as we pass through a series beginning with the structure of the vital organs, to the appetites and passions, to the emotions, the judgment and the will, and culminate in the moral sense, we begin with those features which are most exclusively controlled by heredity, and proceed, by successive steps, to powers less and less under its domination. Conversely, as we proceed from the physical to the moral, the dominion of environment enhances; therefore, training—which is only an artificial device for maintaining a favourable environment—must ever be invoked to maintain a steady and transmissible moral character. But the conception of heredity includes much more than the entailment of generic or idiosyncratic features. It implies inheritance of consecutive transformations which unvaryingly recur. It is not that man, as a species, inherits a nose, but that he inherits the potentiality of passing from infancy to youth, through manhood to old age and death, and that this serial metamorphosis is more certain of entailment than even the appearance of a nose upon his face. Nor must heredity be prefigured as the transference of an agglomerate sum of endowment; but it must be conceived of as the sempiternal convergence of the aptitudes of a man's separate ascendants handed down and integrated in his organization. The most profound distinction in biology being sex, each half of these ascendants will be named

accordingly androgen,\* denoting any progenitor, and gynegen,\* any progenitress, however remote in the lineage.

We require to include in the conception of environment much more than the mere fortuitous surroundings which determine natural selection, for men differ from beasts in this: they can, within certain limits, create a selective environment which will add to or subtract from hereditary endowment. The power of invention, the establishment of customs, the organization of nations belong to this adjustable domain, and furnish educative agencies capable of establishing transmissible qualities of mind and body corresponding to established ideals.

During the discussion of our theme, "the first thing which, in the order of Nature, forces itself upon our notice, is the strength of the sexual propensity, and the comparative weakness of the moral principle which ought to hold it in restraint."† This "propensity" best illustrates physiological and psychological correlation. It has an organic basis. Before birth there is a morphological development which is at first sexless, but at a definite period, varying only a few days, gender appears without function. For years after birth the metamorphoses continue and develop function, and closely following appear conscious emotions that approximate to instincts, which are partly appetite, partly aspiration. The emotions do not appear before the functions, nor the latter before the organs, but the extirpation of the organs effectually extinguishes the related emotions; whereas the power to control the emotion does not arise till later in life. It resides in the will, and the conditions which preside over the co-ordination of this will are so variable, that it is less certainly entailed than the passion which it has to govern. Hence "the weakness of the moral principle" which ought to hold it in restraint. The essential character of chastity implies an active mastery over appetite, not the negation of appetite, and this mastery is a constituent of character capable of being entailed. But such is the vacuity of our language that it does not contain a single word to denote that such a moral attribute exists; the nouns, like chastity and pudicity, being descriptive of states or conditions of continence, not the endowment of it as a faculty. It denies to the heroism of self-conquest a single active transitive verb to denote that the English-speaking race can conceive of a masterful will which rules. Every verb which

---

\* These arbitrary contractions for androgenitor and gynegenitress respectively, enable their plurals to be inflected according to English usage, and thus allow of the formation of adjective and adverbial derivatives which are not cumbersome.

† "Lectures on Magdalenism," by Rev. Ralph Wardlaw, p. 101, New York, 1842.

applies has a passive form. It is herein proposed to rid the language of this reproach by affixing to the noun "astriction" a new specific meaning, to wit: *the binding fast or confining of passional impulse*: to coin the word "astrictiveness," to denote the faculty of astriction. We can then employ the active transitive verb "to astrict," and the adjectives "astrictive," "astrictory," and "astrictable," as useful derivatives.

In tracing historically the rise and development of astrictiveness, we encounter the prevalent theory that government grew out of the patriarchal family, and thus the "postulate that human history opens with perfect marriage, conjugal fidelity, and certainty of male parentage;"\* but later researches prove "that the family is not the primary unit it is assumed to be."†

The tradition that savages are the degenerate sons of a perfect race vanishes before the successive investigations which are being made into the history of primitive man. The hypotheses of Arcadian simplicity and "primitive prudery" among savage women are the pleasant flatteries of poets. The truth seems to be rather, that originally there was no form of regulated marriage. It was only after a series of tentative efforts, a succession of rudimentary forms, and a long-continued and brutal male domination over women, that human experience worked out the system of monogamy and established the modern family. Historically considered, monogamy is not a Christian institution, for it was established in Rome more than seven hundred years before Christ. It is not the acknowledged standard of relation between the sexes among three-fourths of the human family; and even of those nations which profess to maintain it by the enforcements of law and the sanctions of religion, a large proportion of the citizens violate its spirit and its letter. Chastity, therefore, has a much narrower foothold than is commonly supposed, and the poverty of our language in respect to it is apparently justified. We intend, in the present article, to examine the origin and cost of its establishment, the causes that retard its progress, and the necessary measures to maintain it as a permanent entailment.

Ante-dating the gathering of tribes, the formation of families, or the establishment of government, the primary regulator of "the passion" was maternity. The metamorphoses of muliebrity, gestation, and lactation, produce a diversion of vitality which astricts passional impulse, inducing a division of labour in the organic functions favourable to chastity. This is a morphological necessity, and in it the radix of social, moral, and æsthetic

---

\* "Studies in Ancient History," p. 214, by J. F. McLennan, LL.D., Bernard Quaritch. London. 1876.

† Ibid. p. 115.

sentiments and corresponding customs is found. But paternity does not affect men organically as maternity does women. To virility there are no metamorphoses interposed to give the life a new functional office and to deflect vitality from the channel of an indulgence whose only limit is exhaustion. Paternity has no physiological experience, and therefore lacks that profound impress which is produced by maternity, and which, because organic, ensures entailment. In this difference between virility and muliebrity we have the key to the respective parts which the sexes play in the establishment of chastity, something to guide us in the study of its entailment, and, probably, the explanation why woman, rather than man, has submitted to the long and dreadful discipline of tyranny which was to raise this rudimentary physiological metamorphosis into a delicate moral sentiment.

In woman the love of children also rests on organic function, an ante-natal and post-natal experience. Lactation gives rise to child-care, and, later, develops into maternal solicitude and domestic responsibility. Her children are linked with a series of cerebral experiences which are but the registration of varying physiological conditions, the emotional activity surviving the physical causes which brought it into play. The primary impulse being constant and the induced consequents following invariably, the conditions of heredity are completely fulfilled, and she entails upon posterity the physiological metamorphoses and the cerebral conformation that accompanies them. With the man the love of children lacks the organic basis and its psychological unfolding, and must be called into play by grafting it as a secondary sexual characteristic. The woman, having mental conceptions unknown to her mate, and being capable of transmitting them, had to confer these upon generations of sons who were under a favourable environment for the development of these conceptions, and man has thus been more literally "born of woman," than has hitherto been suspected. With man, then, both paternity and love of children were borrowed factors, supported and moulded by social or sentimental necessities which were chiefly created by woman, and which took ages to develop into sufficient coherence to make him co-operate effectively with the primitive woman in the career of child-care, which is the basis of the family. Even when the feeling was created it was a voluntary duty, often interfered with by accidents and liable to frequent neglects. It would fail of that sempiternal recurrence involved in the phenomena of motherhood, the sentiments becoming proportionately unstable. To this day it is the fathers who abandon their young.

Three prime factors concur in the genesis of the family : passion, parentage, and child-love related to each other as cause

and effect. With primitive woman all three are organically basic, with man, only the first, the other two being derivative. How shall this diversity of origin in the sentiments affect the sexes as to the establishment of chastity?

In the dawn of social organization, inconstant man's derivative love of offspring required a suitable environment to fix it as an hereditary element, but in a climate growing food perennially, and requiring no exertion to maintain the family, no such environment existed. A struggle for existence supervening, a large expenditure of vital force was called for to maintain the race against extinction by famines and fluctuating seasons, and around this necessity which enlisted the male efforts, the male love of offspring slowly crystallized and helped to distribute the sentiment between the two sexes so that they both became contributive to its hereditary permanence. But the struggle for existence is the establishment of labour which re-distributes man's vital energy and astricts him by producing a series of physiological and mental metamorphoses formative of character, analogous to those which, in the woman, were induced in a prior stage of society by maternity. Male restriction, then, was probably determined by climatic rigours reacting upon a secondary sentiment entailed from woman, but which failed to characterize males till migration to a colder climate extinguished the posterity of those fathers who neglected the labour essential to maintain their progeny. But the struggle for existence was shared by the woman, so she preserved her initial superiority over man in respect to chastity.

The difficulty with all comparative history consists in the fact that there is a prehistoric existence which can only be reached by methods of induction, all, more or less, open to error. Nevertheless, philology, the study of myths and traditions and surviving customs, and the observation of present savage tribes, furnish a body of evidence which enables us to comprehend social forms we should otherwise not conceive.

The first step toward marriage proper and the patriarchal system seems referable to a disturbance of the ratio of the sexes. Whatever may have been the causes which led to a preponderance of men, whether by infanticide of girl babes, or cannibalism, or the custom of maintaining female warriors, the scarcity of women brought about peculiar communistic groups. Wives had a plurality of husbands; they were the heads of the house; the paternity of children was uncertain; a system of kinships through females only [metrogynic kinship] was organized; and the common property of the group descended through the female lines. Throughout the globe, from the Aryan to the Australasian races, we find traces of this social

order which seems to have been universally prevalent as a stage of civilization. Woman was the first ruler of men. Her motherhood was an experience endowing her with executive mastery intimately connected with the art of governing. The primitive woman must have been more capable than the primitive man. Hence the essential attributes of power vested in her.

Possibly each woman with her family required several husbands to ensure sufficient subsistence ; but, whatever the cause of the establishment of polyandry, it led to important physiological results—for men, astringency ; for women, restriction of partners ; and for rudimentary society, the first trace of organized marriage. Under the earlier forms of polyandry it was the husband who entered the house of the wife and practically came under the dominion of her kindred. “ Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother and cleave unto his wife.”\* If the wife died her children remained with her kindred ; but her husbands, taking their property, returned with it to their people, because this property, by right, belonged to the females of their tribe. Fathers were not accounted kindred to their children. The basis of kinship was a physical fact obviously referable to the mother, and this blood relationship would develop into the conception of a stock having a tradition and a common name linked to the mother. The members of such a group, bound by a common derivation, a common tradition, and a common need of mutual protection, would become brethren ; “ as distinguished from men of other groups they would be of the group stock and named after the group.”† Thus the probable origin of tribes.

It required the union of two or more such tribes to carry forward astringency by means of social regulation. The consolidated tribe would consist of families or gens, each bearing the name of its family before consolidation. With this stage of tribe organization, kinship through females only determined the right of intermarriage. Unions between kindred of the mother's gens were prohibited, but this did not prevent consanguineous marriages within what would now be prohibited degrees. A man could not marry the daughter of his aunt because she was of his mother's gens, but he could marry that of his uncle because she was not. Abraham could marry his father's daughter Sarah, because her mother was of another gens ; but he could not have married his mother's daughter by another husband, because Sarah would then have been of the same gens as his own mother : the conception of consanguinity was limited to female kinship.

But when the tribe consisted of consolidated gens, polyandry would change its form. Instead of a woman marrying chance

---

\* Genesis ii. 24.

† McLennan, p. 123.



husbands and their cohabiting in her family, she would marry several brothers and cohabit with them in their gens. The paternity of children under this form would still be uncertain as to the individual father, but it was certain as to the gens of the paternal blood, and initiated another stage preparatory to female chastity. The law of the Levirate among the Hebrews was imperative. If the elder brother died, the brother next of age had no alternative but to take his widow, *indeed she was his wife without any form of marriage.\** It grew out of a custom which no doubt preceded it, that of polyandry where a woman's husbands were brothers and she lived in their gens. But the significance of the Levirate is that it marks a social condition where the system of kinship through females only was superseded by agnatic relationship. The rise of male supremacy is marked by transferring the conception of female kinship, first to kinship in the blood of the husband's gens, then to kinship in the elder brother's person as the representative of his gens (if he died without issue, it became the duty of the younger brother to raise seed to his elder brother's household), and, lastly, to the recognition of kinship to an individual father.

Agnatic relationship exacted certainty of male parentage. The man was now "the head of the woman," therefore the pedigree of his children must be pure. The subjection of women was begun, and it continued for ages, a ruthless tyranny, mitigated by sentimental flattery. The history of compulsory chastity among wives has been marked by systems of restraint which have varied in form, in degree, and in atrocity, with different ages and peoples. It began when women entered the household of their husbands, and had to conform to the discipline of his family.

Sequestration of women had a double purpose : to protect them from the universal rapine which prevailed in archaic times, and to give surety of paternity. Thus in oriental countries male supremacy instituted the seraglio, which the Greeks copied, secluding their wives and daughters from male society, even that of their husbands and fathers at meals. In Rome, fathers had the right of life and death over their children, a right which they exercised to punish impudicity in their daughters ; and in modern times we have had the duenna, the chaperon, and the companion. The common law of England reduced the wife to an infant, gave the head of the house the right to whip her, to lock her up, to sell her even, and denied her kinship in her own children, so that she was estopped from becoming their guardian. It has been customary with many nations of antiquity,

---

\* McLennan, p. 162.

as it is to-day among savages, to betroth infants to each other, and one reason for the custom was, that the parents should be held responsible for the bride's chastity. The laws of divorce and against adultery have unvaryingly discriminated against wives and favoured husbands, and the laws of inheritance, since woman lost her empire, have deprived her of property, whether inherited or acquired. In the enforcement of safeguards to the legitimacy of posterity, women have suffered untold injustice, brutality, and anguish. They have been tortured, burned, buried alive, stoned to death, dismembered, execrated, denied a soul, and given over to eternal damnation ; but these ordeals have been contributive to chastity as a fixed element of female character. ●

In the formation of tribes by coalition of gens, the rigorous rules which prohibited marriages between persons related by the mother's blood did not prevent consanguineous marriages. Indeed, it intensified the closeness of affiliation, and in the formation of races it has played an important part in raising the characteristics of an unimportant family into the dominating traits of a great people. The fortunate eccentricity of a prepotent individual has been lifted into the hereditary endowment of a leading tribe, and, by extension, of a commanding race. If a tribe prohibited marriage with alien tribes, obviously it would soon convert all its members into blood relations. These are examples of the building up of national characteristics by close consanguinity emphasizing hereditary entailment. The Hebrews owe their marks to such endogamy. Abraham married his half-sister ; their son Isaac married his second cousin Rebecca, whose grandfather and grandmother were uncle and niece. It follows that Rebecca could trace her lineage to Tesah, Abraham's father, through two lines, Nahor and Hasan ; while Isaac could trace his through Abraham and Sarah to Tesah, also two lines, so that Jacob was related to Tesah through his father and mother by four lines, that is, all four of Tesah's children. Now, Jacob was the father of the twelve tribes of Israel, five of whom were the children of his wives Leah and Rachel, his cousins ; and it was of this lineage that the tribe of Judah came, who were to be the kings over Israel.

Endogamy has been a widespread custom reproduced under different names, as castes, royal families, orders of nobility, aristocracies. Among nations successful in achieving civilization, endogamy has set apart a portion of selected women, and erected an environment of sequestration, which has acted with great persistence on the lineage of such women, until chastity has developed from the passive state of mere functional rest to the active faculty of astrictiveness, brought to a degree of sufficient stability to obviate the necessity of marital espionage. It is now

possible for a race of women to regain an ascendancy in their households, which was abdicated during the long and dark ages of male supremacy, to organize in their turn methods by which they can check the profligacy of men, and to establish for them a standard of astringency now unknown, as in the past men began the task by cultivating pudicity in women.

The struggle for existence established labour, and laid the basis of the property career of the race. Subsistence was probably the first form of property. The need of winter stores of food developed thrift, which rests on abstinence. It means, first in order, labour, which involves a redistribution of physical energy favourable to chastity; secondly, a knowledge of future contingencies, and an adaptation of conduct to their exigencies—this is intellectual admeasurement of consequences as to kind and intensity, another form of labour; thirdly, it involves the decision whether present enjoyment with indolence is preferable to present labour for the sake of future benefit. Whenever this series of mental states and corresponding acts converged in the primitive father's decision to maintain his posterity, he planted the germ of the most important forms of social obligation. The rise of the faculty for saving, at first identified with child care, gave to the property career of the race an important function in determining future conceptions of agnatic kinship.

Plurality of husbands may have been a necessity with primitive tribes, the maintenance of the family requiring the efforts of more than one man to provide food and protect it against wild beasts, and still wilder hostile tribes. But as property accumulated, and gave birth to rude arts that increased food and security, it favoured the return to a balance between the sexes, till each man could, by his own efforts, support a single wife and family. The accumulation of wealth, with other favouring local conditions, was propitious to the extension of monogamy among certain races.

To return to the ownership of property, its distribution, and the conceptions of kinship connected with it: at first, property was held in common. Lands were inappropriated, and houses were joint tenements occupied by related families. The death of a member left the others in possession without giving rise to ideas of legal right. The first rule of inheritance was that of succession through females only, but not to the individual female children of the deceased, but to her female kindred jointly. This prevented the males of the gens from transferring the property of the family group to the family group they entered by marriage. The second rule of inheritance arose after woman lost supremacy, and kinship was conceived as referable to the blood of the father's gens; then property was distributed among

the agnatic kindred. It was only when individual property began to supersede property held in common, and when kinship to an individual father was no longer doubtful, that the third rule of inheritance became the custom. Then the estate of the deceased was divided among his sons, the daughters being dowered by their brothers.

Hence, not only has labour created wealth and regulated male continence, but the wealth itself, linked to conceptions of agnatic kinship grounded on certainty of paternity, has aided enormously in inspiring men to compel chastity in their wives and pudicity in their daughters, that they might reap the posthumous fame of an unadulterate sempiternal lineage.

Lastly, religion sanctioned, emphasized, and idealized marital customs, which the entailment of countless generations had erected into bonds so strong and habits so firm, that the social forms and the religious sanctions have been credited with being the ruling power over the minds and acts of men, which the hereditary habits had really established. Physiological organization, and the appetites and passions that rest upon it, have, for the most part, become unconscious in their effect on social order. They act automatically, as the heart does, without the necessity of volition, therefore they have been overlooked in their historical significance. Historians have invariably dwelt on the social events and philosophical dogmas of different ages, which are mainly the conscious efforts of a people, as though these were the fundamental facts of society instead of its evanescent superstructure. They have placed man's interpretation of the facts of society above the facts themselves. It becomes necessary to invert the order, and to examine the *arcana* of entailments.

The establishment of chastity therefore has been a slow process of hereditary entailment under proper environment, marked in various stages by child-care, industry, male-supremacy, and the pride of family growing out of the accumulation of wealth, which has widened social responsibility, and placed the production of wealth not as the end of effort, but as an essential means subordinated to moral purposes. But behind the environment, and forming the radix of the sentiment of chastity, is maternity; so that if we should strip the sentiment of its multiplex moral refinements, at last we should find this physical basis.

Turning from the speculative side of our subject to the facts of present society, we apply our simple formulas to the more complex question of the actual retardation of chastity. Monogamy has succeeded only among nations remarkable for industry. Only when the Greeks and Romans lived upon the products of their own labour did it prevail, and its fall is coincident with the

substitution of wealth by conquest or by slave labour. With indolence national reversion to primitive savage types was predestined. It was not luxury that enervated Rome, it was sloth which set free licentiousness, and with its ascendancy savage forms returned. The patrician ladies whose calendar was reckoned by their successive amours, thronged the gladiatorial arena; coincident with the fall of virtue in their lives rose the love of carnage in their hearts. Just as to-day certain forms of lust extinguish moral sense, and produce grotesque murders, and devilish cruelties practised on girls, which are attributed to insanity, but which are more probably the result of *atavism*—the entailed lechery of the perpetrator, intensified during precocious childhood, arresting moral growth, and reproducing ancestral savagery.

It has been predicted that if mechanical invention should proceed during the next fifty years as it has in the last half century, machinery will supersede all physical and much mental labour. The evil part which it plays in our day is equivalent to the part which the slave labour and the spoils of conquest played in Rome. It is multiplying the indolent employments. Its automacy trains the man into a corresponding automacy which cuts down to a minimum the need of effort for subsistence. Its effectiveness has reduced the hours of labour from eighteen to ten with a rise of wages, and the labour is intermittent because gluts, strikes, and lock-outs alternately intervene. The terms of the struggle for existence are changing. Hard work is less required: Biddy declines service where there are no modern improvements, and Pat will soon follow by refusing to carry a hod without a lift. The upshot is that hard work which underlies astringent is coming into disrepute, and raises the question whether we are becoming the victims of our ingenuity.

It is not a mere cessation of handicraft which is impending, but the accumulation of wealth is so easy and its distribution so diffused, that one of the natural limits of *heterocivism* is being pushed back; for the increasing proportion of income a man can spare for the maintenance of this class gives him an undue power in determining the virtue of women in humble stations, whose false aspirations make them discontented with their lot. We have colossal capital invested in mammoth workshops, but we also have fabulous profits squandered in riot and lust. We are, of course, looking at the danger side of the industrial problem. It will find some solution, but whatever that may be, it must include occupation for the mind and muscle of the generation which gives the answer. Civilization is something besides the power of multiplying commodities. The property career of the race has had a muscular fibre, and this has been the physical basis of some of the most important features of morality, developing

numerous abstract and tender sentiments more flattering, perhaps, to human vanity, but impossible without this rudimentary germ.

The disparity of sex ratio that accompanied polyandry reduced the evils of a redundancy of men to a minimum ; for it contributed to astringency by limiting the ambit of cohabitation. Polygamy performed an analogous office where women were in excess. Both forms of marriage fettered *heterœism*. It now remains to trace the effect of a disturbance of the sex ratio under monogamy with male supremacy and excess of wealth.

The tendency among old communities to an excess of women has been both absolute and relative. Absolute, as by the greater mortality of males from the destruction of wars, exposure to disease and accidents : relative and local, as by the prevalence of male celibacy whether religious or licentious, the concentration of standing armies, the demand for seamen, emigration, and slavery. In England and Wales the disproportion between single women and unmarried males fifteen years old and upwards is progressively increasing. The excess which was only 11.14 per cent. in 1861, was 11.18 per cent. in 1871, and in 1876 more than one-half of the marriageable women were single. In 1850, five of the eastern and middle States of the United States had an excess of males, and four an excess of females ranging from 1 to 7 per cent. In 1860 only two of these States showed an excess of males, all the others a marked increase of females. In 1870 every one had an excess of women, Massachusetts and Rhode Island exceeding the ratio of England and Wales. In comparing the unmarried above fifteen years old in the State of New York, we find in 1850, 7.06 per cent. excess of males, in 1855 it changed to 4.63 per cent. excess of females which increased in 1860 to 5.80 per cent., in 1865 owing to the war, to 18.23 per cent., and in 1875 to 10.22 per cent.

In a nation permitting polygamy this disproportion would be easily absorbed, but in a community where monogamy prevails it reacts on the individual fate of a very large circle of women, and produces a competition resulting in social phenomena varying with the standard of astringency of the individuals involved, and much wider and deeper than the disproportion of sex ratio expresses. After abstracting from the aggregate of women those who are wooed and won and those who are never wooed but whose pride or temper forbids them stooping to conquer, we come to a numerous class who artlessly or artfully resort to husband catching, either directly or by proxy. The beginning of competition is for husbands. But beyond is another circle, where, by successive degrees, we proceed among weak, designing, or reckless women, whose intrigues are neither innocent in method nor justifiable in aim. It is within this circle we find

the diffusive contamination of vice at its maximum, where the vortex is in enormous disproportion to the nucleus of *hetærae* who form its core, because it involves in its meshes so large a following, that it leaves few men who are, at marriage, chaste. Nor is this surprising, for custom requires no such restriction of them, as it exacts of women. Yet men voluntarily surrender their liberty and assume the burden of family ties. The mean age of marriage among men is from twenty-five to twenty-eight, and is preceded by the period of sexual freedom too often merging into licentiousness. Why does the law of marriage overcome most men before thirty? The only cause that seems adequate to such a general result is the compulsion of hereditary entailment—that form which is allied to, if not identical with, morphological metamorphoses. It is because a race development is registered in his very fibre, that each man lives an individual life, conforming to the mean conduct of all his ascendants. But this heredity is not the mere transmission of so much aggregate power or function. It is a transmission of the series of the ascendants, every ancestor being, so to speak, represented. So we must prefigure to ourselves that he derives directly from each *androgen* and *gynegen* of his stock the elements which constitute his hereditary endowments. Each man, therefore, derives his virility primarily from his *androgens* as astricted by the secondary sexual endowment derived from the sum of their *gynegens*, and still further astricted by the struggle for existence involving child-care. To this must be added the sum of entailment of his mother's *gynegens*, so that the cumulation of direct and derivative astrictiveness becomes an irresistible force determining the marital career. The masculine course of development then, tends to ante-nuptial irregularity, then to monogamy with its resultant astrictiveness, and lastly to child-care with its steady duties of labour. Now if a father should entail this developmental tendency upon his daughters, so that it preponderate, there would be among women the analogues of men, with their unstable chastity tempted by the unfavourable environment due to the disturbance of the sex ratio. This seems to be the conditions that prevail among the *hetærae*.

The number of women in any community who have forfeited their pudicity is an unknown quantity, and any computation that should be attempted must be largely guess work. In England\* the number of children born out of wedlock was, in 1842, 6·7 per cent. of the total births; in 1851, 6·8 per cent.; in 1871, 5·6 per cent.; and in 1875, 4·8 per cent., the ratio diminishing. In 1870 it was in France† 7·4 per cent., and Switzerland 5·7 per cent.; while in Massachusetts the ratio

---

\* Registrar General's Report, 1877.

† Letter of M. Donat Sautier de Ronay, in "Continental Bulletin," 1876.

gradually rose from 1867, when it was 8·3 per cent., to 10·9 per cent. in 1871, to 13·2 per cent. in 1873, to 14·4 per cent. in 1875, and, culminating in 1876, it stood at 16·9 per cent.\* The registration statistics are untrustworthy for the purpose of estimating instability of astringtion, because (1) the number of births registered as illegitimate include legitimate children who are abandoned ; (2) the registration of births is imperfect, as in the Massachusetts returns ; and (3) they record neither the still births, the prevented births, the concealed infanticides,† nor the imprudent women who are childless. The steady fall in the ratio of illegitimates in England and Wales from 1842 to 1875 is probably owing to preventive obstacles, while in Massachusetts, strange as it may seem, the increase of the ratio is partly due to the same cause. The influx of Irish Catholics into Massachusetts is displacing the native population, and as the former do not practice prevention, their birth-rate adds to the registration of illegitimates, while the native women who increasingly employ it, proportionately subtract from the registration of legitimate births, and thus widen the ratio, till it appears disproportionate as compared to other countries. Assuming that the number of illegitimate births in a given year affords a basis sufficiently correct upon which to make a computation, we have in England, in 1856, 42,651‡ as an index of feminine instability. If the mean future life of these women was twenty years—a very low estimate§—and the yearly accession of new transgressors equalled one-half of the illegitimate births thereafter, we should have an aggregate of 444,760 of such women, or 6 per cent. of the total number of women over fifteen years of age, a large proportion of whom become the wedded wives of their generation. This view is confirmed by the career and fate of the *hetæra*, concerning which the greatest misapprehension prevails. Dissipation does not reduce their average of life to four years, as bad observers have asserted. Their death-rate is probably not lower than that of reputable women in their own rank of life, for they are recruited from among the most vigorous of the race. Their calling is “but a transitional state which the greater part of them quit by the end of the first year ; very few persist in it to the end of life.”|| A writer in this Review, calculating the rapidity of this transition in different cities, says of the return of this population to ordinary life, “whereas, exceptions apart, the total prosti-

\* Massachusetts Registration Report, 1876:

† Dr. Lankester testified before a Parliamentary Committee that there were in London 16,000 women who had committed child-murder.

‡ Registrar-General's Report, 1878, p. lix.

§ The mean future duration of life at 20 years is 39 years, and at 40 it is 26 years.

|| “De la Prostitution dans la Ville de Paris,” by Duchatelet. Paris, 1857.



tute population of Copenhagen vanishes within a period of five years, and that of Paris within six years, its place in each capital being filled by a new supply, that of London, exceptions apart, does not, perhaps, disappear and become replaced in a less period than seven years.\* What becomes of them? Mr. William Acton tells us that "the better inclined class become the wedded wives of men of every grade of society, from the peerage to the stable."† In Copenhagen, during six years ending 1849, there were erased from the registers of the police the names of 347 *hetærcæ*. Of this number ninety-five, or twenty-seven per cent., were reported as being subsequently married. How many of the 122, which the same register enrolls as gone to service or emigrated, also became married no one knows; but it must have raised the percentages perceptibly. This large proportion of retrievals may astonish persons who think that whoever enters this career leaves hope behind. But we have an American example which is much more conclusive as to this question of retrieval, because it occurs in a rural district, where the history of each woman was well-known to her neighbours, and where the opportunities for a full record were far greater than those of any police. In the family of the "Jukes,"‡ whose lineage has been traced for seven generations, 709 individual biographies are recorded. Of the women of this stock, all blood relations of five sisters, 162 had reached the marriageable age in 1874, including girls of fourteen. Of these adults, eighty-four, or 52·40 per cent., were unstable; and of ninety-five who are known to have been married there are twenty-eight, or 29·47 per cent. who had illicit relations before marriage. Subtracting from the eighty-four unstable women the eighteen now living, who had not yet passed their twenty-fifth year in 1874, and we have sixty-six left. Of these, 42·72 per cent. had become married subsequently to their lapses. The tendency of abandoned women, therefore, is to follow the masculine phases of passional unfolding—ante-nuptial self-indulgence, marriage at or before the twenty-eighth year, the rearing a family, and a partial or complete retrieval during wedlock. Among such women there is a preponderance of entailment of the masculine order. Each one inherits secondary male characteristics from both parents. From her *androgens* she derives directly traits which make her their analogue, while the muliebriety she inherits from her *gynegans* is impaired by the ascendancy of their male progenitors, still further impaired by their own large proportion of retrocessions.

---

\* WESTMINSTER REVIEW, July 1869, p. 195.

† "Prostitution," &c. London, 1857.

‡ "The Jukes," &c. G. P. Putnam & Sons. New York, 1877.

We can therefore realize how powerfully heredity operates to maintain *heterœism*. Nevertheless, so much stronger is the inheritance of muliebrity, that it usually reasserts itself after the twenty-fifth year, and causes two-fifths of this class of women to revert to legitimate wifehood.

Applying this ratio to the 444,760 unstable women of England in 1876, we have 187,306 of the married women directly drawn from that class. These figures sufficiently display how the successful competition of the most unscrupulous women robs the nation of the motherhood of its best women, because the disparity of the sex ratio acts as an insuperable bar to honourable marriage. Retrogression is a double mischief: first by increasing the proportion of marriages in which the heredity of both partners cumulates to reproduce ante-nuptial irregularity, a smaller percentage where this irregularity continues during marriage, and another number where it breaks out in widowhood or after divorce, thus widening the theatre of environment which maintains the disorder; secondly, we fail to perpetuate the virtue of the very women whose will-power, sense of duty, and delicacy of sentiment would fortify and enlarge the circle of the chaste and broaden the basis of national astrictiveness.

So far the argument has considered chastity only as limiting promiscuity by various forms of marriage and domestic customs, but recently Malthus' doctrine of diminishing returns and its corollary, the necessity of prudential restraint on the increase of families, has led to a public advocacy of the necessity of artificial intervention.\* The proposition of Malthus looked to the extension of astrictiveness within the marriage bond which monogamy does not require, and promised enduring results, for it rests on an extension of the sense of duty to posterity, and continues the direction which the growth of the race has already taken in this respect. As it now stands, the difficulty of enforcing male astriction has been that paternity has carried with it no physiological responsibilities, and now it is proposed to reduce women to the same irresponsible condition by making her, artificially, neuter. How will this transformation affect the expansion of lust? how modify the love of and desire for posterity? how far undermine the stability of society?

Obviously, immunity from procreation and parental responsibility will invite the multiplication of ephemeral partnerships, and, hence, a gradual social change will supervene which must have very profound results, especially on child-care. If

\* "The preventive check proposed by Malthus must therefore be rejected, and a wiser solution of the problem must be sought."—*Law of Population*, p. 29, A. Besant.

motherhood was the source and primary conservator of chastity, an assault on the metamorphoses of muliebrity which shall artificially approximate women to the analogues of men must be at the expense of love of posterity. The decline in child love will impair the sentiment of domesticity, and as the canker grows, the home which is the environment that most directly supports and nourishes chastity will decay. It is the home which is the centre of monogamic marriage, and if this disappears the entire social order must change with it. But other changes must accrue. Tampering with maternity must bring disease and exhaustion, it must fill the nation with surviving infants who are doomed to grow up emasculated, and unable to sustain the power of the race. If this proceed to a certain point, morality and intelligence will decline, and civilization will have to be assumed by a succeeding people who respect maternity and impose on paternity the duty of supporting home.

We may sum up the present tendencies as follows :—Machinery is supplanting human labour and unshackling passion, while the increase of wealth extends *heteræism* which the disproportion of the sex ratio facilitates. Already the prevalence of artificial intervention is giving the masculine evolution a preponderance in the formation of posterity, and the influence of muliebrity is restricted, so that there is being organized a formidable nucleus of moral lepers who, by a fatal and unscrupulous competition, exclude the best women from continuing the race. With this fraction of the community the love of offspring expires, and with it the sentiment of domesticity and the consequent breaking up of homes which are the essential environment for cultivating chastity. But as the tendency of the members of this disorderly class is to become extinguished by disease and by sterility, their numbers must ever be recruited from among the reputable ranks, fallen by steady impairment of maternal virtue, mainly through the retrogressions of fathers entailed on their fated daughters.

Is civilization, which, out of a few physiological metamorphoses, could build up, so to speak, the moral and æsthetic feelings that can restrain passion, incapable of extending its dominion over all? Why should the extinction of *heteræism* in the selected few be a more difficult future task than has been the past establishment of monogamy with female chastity among the favoured many? Have we not probably overlooked some of the essential means to this end? and would not a knowledge of the physiological, psychological, and historical development of astrictiveness furnish invaluable aids in training coming generations, and in devising rational customs conducive to this purpose?

ART. VI.—“THE RELIGIOUS INSTINCT” OF THE  
HOUSE OF COMMONS.

1. *The National Reformer; Radical Advocate, and Free-thought Journal.* Edited by CHARLES BRADLAUGH.
2. *The Saturday Review.* June 26, 1880.
3. *The Nineteenth Century.* August, 1880.
4. *The Fortnightly Review.* August, 1880.

THAT the junior member for Northampton has performed a signal service to the cause of religious freedom, in seeking to avoid the subscription of the Parliamentary Oath, will hardly be disputed by any one familiar with the stirring incidents of the months of May and June. The conduct of his case was, moreover, marked by a quiet dignity and strong respect for law, the more conspicuous by reason of the frequent absence of the like on the side of his opponents. No word escaped the lips of the honourable member, either in the House or before the Select Committee, which was not strictly to the point; and, in maintaining his constitutional right to go through the form of the oath unchallenged, he played no meaner part than that of vindicator of the principle of Representative Government against the audacious attempt of a reckless House of Commons to sit in judgment on the choice of the constituencies.

Nor can it be said that the course pursued, although unusual, was either hypocritical, or sophistical. Anything but the former, as the head and front of his offending, according to a most excellent judge of such delicate questions, was just the absence of so venial a frailty.

“His unnecessary declaration that the religious sanction of the oath was to him a meaningless form, mainly created the complications which have since ensued; but it was well known that many members of the present and former Parliaments held the same opinions with Mr. Bradlaugh. To them, also, the religious sanction was unmeaning, though they had the good sense, or good taste to abstain from thrusting their unbelief on public notice.”\*

This “unnecessary declaration,” refers, we presume, to the letter which is appended to the Report of the second Select Committee, and which was written between the passing of the first report and the application to take the oath. Nothing of

\* *The Saturday Review*, June 26, p. 807.

the nature of a "Declaration" was made at any other stage of the affair, and even this was extra-Parliamentary. With regard to the necessity for such an expression of individual sentiment opinions will probably widely differ.

The charge of sophistication might be raised with some plausibility, but could be as easily met. The Promissory oath which Mr. Bradlaugh was willing to take runs as follows: "I, A. B., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Victoria, her heirs and successors, according to law. So help me God." Now, Mr. Bradlaugh writes, in a letter to the Rev. Thomas Lawson,\* "The word 'theos' or 'God' has for me no meaning." And he makes this assertion on the ground that he is a Monist, and that Monism is equivalent to Atheism. "By Atheism, I mean the affirmation of one existence, of which existence I know only mode. . . . By 'existence' I mean the totality of phænomena and of all that has been, is, or may be necessary for the happening of any and every phænomenon." We are not absolutely sure from this whether Mr. Bradlaugh identifies existence and the phænomenal world. His language would seem to negative such a supposition, for the "totality of phænomena" is supplemented by "all that has been, is, or may be necessary for the happening of any and every phænomenon;" but then a little further on we meet with the statement "the word 'universe' is with me an equivalent for 'existence,'" and "the word 'Nature' is another equivalent for the word universe or existence."

Now our difficulty is this: If Mr. Bradlaugh is a Phænomenalist, if his Universe and Nature are only the "modes" of which alone he is cognizant, how does he come by the "one existence"? or if he is an Ontologist, believing in an existence over and above "mode," an unknown something conditioning phænomena, why need the word "God" be to him insignificant? Spinoza had no difficulty in admitting "theos," and Spinoza was a Monist. But Spinoza's Monism was also Pantheism, and Pantheism is rejected, because though "Pantheism affirms one existence," it "declares that some qualities are infinite." "Atheism only affirms qualities for phænomena," and "phænomena are, of course, finite." The "one existence" then has no qualities, but it "exists." Is it then the blankness of nothingness? and again we ask, how do we know it to be "one"? We do not urge these objections with any other desire than to lead Mr. Bradlaugh to explain further his metaphysics. We are willing to believe his own thought is coherent; but at present we must confess we

\* *The National Reformer*, February 8, 1880.

are unable to unravel it. However the riddle be resolvable; the question of his sincerity is not affected, and the phrase "So help me God,"\* may well retain its insignificance, even though its last word need not be expunged from the Dictionary.

The position of the disabled Jew was altogether different. "Upon the true faith of a Christian" were words having for him a very definite signification. They distinctly implied an admission of the belief that Jesus of Nazareth was the true Messiah, the Saviour of inspired prophecy. Accordingly the conscientious Jew could not take an oath which included such an asseveration, but an Atheist of Mr. Bradlaugh's type is not excluded by the terms of the present formulary; nor, indeed, an Atheist of any type, with any propriety, in an age whose spectrum of belief, though commencing with the flaming hue of Anthropopathic Polytheism finds room for the exceeding pale tint of the Unknown and Unknowable X. That the subscription of meaningless formulas is objectionable none will deny, as objectionable as is the retention of non-ruling rulers, or other shrivelled remnants of once vigorous and useful political plants. They at least cumber the ground, and make straight walking often intensely difficult; and they may be used by clever obstructives to block the car of national progress. Mr. Bradlaugh was compelled to use the forms of law even to subvert the fetichism of oath-taking, as a Republican would be constrained to employ like forms to procure the abolition of a hereditary monarchy; but every move made

---

\* The following extract from the report of a case before Mr. Vaughan at the Bow Street Police-court, in which Mr. Bradlaugh appeared as complainant, may serve to remove some prevalent delusions in regard to Mr. Bradlaugh's speculative creed:—

"Mr. POLLARD: Have you ever in your lectures said, 'There is no God'?"

"Mr. BRADLAUGH: No; on the contrary, I have said the Atheist does not say there is no God. . . ."

"Mr. VAUGHAN: You said just now, 'The Atheist does not say there is no God.' What is the explanation?—"The Atheist says that the word 'God' is a word to him of no meaning; that he has never heard or read of a clear or distinct definition of it, or one which, when given, was not contradictory on the face of it. The word to him is an empty sound. The word 'God' to me has no meaning, and I cannot deny that to which I cannot attach a meaning."

"And upon that you say?"—"I affirm one existence."

"Then you affirm one existence, that is, the existence of one Supreme Being?"—"I affirm one existence, that is, one existence of which I only know mode by attribute. I know no being distinct from that."

"Distinct from what?"—"Distinct from the one Existence."

"Then that existence must be Supreme existence?"—"It is the only one. Supreme is a word of relation."

"Do I understand you to deny that there is a Supreme Being with divine attributes?"—"What do you mean by 'Divine attributes?' And what do you mean by Supreme Being as separated from that definition?"—*National Reformer*, vol. xxxv. p. 342.

was clear and above board ; and if it be true, as the *Saturday Review* assures us, that "many members of the present and former Parliaments held the same opinions with Mr. Bradlaugh," those, who place public honesty before all other political virtues, will know how to value an act which broke the yoke of a debasing custom, even at the cost of offending the presiding geniuses of "good taste."

It is, of course, another question how far Mr. Bradlaugh's interpretation of the non-essentiality of the words "So help me God," and of the equivalence of the phrases "I swear," and "I solemnly declare" in the legal form of affirmation, is conformable to the opinion of the Bench. On that point the Committee seem to have pretty generally dissented from Mr. Bradlaugh's reading. In appraising his conduct it is sufficient to have assurance that he held a consistent, and frankly avowed, theory. Those only who presume to declare Mr. Bradlaugh devoid of conscience, because the intellectual results arrived at by him happen to differ widely from their own, will be inclined to suggest an unworthy motive for an unbefriended opinion. There is not a tittle of evidence to be derived from Mr. Bradlaugh's examination before the Select Committee, to warrant the inference that he was merely arguing a theory with an *arrière pensée*. Asked by the Attorney-General whether he attached any express or particular meaning to the words "I swear," he replied "The meaning that I attach to them is that they are a pledge upon my conscience to the truth of the declaration which I am making," an answer which may serve for many.

Whatever may be thought of the quality of the speeches in Parliament on the important questions which the conduct of Mr. Bradlaugh gave rise to, it cannot be said that there was any lack of variety in the sentiments expressed. In the course of three protracted debates—first on the question of reference of Mr. Bradlaugh's right to take the oath after claiming to make affirmation ; then on Mr. Labouchere's proposal that the member for Northampton should be allowed to affirm ; lastly, on the motion that in future any Member claiming to affirm should be admitted to do so at his own legal risk—probably no important aspect of the case was left unnoticed. Both speeches and votes represented the strangely discordant, and, it must also be added, somewhat chaotic state of public opinion in this country, at the present time, with regard to the relation of supernatural religion to practical affairs ; and also revealed the indistinct apprehension of the reach of their professed principles on the part of men usually sufficiently clear-sighted.

To take the last point first. It borders on the incomprehensible

how staunch Nonconformists, such as Sir Charles Reed and Mr. Samuel Morley, could so easily forget their own hardly-won battles, as to make common cause with those enemies of social justice, who would only too gladly refurbish the weapons of intolerance for use against themselves, if they dared. Liberals who abstained from supporting Mr. Labouchere's motion, and who were only brought to a sense of their duty by a Government reminder, if they less openly flouted the principle of Religious Equality, pursued a course indicative of moral cowardice, or culpable indifference. They deserted their posts at a time when no stone was being left unturned to bring discredit on a cause to which they were solemnly pledged. As Mr. Bright truly said: “It is occasions like this that try men and try principles”—occasions when a battle is fought under the greatest disadvantage, when standing firm to principle means association with men who are a mark for fashionable scorn, a portion of whose ill-fame may possibly be transferred to oneself. So signal a defection will hardly be soon condoned; and there are probably not a few electors who, when the national judgment is next required, will consider the conduct of many honourable members on such an occasion, as a better test of fidelity to Liberal principles, than a host of purely party divisions.

Nor can we declare altogether *sans reproche* even the academic member for Southwark, whose language in debate with respect to Mr. Bradlaugh personally was little short of insulting, and whose utterances were strangely at variance with the reputation for breadth of view with which he is usually credited. Professor Rogers posed (at least by implication) as one irreproachably sound in the faith himself, but his vaunted superiority to the uneducated sceptic did not save him from condescending to what was either a pointless truism, or an unjustified innuendo. “In his opinion, a person who recognized no law beyond that of his own mind, and such scanty rules as he thought fit to lay down for his own guidance, very much weakened his own character, and lessened the value of his own life and acts.”\*

Leaving the false or half-hearted friends of religious liberty, we proceed to consider the position taken up by those whose voices were loudest in maintaining the rightfulness of a policy of exclusion.

Sir H. Drummond-Wolff struck the keynote of this concert of intolerance when, in interposing between the member for Northampton and the administration of the oath, he drew the distinction between the liberty that is expedient and that which

---

\* *National Reformer*, vol. xxxv. p. 357.



is injurious. "Parliamentary oaths had been relaxed in regard to the members of different creeds or sects; but all those sects had a common standard of morality, a conscience, and a general belief in some divinity or other. What they had now before them was the distinct negation of anything like perpetual morality, or conscience, or the existence of a God."\* It would have been interesting to have heard from Sir H. D. Wolff a description of the "common standard of morality" of the privileged sects, and very desirable to have had an amplification of the curious phrase, "anything like perpetual morality." Considering that moralists, even within the same orthodox circle, are still often widely opposed with regard to the ultimate rule of right, it is not exactly clear what sense is to be attached to this "common" ethical standard. Until the phrase "anything like perpetual morality" is rendered more precise, we are unable to gauge the enormity of its distinct negation; but taking the words in their nearest rational meaning, and understanding Sir H. D. Wolff to affirm that Mr. Bradlaugh advocates a return to moral chaos, an anti-social state, wherein "every man does what is right in his own eyes," the charge is too foolish to need refutation. There is, indeed, a sense in which the extinction of morality, so far from being the dream of a lawless imagination, represents the best faith of our times—the hope, namely, that habitual regard for the welfare of others will ultimately lead to a social state, wherein the terms Duty and Right shall have ceased to be significant, through the cessation of the moral conflicts which made them possible; but such a thought would doubtless savour too much of Utopia to command the attention of a Conservative baronet.

It appears that Sir H. D. Wolff was misreported in the words "a general belief in some divinity or other," for, on quoting the remark, the Solicitor-General was interrupted by the honourable member, and assured that his statement had been "some divinity of unity or a divinity of trinity."† It is singular that so strange a confusion should have arisen; but of course the theological baronet is entitled to the correction, and has fully saved his character for the invention of remarkable phrases. The charity of Parliament having, however, been so far stretched as to allow "a general belief in some divinity of unity or a divinity of trinity" to be a profession sufficient for ensuring the piety of its members, the profane mind will hardly be brought to see why an extra dose of generality should

---

\* *National Reformer*, vol. xxxv. p. 339.

† *Ibid.*, vol. xxxv. p. 362.

lead to consequences whereby the “law of continuity” seems utterly set at defiance.

A devout believer in “some divinity of unity,” the member for Greenwich, Baron de Worms, repudiated with great energy the assumption of Mr. Bright that the question was one which went to the root of the principle of religious liberty. “This was an irreligious, not a religious question. He had yet to learn that there was any point of resemblance between those who differed in details only in matters of religion, and the man who said he had no faith in that one Supreme Being adored by seven-eighths of the human race. He was amazed to hear that had it not been that the hon. member for Portsmouth interposed, the Government would have allowed the member for Northampton to press the Holy Book to his lips, and take the name of the Creator in vain, in the midst of the most religious and Christian assembly in the civilized world;”\* an oratorical effort rewarded with frequent cheers. It does not appear that any honourable member thought it worth while to comment upon the vividly contrasted sheep and goats, on the unanimous fidelity of the seven-eighths of the human race, differing only in details in the worship of one Supreme Being, and the infidelity which declined to join in so harmonious a chorus. Perhaps the flattering allusion in the peroration to the “most religious and Christian assembly in the civilized world” disarmed all opposition.†

The members for the City of London particularly distinguished themselves in these quasi-theological debates. The Liberal minority member stayed away from the critical division which nearly led to a conflict between the Lower House and the Courts of Law; and Messrs. Fowler and Hubbard made two of the most rampantly bigoted speeches in the whole course of the affair. Neither of these gentlemen could justly be said to be below the intellectual average, but we are bound to add that our estimate of their abilities is not derived from observation of their achievements on the occasions now under consideration.

Mr. Alderman Fowler's utterances, about to be quoted, are the more singular, as he may claim to have been educated in what is generally supposed to be one of the most enlightened

---

\* *National Reformer*, vol. xxxv. p. 357.

† The Baron affords us no clue to the numerical estimate of the forces arrayed on the side of belief. The inhabitants of Asia probably exceed those of all the rest of the world put together, and out of this vast number it would be a liberal allowance to set down fifteen per cent. as Christians and Mohammedans; but the inhabitants of China and the larger part of India, who in ordinary times are described as absolutely godless, or sunk in abject superstition, are apparently quite presentable Theists when the need of these imposing reserves arises, to overawe the British infidel.

centres of modern learning : he is a Fellow of the well-known College in Gower-street, a graduate in honours of the University of London, and at the present time enjoys the distinction of sitting on the council of his college, and the senate of his university, in the latter case as the elect of the body of graduates themselves. This is, however, the way in which this gentleman does credit to the Institutions whose proud boast it is that their doors are open to all comers, irrespective of race or creed. "The person who now sought admission to the House was one who denied the existence of a God, and of a future state ; and he asked whether it was desirable to have such a man in the House ? A man who did not believe in a God or in a future state was not likely to be a man of high moral character ; his language must necessarily be, ' Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.' The majority of the people, including those of the City of London, were opposed to the admission of an Atheist into the House, and if he assented to the resolution he should be a reprobate to his country, his sovereign, and his God."\*

By the side of this remarkable utterance we may place the equally profound remarks of his colleague : "It was impossible to deal with the question on mere legal grounds ; it must be dealt with by the religious instinct which Jew and Christian alike possessed. He hoped the religious sentiment of honourable members would induce them to retain in the forms of the House a recognition of the Supreme Being to whom everything must be referred if men were to be anything but simple sensualists, who referred only to themselves for the truth or morality of what they did."† The depth of degradation to which the non-believer in a God and a hereafter must inevitably fall, as depicted by the pious alderman and his colleague, would probably accord with the expectations of that ascetic constituency, whose pre-eminent political wisdom is still acknowledged by being the only one permitted to return four members to the National Council. The language of the impious sceptic, we are assured, must *necessarily* be, " Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die ;" and the ascription of all things to a Supreme Being is alone efficacious in saving men from becoming simple sensualists, who refer only to themselves for the truth or morality of what they do. It will be time enough to argue with such disputants as these when the links in the chain of inference are supplied, and the connection between abstinence from theological dogmatism and good dinners is made plain to the nineteenth century

\* *National Reformer*, vol. xxxvi. p. 26.

† *Ibid.*, vol. xxxv. p. 359.

· understanding.\* Perhaps, however, we ought not to be surprised that a view, which is preached *ad nauseam* from almost every village pulpit, should have become so familiar in the ears of our passive-minded church-goers, as to have assumed the character of a sort of necessary truth. Mr. Hubbard’s attempt to decide the question at issue by an appeal to “the religious instinct” of the House of Commons was forcibly rebuked by the Solicitor-General, who made one of the ablest speeches in the first great debate. The uncertain nature of the oracle was effectively shown by the exhibition of the consequences of relying on this same instinct in various striking instances in the history of Parliament.

Mr. Warton must be allowed the credit of having revived an old but very respectable point. “The man,” he enounced, “who did not fear God could not honour the king. . . . That was the principle which ought to guide them, if the House believed, as he hoped it would ever believe, that no man’s allegiance to his Sovereign could be trusted who professed no allegiance to God.”† Mr. Warton did not attempt to assign the grounds for this concomitance, nor did any of his hearers rise to controvert the statement, whether from a feeling of its irrelevancy, or a secret conviction of its verity, is left to the reader to surmise. The argument, or rather statement, may, however, be noted as being one of the few attempts to find a positive connection between religious belief and political order.

The same gentleman was equally positive on another point, in the debate on Mr. Labouchere’s motion. “A good deal of the debate on the other side,” remarked the hon. member, “had proceeded on the assumption that an infidel could have a conscience. He contended that it could not be so. The very essence of conscience was the solemnity of religion.”‡ The speaker’s contention is not reported, and we take leave to doubt whether it ever had existence; but that Mr. Warton is not alone in his opinion, many confident statements heard in the course of these debates sufficiently show, and a potent voice outside Parliament, as we shall soon see, has proclaimed the same irrefragable truth. That “the very essence of conscience” is “the solemnity of religion,” however, strikes us as a somewhat unusual assertion, nor do our philological or philosophical acquirements enable us ade-

---

\* Surely these worthy City gentlemen do not suppose that the recognition of the Supreme exemplified in listening to the “grace before meat” is an infallible preservative against a familiar species of simple sensualism?

† *National Reformer*, vol. xxxv. p. 358.

‡ *Ibid.*, vol. xxxvi. p. 26.

quately to conceive its import. Indeed, the laxity of language, which the Parliamentary debates bear witness to on this subject, induces a painful feeling of suspicion, whether such "airy nothings" are wont to pass for wisdom on other and more mundane matters. Not that the numerous members, who spoke with such solemnity and self-assurance in the recent debates, imagined for one moment that they were dealing with airy nothings. Far from it; they believed that they were revealing to an oblivious or wrong-headed political party the open secrets of the universe—verities which were too plain to be missed by any but the wilfully wicked. The "King of kings" was as real a being to Messrs. Smyth and Sullivan as the Empress of India to a subject of the Nizam.

It seems to have been a matter of the most *naïve* astonishment to a number of honourable gentlemen, that Theism and its corollaries should occasion perplexity to any well-constituted mind. What effrontery to insinuate that a name familiar in so many mouths might conceivably be taken in vain! There were, however, gentlemen even on the Conservative side of the House who could have opened their fellow-members' eyes had they chosen. None knew better than the acute author of "A Defence of Philosophic Doubt," what curious difficulties and controversies arise, when finite minds try to get to the roots of belief—how much there is to be said both for and against any absolute dogmatism. But, perhaps, even the honourable member for Hertford felt that the task would have been beyond his strength of driving such subtleties into the heads of men to whom doubt is "devil-born." A long course of Socratic dialectics would have been needed, before these plain minds struggled into a dim consciousness, that there really were one or two small matters to discuss, before the universe was emptied of its mystery. Subtlety, however, is far removed from these unfaltering believers. Indeed, any suggestion of being guilty of dabbling in such wares would be felt by these satisfied gentlemen as almost as great a slur on their reputation, as being guilty of "distinct negation." A man who is so far corrupted as to be subtle—*i.e.*, to be critical about the connotation of words, is a dangerous character, even if the exercise of his critical faculty should land him in the most irreproachable orthodoxy. No, before all things beware of the vagaries of the intellect! It is the will, and not the reason, which is concerned in these solemn matters. "If you do not see this you ought to," is the tacit assumption. "You have no business to have scruples, or foster a taste for hair-splitting," is the unmistakable purport of the argument with the doubter. A rightly constituted human being, healthy in body and mind, never does quarrel with the creed which his neighbours *talk*. To

presume to have an opinion of one's own is to be a "renegade to one's country, one's sovereign, and one's God." To wait for deeper insight is looked upon accordingly as offering an insult, refusing to "tolerate the Almighty," &c. This is changing the *venue* with a vengeance; but it is a course only too frequently adopted, and one which found a host of imitators in the House of Commons.

Now in matters affecting the very existence of society, Will must be allowed rights of supremacy over Reason. The State cannot afford to let its decrees, as expressed through its recognized organs, be set at defiance by any one choosing to dissent from the national voice in the affairs of public life. The State may have drawn false inferences from its premisses, may have made grave errors in its utilitarian calculus, but the citizen must respect the social judgment as long as it is in force, or suffer for it. The very existence of society depends upon obedience, and the community cannot allow a divided temporal allegiance. But, then, the action of the State is not in this case tyrannical. It may be mistaken in its particular legislation, but the premisses whence it draws its conclusions have terms homogeneous with those which go to form the propositions of the individual rebel. Experience is the ground of both. The welfare of the community, as a community, is the guide of judgment; and either party, the governing body or the individual dissenter, has it in its power to convince the other of the error of its ways, and to bring the private into harmony with the public conscience.

It is quite otherwise in the assertion of a national voice in religious matters. Here notions are introduced in the premisses which are not homogeneous, which are insignificant or of doubtful reality to one of the parties, and with respect to which there is no possibility of coming to an agreement. This is the reason why all punishment for heresy is illegitimate, and why the attempt to make the practical obedience of the citizen turn on a special speculator's opinion is simple tyranny. Our Parliamentary theologians in ignoring this distinction, in seeking to inflict a civil punishment for failure to comply with their own conceptions of speculative truth, were guilty of a grave offence, and were following in the steps of the many social persecutors, whose deeds have so disgraced the pages of human history.

This vicious principle of creating disabilities for speculative heresies is of such a kind that it can be practically upheld only by eradicating all opposition; either by converting the infidel to supernaturalism, or by the shorter process of suppressing him altogether. Its accepters in Parliament seem to have had small hopes of the sufficiency of the former method, at any rate they did not personally countenance it; their reliance was on the old-

fashioned plan. It was a candid avowal on the part of Mr. Sullivan, the opponent of Mr. Bradlaugh who maintained his opposition to the very last:—"He confessed he was moved in this matter by what some would call religious prejudices. They were not prejudices of any narrow kind, which would make a bigot oppress those who differed from him."\* Such prejudices never are of a narrow kind in the eyes of those who base their conduct upon them. They are always of the widest possible kind, including the welfare of the human race to the world's end, and that of the individual himself to the day of judgment. For time and for eternity—such is the span of the supernaturalist heresy-hunter.

But those who recently invoked this world-old principle in the House of Commons somewhat overplayed their parts. Their fervid advocacy, though rewarded with cheers from friends, not unfrequently covered itself with ridicule. It was a fitting conclusion to a display of bigotry not of the newest pattern, that the last word should be spoken by a "counterfeit presentment" of the privileged companion of the rulers of darker ages. General Burnaby supplied a choice illustration of the argument from authority. He had summoned a "cloud of witnesses" [chiefly by telegram], and accordingly there was present in the spirit a motley crew, comprising bishops, Anglican and Catholic, the Pope's secretary, Moravian elders, and the Chief Rabbi—all to prove that bats and owls, whose *raison d'être* is the darkness, if put to the question, would unanimously affirm that darkness is better than light!

No wonder that some of the shrewdest heads would rather the waters of strife had never been stirred; although Sir Hardinge Giffard was doubtless indulging in a little harmless exaggeration when, in moving his amendment, he remarked: "There was, he believed, no member of that House, if he excepted the hon. member for Northampton, who did not heartily regret that this question ever was raised." Despite the latent folly and uncharitableness which the case has suddenly brought to light, we are unable to share in Sir H. Giffard's lamentation. We can well understand that the leaders of Tory imbecility should deprecate the zeal which, in trying to wound a political enemy, only made itself ridiculous in the eyes of tranquil observers; but the liberal from conviction will hardly regret a step which enabled the chiefs of a Government renowned for intensity of religious conviction above the breath of suspicion, to appear, in a perplexed state of the public mind, as the guardians of the traditions of a progressive country. As the

---

\* *National Reformer*, vol. xxxvi. No. 4.

Premier said, on the eve of a defeat welcomed by exulting demonstrations, which could not have been louder had the triumph of the noblest of causes been celebrated: "We (that is the House of Commons) have been driven from the Church ground; we have been driven from the Protestant ground; we have been driven from the Christian ground; and now it appears there is to be a final rally upon this narrow and illogical basis of Theism. That will go whither your Protestantism and your Christianity have gone."\*

The rally occurred as predicted, and it may have been final; but whether final or not, the concluding prophecy is on the eve of fulfilment, and already we are hearing the wail of lamentation which presages the passing away of an old order. For, to prove how real has been the victory recently gained, the highest Catholic authority of this country has felt it not beneath his dignity to avail himself of the pages of one of our most widely circulated magazines, to deliver the Church protest against the verdict of the age, expressed through a parliamentary organ. It is true Cardinal Manning declares the recent victory to have been only gained by a "by-vote of a party majority," but the tone of "An Englishman's Protest" is couched in language far too vehement to leave the reader in doubt as to the writer's secret belief. Four and a half pages of the *Nineteenth Century* are deemed sufficient for this manifesto, but they are four and a half pages pregnant with meaning, and they are pre-eminently excellent reading for the free-thinker. They are one of those very significant spiritual beacons, which curiously reflect, as well as radiate, their beams, in a manner unsuspected by the kindlers thereof. It is not, however, the spirit of the Catholic Church alone which shines through these pages, the self-sufficiency and unchangeable pretension to govern the world of a decadent hierarchy, but the spirit of Theology.

The Cardinal's declaration comes to this: The British Empire has hitherto rested on a dual basis, the one part natural, the other supernatural. The supernatural is by far the more important—the most precious of the institutions based thereon being "the Christian law of marriage in its unity and indissolubility;" but underlying this supernatural foundation, of late somewhat slighted, are "the lights and laws of the natural order," on which reposed all the great empires of the old world. This theism of the natural order asserts "that God exists, that He is good, wise, just, and Almighty; that He is our Lawgiver and our Judge: that His law, both eternal and positive, is the rule of our life; that this law binds us in duties

---

\* *National Reformer*, vol. xxvi. p. 30.



to Him, to ourselves, and to all men; that this law is the sanction of our personal, domestic, social, civil, and political life: in a word, without God there is no society of man, political, social or domestic. Society springs from God, and lives by His pervading will. Deny the existence of God, and nine thousand affirmations are no more than nineteen or ninety thousand words. Without God there is no lawgiver above the human will, and therefore no law; for no will by human authority can bind another. All authority of parents, husbands, masters, rulers, is of God. This is not all. If there be no God, there is no eternal distinction of right and wrong; and if not, then no morals: truth, purity, chastity, justice, temperance, are names, conventions, impostures.\*" By the time the reader has reached the final clause his breath is almost gone. But there is much more. He has still to learn what the consequences will be of apostasy—how abrupt is the passage from the solid greatness of a theistic nation, to the utter barbarism of a nation of Agnostics. And this doom of a return to the condition of "herds or hordes" is hanging over the unthinking British Empire, if one Parliamentary by-vote be not speedily reversed. But the British Empire may be saved, if only British fears and imaginations can be played upon, and this is at least a work in which the Cardinal can give effective aid. The scruples of Theistic non-jurors, he generously declares, were rightly respected, for the sake of their Theism. "But let no man tell me that this respectful confidence is to be claimed by an Agnostic, much less by those, if such there be, who, sinking by the inevitable law of the human mind below the shallowness and timidity of Agnosticism, plunge into the great deep of human pride, where the light of reason goes out, and the outer darkness hides God, His precepts, and His laws."†

Were this only the tirade of some village Boanerges, it might be as readily forgotten as so many sacred orations, whose descriptions and denunciations are equally awe-inspiring, but the echoes whereof do not linger fondly in memory—but here we have matter deliberately written, printed, revised, and signed "Henry Edward, Cardinal Archbishop," and receiving the place of honour in a review which is Catholic in the best sense of the term. This manifesto then is not without weight, if its intrinsic value be but slight. Its sentiments, if less openly avowed, are entertained by numbers whose influence is far from inconsiderable, and we have reason to believe are even shared by many who would ordinarily pass for liberals of a pronounced kind. It would be a grave

\* *Nineteenth Century*, No. 42, p. 178.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 180-1.

error, accordingly, to make too light of such a declamatory production; and, although at this present moment the danger may not be so very serious, it is well that free-thinkers should not underrate the struggle of the forces representing the old order, which, while presenting themselves in a guise different from that of former times, are yet essentially the same.

In fact, it cannot be too clearly perceived, that the creed which now passes under the vague appellation of Theism, is that spirit of opposition to human progress, which in former times has done so much to arrest the world under the shelter of the Christian name. The peculiar dogmas, which have hitherto differentiated Christian Theism from other historic religions, have either lost their hold on that part of society which will exert an influence on the future of the race, or have been denuded of their speciality of "revealed," and have sunk into forms of what our Cardinal calls the "Theism of the Natural Order." "Revealed" religion indeed finds few acceptors, if still many lip-professors, and the recent debates in Parliament show plainly, by omission rather than by commission, how little doctrines, which once it was blasphemy to doubt, form part of the actual creed of the present day. The Christian *μυστήρια* are cherished now, either by men the circumstances of whose lives have left them out of the current of modern thought, or by a select few who might be fitly described as ecclesiastical dilettantes. The actuating creed is Spiritual Theism, the creed partially expounded by Cardinal Manning, of which the great names of might are God, Freedom of Will, and Immortal Life—the deliverance of the "practical reason," the verities which it is alleged we cannot choose but see if our spiritual eye is but clear.

The new rallying-cry is not "Believe in the redemptive act of the Divine Son" or in "The Three Persons in the One Godhead," but "Believe in the non-empirical origin of moral instincts, in an entity apart from body, in the existence of an Infinite with all the attributes exhibited by human intelligence, though super-human." No "respectful confidence" for "Agnostics"—*i.e.*, for those who prefer to deliberate long and seriously before assenting to creeds, which strain the utmost resources of human art to put into non-contradictory language. It is no longer "Allah and the Prophet," or the sword-point; but the confession of "Allah" or civil disabilities, exclusion from political office, liability to social disgrace. This is indeed an alarming prospect for the closing years of this nineteenth century. Are then our social rights in future to depend upon the philosophic school to which we incline, to be made conditional upon our acceptance or rejection of Rational Psychology? It is clear that the old instruments of torture cannot be brought into requisition

to coerce the heretic; but modern instruments, which inflict a less corporeal, but not less keen pain, may, and if certain persons had the temporal power in their hands, undoubtedly would, be invoked. We grieve to have observed, in the writings of men far removed from those of adherents of ancient hierarchies, expressions of bigotry which do not essentially differ, though couched in less outspoken terms, from those emitted by the heads of venerable churches.

How shall this threatened danger be met? Practically, of course, by such calm and uncompromising resistance to the pretensions of dogmatists as has been made by the junior Member for Northampton, by using all the forms of law to enlarge the area of civil and social freedom; and by openly questioning the assumptions and inferences which afford a seeming justification for fettering the self-regarding actions of mankind. The gross assumption also that Theism and Ethics are inextricably united must be strenuously refused. Morality of a kind may undoubtedly be based on a theological foundation. An *à priori* Ethic and Politic may be unfolded, in which a terrestrial "kingdom of heaven" represents the State, where every item of the moral code is supposed to be miraculously imparted, and the social system kept together by the autocracy of some selected organ. But such a moral system does not belong to the "natural order." At every step it has to justify its first principles; and in the last resort must surrender the individual reason into the keeping of an alien conscience.

The Catholic Church has been clear-sighted enough to discern this. It knows perfectly well that a theological morality means government of the world by a specially constituted authority, which constituted authority it always retains the conviction destiny has marked out for its own portion. Leave the least chink for the entrance of an *à priori* Theism, and the end is that so well presented in Mr. Mallock's "Is Life Worth Living?" If a theological sanction is necessary for right conduct, there is no other issue but the restoration of Papal authority. The supreme duty becomes a supreme volition—"I resign my judgment to be guided by the Holy Roman Church," the first and last independent act. The distinction, in short, between a Theism of the natural and of the supernatural order is a distinction without a difference. The divine existence and attributes, and the eternal morality which form the content of Cardinal Manning's simplest form of Theism are all transcendental. The attributes of goodness, wisdom, justice, are experientially found nowhere save in the thoughts and actions of man, and almightiness is an attribute as incomprehensible as it is indiscernible. Lastly, eternal morality is not so much a pure abstraction as a self-contradictory notion.

It argues dulness of apprehension, possible to the English alone of civilized nations, to transfer so confidently the facts and relations of human life to the Self-existent. As a crude realism dominates the physical conceptions of a race unaccustomed to analyze its experiences beyond the requirements of mechanical science, so a crude Anthro-po-theism contents the same concrete thinkers for an Ontology. A naïve Dualism in which a finite consciousness confronts a supreme mind with a like sense of selfhood, substantially homogeneous, yet contrasted as being infinite extensively and intensively—such is the creed which still flourishes in its pristine simplicity, although it is placed beyond doubt that human consciousness is but of yesterday, and notwithstanding the practical assurance that to-morrow it will have disappeared. That the great wave of Force rolled on before the advent, as it will roll on after the decease of man, gives no pause to the glib expounders of the nature and ways of the Eternal Reality; and as in the days of the ancient cosmogonist, when the lights of the stellar universe were supposed hung up to enable the wandering nomad to tie the ox in his stall, so now the mental pictures of the transitory denizens of this most insignificant of planets are proclaimed as the ultimate and everlasting truth.

We are not unaware of the answer which may be made to these animadversions on the popular creed. We are not unmindful of the skill with which the metaphysical theologian attempts to turn the edge of the Protagorean maxim πάντων χρημάτων μέτρον ἄνθρωπος against its assertors, by using the relativity of human conceptions to derive the conclusion that, the ineradicable craving for ultimate explanation being granted, sufficing explanation must be found in terms of human consciousness. But this plausible reasoning derives all its force from a verbal ambiguity, which has perplexed so much theological and metaphysical reasoning. Granted that speculative satisfaction is an ineradicable need of the human mind, and that man must find the key to supreme enlightenment in his own experience, the final elucidation need not be such as to satisfy the demands of a complex psychical state. In other words the πρώτον κινούν is not of necessity expressible either in terms of emotion or of reason. These attributes are complex to a high degree. Now explanation seeks simplicity, endeavours after an unanalyzable unity. How beside the mark then to select just those forms of experience which have been but slowly elaborated, and are the result of the compounding and re-compounding of the raw material of what passes by the common name of consciousness!

This same innocent-looking word “consciousness” has been the *ignis fatuus* of the philosophers, time out of mind. Because the subject element can never be discharged in cognition, it has been

taken for granted that (subjective) "consciousness" is the irrefragable basis of certainty, identical even with "existence," ultimate, immediate, simple. But all these assumptions must be denied. Consciousness is never pure subject, is always subject-object, in every case with a content largely inferential, and in no case simple, but usually highly complex. The ideas which now stand highest in our vocabulary are ideas foreign to primitive man, have been acquired through the growth of an ever-complicating social existence, and may be superseded at a still higher stage of social existence. To pretend, then, that any group of these attributes is peculiarly of the essence of the world-fashioner is to raise a claim which cannot be admitted. The ideas which are wanting to the savage, and which are engendered by a peculiar set of human relations, can hardly be of the essence of the immutable and eternal. When the time for the dissolution of these same human relations arises, the ideas of consciousness which emerged with them must likewise disappear; and yet the eternal essence will be unaffected, as the waters of the sea are still there when the last ripple due to the spent storm has subsided.

There is another point of view, undoubtedly, from which the Theistic dogma may be regarded, and which the foregoing line of argument does not touch. It is that view which abolishes the distinction between noumenon and phenomenon, the Monistic dogma of an ever-unfolding Unity. A creed of this kind, which strives to realize the universe as a never-ending process of emerging and sublated opposites, may satisfy the craving for a reconciliation of the unity and diversity which lie at the root of all thought; but any creed in any fashion resembling this, Hegelian, or aught else, belongs to quite another order of thought than the vulgar Theism, and can only be tortured into harmony with it by a series of thinly-concealed *equivokes*. The vulgar Theist would fail to find his whereabouts in a sphere, which did not allow him distinctly to realize in imagination a contrast between his Ego, conceived as substantial, and a substantial World-Ego; and an Eternal Thinker in whose mental history he was only a thought, or an Infinite Person which was constituted by the unity of consciousness transcending all finite experience, as the unity of consciousness of the cerebrum in man transcends that of the inferior centres, would not be the Personality the plain Englishman would exactly feel it necessary to be thankful for. When it had come to this he would think it time to pack up his spiritual baggage and be off, leaving the wise fools of this busy world, Oxford dons and Glasgow professors, to "worry and be worried."

Whether a belief in Transcendentals be, or be not, justifiable,

it is beyond the scope of this article to inquire ; but what we are prepared to maintain is, that their acceptance or rejection, as doubtfully connected with practical affairs, is no concern of the State. A metaphysic, whether of the speculative or the practical reason, may be needed to satisfy the intellectual unrest of the philosophic mind *par excellence*, but will add no keenness of insight, and supply no real strength in the conduct of life, to the vast majority of active natures ; still less, then, a theology which, to avoid self-contradiction, must deal with the most rarefied abstractions, and only gains in utility the nearer it approaches a crass idolatry. To parody the language of the Cardinal Archbishop, “Deny the existence of God, and nine thousand affirmations are no more than nineteen or ninety thousand words,” we would say, “Deny the social instincts, and nine thousand oaths are no more than nineteen or ninety thousand words.” For the reliance of mankind is now, and will come to be more and more, dependent on the fact that the complex relations of life are such, that disinterested service is as much a practical necessity as self-aggrandizement. It is not the injunction of an over-ruling God which procures this triumph of the worthy over the unworthy in the great concerns of life. Neither the self-indulgent thief, nor the ambitious warrior, is debarred from stealing ewe-lambs, or over-running provinces, by the profession of the strictest Monotheism ; and the power which holds a nation together, and renders self-sacrifice less a virtue than a privilege, is the aroused feeling of a common origin, and the energy of an offended corporate conscience. A man must either possess a strangely guileless mind, or live in a seclusion almost monastic, to seriously suppose that the practice of oath-taking in vogue has even the slightest efficacy in binding men to truth-speaking or patriotic duty. The high value recently placed upon the formula of adjuration has a strange sound, when expressed by men of the world and lynx-eyed cardinals.

There are in fact three classes who deprecate abolition of the public recognition of the supernatural :—the cultured Sadducees, whose reliance on forms for the masses is in inverse ratio to their hold over themselves ; the traditional believer, who looks upon God as almost a part of the British Constitution ; and the ecclesiastic, to whom the world in which man is fated to live is a shadow, behind which is an invisible substance immeasurably superior in real worth, though by the nature of things perpetually unenjoyable. The first of these groups, discounting such interests of the moment as are alluded to by Mr. Leslie Stephen in his article in the *Fortnightly Review*,\* probably resist change

---

\* August, 1880, p. 185.

from a rooted disinclination to declaring themselves on any fundamental question. It is both convenient and agreeable to earn golden opinions in all quarters—now a reputation for unimpeachable orthodoxy by the inimitable non-committal style, which takes away with one stroke of the pen what it gives with another; now the praise of living in the light of the highest reason by a sparkling satire on some ill-bred enthusiast. The rural squire, or somewhat unideal city merchant, has been so accustomed from youth up to hear the most solemn litanies and mystic creeds interspersed with petitions for the coarsest material well-being of his rulers, that a sort of inseparable association has come to be struck up in his mind between the Three Persons in one God and the inimitable British Constitution. The ecclesiastic has not only a sufficiently powerful practical motive for preserving a system with whose mysteries he alone is presumed to be conversant, but has been so trained to look at all things through spectacles made under the requirements of another world Optics, that his interests and artificial science are at one in leading him to look with extreme horror on any innovation, which has for effect the discharging of the idea of a supra-mundane order from this common human world.

The second class, as being composed of men who come out manfully into the open field, but with primitive artillery and antiquated tactics, though most numerous and noisy, really count least in a struggle of pure principle in the circumstances of the present time. Their opposition is too deficient in subtilty for effective resistance. The cultured Sadducees, whose province is chiefly literary, are too destitute of convictions themselves to have much influence on the convictions of others, and their numbers are too few really to enable them to do more than retard social progress, by hindering the formation of a coherent belief, the sole guarantee of correct individual action. It is the third group, in possession of all the weapons bequeathed by long ages of warfare, and banded together by a common faith, which prompts the temporal power to persecution, and whose *non possumus* makes a war *à outrance* between the spirit of Theology and of Experientialism inevitable.

The indolence or incapacity of the mass of mankind has so long allowed the practical instincts to be warped, or controlled, by a minority with a greater relish for power than for ministering to human pleasure, that most men find it difficult to acquire self-trust. They have been so well drilled in the belief that all self-gratification is pure evil, and only permissible under special prescriptions declared to be of supernatural ordinance; have had it so carefully instilled into them, as an obvious and undeniable first principle, that disinterestedness and unselfish labour for others is something

supernaturally imported into social life, that the inevitable tendency of human nature left to itself always has been and always will be to grasp as much as it can, and let all outside this charmed egoistic circle go to the wall—that they are appalled by the suggestion that all extra-human sanctions should be removed.

But the traditional doctrines are as false as these fears are groundless. Human nature is not the incarnate egotist theologians would persuade us, nor are the real ends of life the abstractions vaunted as pure good. The anthropology of the ecclesiastic is grossly unhistorical, and grotesquely wide of the truth, and the rule of life prescribed is a confusion of means and ends. At no time has it been true that man has been exclusively governed by self-interest, least of all in an age when voluntary sacrifice not seldom even overshoots its mark. The tribal feeling which governed our rude ancestors made independent action rather the exception than the rule, and the primitive conscience only grew silent before the Heteronomy of Civil Law and Sacerdotal compulsion, because, as implying a low faculty of representation, it was incompetent to keep pace with the growing complication of social relations. A long interregnum followed, in which the Sacerdotal order played the part of a surrogate, shaping man's practical conduct while his reason and heart grew apace. But with the growth of these faculties man ceased to need these external guides, and the social instinct, illumined, assumed that self-government which is indispensable, if the individual is ever to shake off the trammels of infancy and acquire his full stature.

The Divine Law can now have no other meaning than that law which secures to all the members of the community the fullest enjoyment of life. Any code of duty, which does not permit of human aspiration and satisfaction being squared, must be challenged for its warrant. Men will no longer acquiesce in the priestly claim to pronounce judgment upon what does, and what does not, constitute true goodness. Restraints, said to be divinely ordered, will have to justify themselves by a gain which human thought and feeling can appreciate, and no appeal to a superhuman will will be allowed which cannot convince the reason and satisfy the heart. We, as little as the Archbishop of Westminster, believe that "truth, purity, chastity, justice, temperance, are names, conventions, and impostures;" but not because "God exists," and "without God there is no lawgiver above the human will." They are good by force neither of Divine nor of human will, but only in virtue of the right whereby all things are justified, by being adapted to their ends. If it be said that such is the true interpretation of



being the result of the Divine Will, we reply, why then invoke the name of God in the case at all? If they are good without the appendix of His name, how much the better are they for that addition?

But the ecclesiastic means something more than this. He declares that the attributes cited are portions of "eternal" morality. We must confess that we have never been able to comprehend the dictates of this eternal morality. As little as we can comprehend an eternal and immutable truth and error can we understand an eternal and immutable right and wrong. There is only one way in which eternal or immutable can have any significance—viz., that in all like circumstances like judgments of right and wrong should be pronounced. A soldier, say, acts rightly in trying to shoot the armed member of another State with which his country is at war, wrongly after peace has been restored. Let these relations be reinstated, and what has been right and wrong once will be right and wrong again. But who denies that? Surely not the Agnostic, not the Atheist. These men, whatever their doubts about the origin of things, have a very firm conviction that law and order are universal; nay, it is the very belief that makes them Agnostic and Atheist that they cannot comprehend a universe where, with precisely the same circumstances, the same phenomena do not happen.

But the difficulty of the Theist is just this, how not only to sustain an eternal morality in the above sense, but to convert his morality from a negative to a positive one, how not only to universalize his maxims, but to get his maxims at all. It is no use resorting to the "Divine Wisdom and Goodness" for this positive code, for the Divine Wisdom would need as many organs of impression in the human mind as there are situations in human life to be legislated for. We want not merely an abstract reverence for truth, purity, chastity, justice, but to know whether this impression about to be conveyed ought to be conveyed, whether this particular abstinence is fit and proper, whether this bargain we are about to make is truly deserving the name of justice. If they are pure and just actions now they will be pure and just actions (under similar circumstances) for ever we are agreed; but the act which is pure and just with respect to A and B, will be impure and unjust in reference to C and D. Hence all this pompous talk about "eternal distinctions of right and wrong," about wicked secularists who "plunge into the great deep of human pride, where the light of reason goes out, and the outer darkness hides God, his perfections, and his laws," is so much *brutum fulmen*, "words of sound and fury signifying nothing," phrases cunningly devised by an alarmed minority to retain the allegiance of a world fast gliding from its grasp.

## INDEPENDENT SECTION.

[Under the above title a limited portion of the "Westminster Review" is occasionally set apart for the reception of able Articles, which, though harmonizing with the general spirit and aims of the Review, may contain opinions at variance with the particular ideas or measures it advocates. The object of the Editor, in introducing this department, is to facilitate the expression of opinion by men of high mental power and culture, who, while they are zealous friends of freedom and progress, yet differ widely on special points of great practical concern, both from the Editor and each other.]

## EAST INDIAN CURRENCY AND EXCHANGE.

1. *The Times*, May 23 and 24, and June 13, 1879, containing Debate on the East Indian Budget.
2. *The Fortnightly Review* for July, 1879 ; Article, "A Simple Way out of the Indian Difficulty," by ROBERT LOWE.
3. *The Nineteenth Century* for January, 1879 ; Article, "The Depreciation of Silver and the Indian Finances," by Colonel GEORGE CHESNEY.
4. *Silver and the Indian Exchanges—a Remedy for its Depreciation*. Ten Essays, submitted to the Secretary of State for India in Council, by Colonel J. T. SMITH, R.E., F.R.S., &c. &c. London : Effingham Wilson.
  - (11) *On a Change of Standard for India*, and
  - (12) *On a Gold Standard and Silver Currency*, by Colonel J. T. SMITH, &c. &c. Prepared for the Committee appointed by the Secretary of State for India.

THE question of the Indian Government's difficulties in connection with the unfavourable condition of the Indian exchanges still remains in suspense, notwithstanding the length of time that discussion has been directed to it, and the high names and prominent statesmanship that have striven to unravel the meshes of the tangled web. Since the Indian exchanges began to fall, there has been extraordinary pressure on the official mind, both in London and in India, to explain the financial and monetary phenomena to which the fall is due ; and although the best economic talent of the country has contributed its quota towards elucidation, the undoubted fact remains that the Government is still in a condition of bewilderment ; the causes are as yet seen only as through a glass darkly, and instead of a solution, there is a policy of expectancy, under which it is hoped that natural causes will come to the rescue of baffled statesman-

ship, and the force of circumstances will bring about the remedy that responsible legislators have failed to discover. The subject has been treated in England in a singularly narrow spirit, begotten of prejudice and timidity. The superstition of the so-called single gold standard has stood as an insurmountable barrier against full and fair discussion, and the result has been, that a satisfactory conclusion could not possibly be arrived at. Yet the question is one of the most pressing importance, and as I believe that the last word has not been spoken on the subject, I propose to review some of the more prominent considerations involved in the issue. The policy of expectation is only a defensible one, when the chief existing facts have been submitted to the test of existing knowledge; and I trust to show that neither the Government, nor the leading financial and economic authorities of the House of Commons, have brought the chief facts of the case to the test of existing knowledge. The debate in the House on the East Indian Budget last year excited much greater attention than usually falls to the lot of Indian affairs, and the leading speakers received very exaggerated congratulations from the press and the public. Yet, although most of the speeches bore signs of careful preparation, the result is to leave the reader in a chaos of doubt and bewilderment, with an oracular assurance, however, from the leading speakers, that something favourable may be expected in the future, when the abnormal causes affecting silver have ceased to exist. No one gave any reasons for supposing that the abnormal causes would cease to exist, so that however much the public may be inclined to draw hope from the future, no sufficient basis was offered on which to found any such hope. The House of Commons was content with a very weak and confused discussion, the perusal of which leaves behind a distinct idea of incompetence; and to justify this accusation, I will reproduce the chief passages in the debate that bear on Indian currency and exchange.

Mr. Robert Lowe.—“He had just put down on paper a few propositions which could not be denied. The first was, that the rupee possessed a much higher value in India than in Europe. Though rupees were so very much depreciated when sent for the payment of debts in Europe, in India they maintained very nearly, if not entirely, their old value. We had, therefore, the same coin with two different values, one of which was very much higher than the other.”

“They knew that every power in the world that employed gold instead of silver as its standard of value was a loser by that means.”

[The value of a currency] “depended on two things—first, that it should be a legal tender, and that after it had been made a

legal tender, some means should be adopted by which it should be limited so as not to exceed the gold standard—if gold, for instance, was the standard. If you had these two things you had got a currency, a thoroughly good gold currency, with the advantage that you had not to find the gold for doing it. That was the plan suggested many years ago by Mr. Ricardo, and which, so far as he (Mr. Lowe) knew, had never been carried out. According to Mr. Ricardo's proposition, if a person brought a certain number of these notes—100, or 200, or 1,000—he should always receive gold for them.”—*The Times*, May 24, 1879.

Lord George Hamilton.—“The great object should be to raise the price of silver in England, and not in India. So long as there was a great demand in India for the commodity called silver, and a small demand in England, so long would the purchasing power of silver in India be greater than it was in England. Undoubtedly, the sale of the Secretary of State's bills in England had a depressing effect on the silver market.”

“The hon. Member for Hackney said this [the proposed Indian loan] was a proposal to speculate for silver. So far as speculation in silver was concerned, speaking for the office, he could say the wish was to have nothing to do with silver, but, unfortunately, the Secretary of State, from the exigencies of his position was the largest seller of silver in the world, and obliged to force his silver on the market whether there was a demand for it or not. If they restricted the amount, the exchanges would improve. Suppose by a judicious use of the £5,000,000, they could raise the price of the rupee, it by no means followed that they would be raising the price of silver in India.”

“But what was absolutely ruinous was the constant fluctuations up and down in the value of silver, for that destroyed the basis of calculation of the merchant and trader.”—*The Times*, May 24, 1879.

Mr. J. K. Cross.—“Many people outside the House of Commons seemed to think that India was about to be ruined by cheap silver, and that seemed to him to be such an extraordinary delusion that he would ask the permission of the House to say a word or two on the subject.”

“They [the Indian Government] had a dual duty to perform—they had to govern India and to sell silver. In their functions as a Government it was their duty to render the rupee, the medium in which taxation was paid, as easy of acquisition by the people as possible. As sellers of silver their duty was to get the highest price they could for it.”

“Now, if the Loan Bill was not intended to enable the Government to hold back silver when the market price seemed to them to be too low, the bill had no meaning. The only excuse

for the Loan Bill was the difficulty of selling exchange, which was really selling silver. As silver merchants the Government were quite right in holding their silver, provided they thought it certain to rise."

"They had seen within the last ten days greater variations in the price of silver than had taken place in the seventy years that the French value was at work."

"India sends us a very large quantity of surplus profits. She sends us nearly £20,000,000 a year more than we send her in merchandise."—*The Times*, June 13, 1879.

Mr. G. J. Goschen.—"It ought not to be forgotten that in India bars of silver might be brought to the mint to be coined, and gold [notes or silver coin?] obtained in exchange, and that all contracts were made in India on the basis of a silver currency. If any measure were adopted to close the mint, the privilege would be taken away from debtors of paying their debts through the medium of the coinage of silver bars."

"To send gold to India just at a time when it was almost inconveniently appreciated in Europe, was to expose India to the evils of an appreciated currency in order to rescue her from the misfortunes of depreciation. It was, perhaps, an open question which of the two evils was the worse. He objected, then, to any plan that would shut the door against silver by substituting a gold currency, because, in his view the rectification of the market ought to be brought about by spreading silver over its natural area. It was for the interest of commerce generally, both in India and Europe, that the whole of our commercial transactions should be based upon an aggregate of gold and silver together, rather than that it should rest only upon gold. Monometallists made a great mistake when they endeavoured to convert all nations into using gold only."

"On behalf of the mercantile interests he entirely demurred to placing such a power [that of regulating the currency] in the hands of Lord Lytton and Sir John Strachey, or of any other Indian Viceroy or financial secretaries. He preferred the vagaries of the precious metals to the vagaries of legislatures."—*The Times*, June 13, 1879.

Mr. A. J. Balfour.—"But every historical example of a currency artificially managed and in the hands of a Government, and not depending on natural causes, showed that such a currency was subject to fluctuations of an extremely violent character."—*The Times*, June 13, 1879.

It will be seen from the above extracts that "heroic finance" was unrepresented except by Mr. Lowe, who said that he "took his life in his hand in offering such a suggestion, but if he were wrong he hoped it would be shown in what respect he was so."

Mr. Gladstone did not touch on the exchanges or the currency, and the other speakers did not bring to light on these subjects anything of sufficient importance to be noticed in a brief summary.

Mr. Lowe advanced the proposition which he had put down on paper, and which he said could not be denied, that the rupee possesses a much higher value in India than in Europe, that it maintains pretty much, if not entirely, its old value in India, while it is very much depreciated when sent to Europe for the payment of debts. Lord George Hamilton confirmed this view, alleging as a reason that so long as there was a great demand for silver in India and a small demand in England, so long would its purchasing power be greater in India than in England. By similar reasoning it might be contended that so long as there was a large demand for cotton goods in England and a small demand in Ceylon or Patagonia, so long would cotton goods command a higher price in England than in Ceylon or Patagonia. In the sense, however, in which Mr. Lowe's proposition was put forward, I do not believe it can be maintained. He contends that uncoined silver has a much larger purchasing power in India than in London, that is, that by the removal of silver from London to Calcutta or Bombay, it is increased in purchasing power much beyond the charges of transportation; or, if it be there converted into rupees, these rupees have a greater purchasing power than the silver in London, much beyond the cost of transportation and the two per cent., the mint charge for coining. Economically speaking this doctrine is utterly untenable; but, as it is the keystone of Colonel Smith's scheme for rectifying the exchanges, I shall discuss it at length when I come to consider that scheme.

The testimony from the Indian Government and from all other sources is that silver prices have not risen in India, or, what is the same thing, that silver has not depreciated. The gross imports of silver into India in the five years ended March 31, 1872, amounted to £35,905,019, while for the five years ended March 31, 1877, they amounted to £25,586,500, showing a decrease in the five years during which the rate of exchange was falling of £10,318,519. During the earlier five years the gross imports of gold amounted to £21,999,652, whereas during the later five years they were £9,640,508, showing a decrease of £12,359,144. And during the earlier five years the total *net* imports into India of gold and silver amounted to £50,179,933 against £24,159,415 in the later five years, showing a total deficiency in the *net* imports of gold and silver of £26,038,518 in the later five years. It is true that in the year ending March 31, 1878, the total *net* imports of gold and silver amounted to £15,142,464, since which time they have considerably fallen off. These figures, therefore, show that

during the five years ended March 31, 1872, the average annual net imports of gold and silver were £10,039,587, whereas in the five years ended March 31, 1877, they were £4,831,883, and taking the six years ended March 31, 1878, they were £6,550,313. I now ask how, in the face of the above figures, could silver have depreciated in India when the supply to India had very greatly diminished in the six years, from 1873 to 1878? The generally accepted theory has been that excessive quantities of silver have come upon the markets of the world, and depreciated its purchasing power; but at least any excess has not gone to India, and its purchasing power has not been diminished in India during the period since the gold price of silver began to fall. Indeed, Colonel Chesney maintains,\* and I believe rightly, that silver has increased in purchasing power in India with regard to commodities, and the above figures pointing to diminished imports of silver into India would warrant the conclusion that silver must have advanced in purchasing power in India during the last seven years, because the volume of money in circulation must have relatively decreased as compared with the five years before the gold rate of the exchanges began to decline, and, therefore, in an economic point of view silver prices in India must have declined somewhat if the general condition of the trade of the country remained, as it did, practically unchanged.

Again, it is often assumed that the United States have poured forth large quantities of silver from the Nevada mines which it was feared would deluge the world. The facts, however, do not support this conclusion. The average annual net exports of silver for the four years from July 1, 1868, to June 30, 1872, amounted to £3,414,440; while those for the six years and a half from July 1, 1872, to December 31, 1878, amounted to £3,346,198.† In the meantime the silver in the Bank of France has risen from £3,200,000 in 1870, to £50,538,000 on March 4, 1880. Further, while in the four years from 1868 to 1871, the net imports of silver into France were £10,400,000, in the four years from 1872 to 1875 the net imports were £33,500,000, and France is still a large importer of silver, and has doubtless taken the bulk of Germany's silver at a large reduction in gold price, since the Latin Union have suspended the coinage of silver. Without offering a very positive opinion, I nevertheless regard the figures I have adduced as offering a high probability that France has absorbed the main body of Germany's surplus silver. And at least

\* "It is certainly the case that the rupee has not yet undergone depreciation with respect to commodities, for prices are lower now than they were seven years ago, before the fall in silver began."—Colonel Chesney in *The Nineteenth Century* for January, 1879, p. 109.

† See the Money Article of *The Times* for August 1, 1879.

I wish to call special attention to the indubitable fact that the surplus silver of Germany has not gone to India. The inference from this fact, which I commend to economists, is that silver cannot have fallen in purchasing power in India, yet India is the great silver absorbing and consuming country of the world—the barometer that indicates appreciation or depreciation—to which, if silver were depreciating in general purchasing power, in consequence of excessive supplies, it would inevitably flow, just as exceptional supplies of gold would inevitably flow, to the countries which have their mints open to gold.

I maintain, further, that as silver has not depreciated in purchasing power in India with regard to commodities, political economy teaches that it cannot have depreciated in purchasing power in London with regard to commodities, the opinion of so many House of Commons authorities to the contrary notwithstanding. As well might it be argued that gold could depreciate in purchasing power in New York without depreciating in London. But the fallacy of such a proposition will be manifest to anyone who only considers how prices arise and how they change, and that wherever the mints are open to silver, the silver of the world will find its equilibrium by flowing to those countries where the range of prices attracts it. To say that silver prices in India are 16 per cent. higher than silver prices in London, would be equivalent to saying that there is no open mint in India, and that rupees are at a monopoly value higher by 16 per cent. than the purchasing power of silver either in India or London. But there are mints in India, and as between England and India there is easy and abundant communication, there can be no material difference between the purchasing power of silver in India and in London. It is certain, therefore, that the purchasing power of silver in London over commodities has not only not diminished, but has rather increased—that is, with a given weight of silver one can go into the markets of London and buy a larger quantity of average staple articles of consumption than he could have done with the same silver before the gold price of silver began to fall. For a period of years until very recently the British Returns of Trade have shown diminishing quantities and more rapidly falling values or prices, until silver in comparison with staple articles had rather increased in command over commodities, though it had not increased by 15 per cent. to the extent that gold had increased in purchasing power.

And I may remark here that the movement in the United States to remonetize silver, which was met with such an indignant outcry of denunciation from England, was based on the fact that gold was increasing so rapidly in purchasing power,



not through any natural causes, but through the legislative action of Germany, Norway and Sweden, Holland, and the United States themselves in accumulating gold, that a perfectly legitimate conviction arose in the United States that silver ought to be remonetized so as to palliate in some degree the injustice that was being done to all debtors in favour of all creditors. Lord George Hamilton says, "The great object should be to raise the price of silver in England and not in India," which would indeed be a miraculous triumph of statemanship over the laws of political economy. I contend, on the contrary, that gold having become appreciated through the extraordinary demands of countries recently adopting the single gold tender, the supreme object should be to lower the purchasing power of gold to its former level, to the level of silver, and nearly to the level of the former gold prices of commodities.

The next point to which I desire to refer is the assertion by Lord George Hamilton, Mr. J. K. Cross, and other speakers, that the Secretary of State for India is the largest seller of silver in the world, and is obliged to force his silver on the market whether there is a demand for it or not. My contention in opposition to this supposed function of the Indian Secretary is, that that official does not sell a single ounce of silver. To make this clear it will be necessary to show exactly what the connection between the Indian Government and the Secretary of State for India is in relation to finance, and what the Council-Bills really represent. The function of the Indian Government is to receive their income from taxation and other sources in Indian money, and to pay their obligations, including those in England, out of such money. But I cannot see that the Indian Government have any dealings whatever with silver, although they may handle silver coins, any more than the British Government deal in gold because they receive gold coin in payment of taxes. The Indian Government coin all the silver offered for that purpose, the British Government coin all the gold offered for that purpose; but the former is neither a buyer nor seller of silver, and the latter is neither a buyer nor a seller of gold. The actual manner in which the money due to England is transferred from the Indian Treasury is by the Secretary of State for India selling his bills drawn on India to bankers and others, who pay him a certain amount of English money, namely, gold coin or its equivalent or representative, for those orders on the Indian Treasury which entitle the holder to a certain amount of Indian money, namely, silver rupees. This is the operation to which the term "selling silver" has been erroneously applied. What takes place is this. Indian merchants buy the produce of the country and ship it principally to England; and

as the exports from India largely exceed the imports, this excess goes mostly to England because for the Indian Government's liabilities in England and for moneys payable by people in India to people in England, India must pay without any return in English goods, and therefore must pay by excess of exports over imports. The Indian produce representing the obligations in England for which there is no return in goods, is bought from time to time and shipped to England; the merchants who purchase it draw bills on London under letters of credit, because all the money received by Indian merchants from the sale of imports will have been invested in exports (I pass over the fact that a large amount of the exports in return for imports will be purchased and paid for by bills drawn under letters of credit, as this is a matter of form only) and therefore the residue of exports against which there are no imports must be provided for in some other way. This residue must go to England directly or indirectly, though all the other export trade and all the import trade except the silver to keep up the coinage should cease; and as the merchants have no money derived from imports to pay for it, they must draw bills on London or elsewhere, sell them to the banks who deal in exchange, and with the money thus received pay for the residue of the exports. This residue arrives in England from time to time in the form of cotton, seeds, tea, indigo, &c.; and as sales are made, or money found from other sources, the bills drawn in India against these exports and generally payable in London, are met and taken up from the banks holding them, and thus the banks receive back in London in gold the equivalent with a profit of the rupees they gave for the bills in India.

But before the banks can repeat the operation of buying bills in India drawn against shipments of produce, they must convert the gold they received in London into other bills payable in India, by which they will receive in India the amount of rupees, more or less, that they originally paid for the bills drawn on London. I leave the question of brokers' commissions, profits or losses out of account, so as not to complicate the case unnecessarily. At this point it may be said that the London bankers can invest in bills drawn against shipments to India of cotton goods, or metals, or silver, or that they can purchase silver and take the risk of profit on it; but as I have assumed that I am dealing with the residue of exports from India against which there can be no imports, for the money received from this residue of exports when sold in England there cannot be found any bills representing exports from England to India in which to invest. At this juncture, however, the Secretary of State for India comes forward and offers to sell for gold coin his Council Bills payable

in India in rupees, without the need of any exports from England at all,\* as the rupees are lying in the Indian Treasury awaiting his orders. The Council Bills are purchased by the banks in London and forwarded to the banks in India, which in turn receive from the Indian Treasury the amount of rupees that they invested formerly in the merchants' bills, and they are now prepared to make a similar investment in bills drawn on London.

By those means, therefore, the appropriation in the Indian treasury for English obligations is transferred to London, without the Secretary for India selling one single ounce of silver. Now I think the matter can be still further simplified by asking what are the real essentials of the financial operations between the Indian Treasury and the Secretary of State for India? Why do the merchants shipping from India the residue of exports not sell their bills directly to the Indian Government? Because, though they have the money, they would not purchase private bills, even with shipping documents. The Indian merchant therefore goes to a bank and offers his bill, and the bank practically says to the Indian Government that out of the residue of exports represented by this bill the Secretary of State in London must be paid, and if the Indian Government will hold a corresponding portion of the funds due to England, the bank will take the merchant's bill and pay for it out of its own money, or it may be out of money borrowed from the Indian Treasury. itself on securities, will transmit the bill to London, collect the amount of it at maturity, pay the amount over to the Secretary of State in exchange for Council Bills, and on presentation of the latter receive the amount from the Indian Treasury out of the funds lying there as due to England.

I have thus arrived at the indisputable fact that the Secretary of State for India is virtually, through the intervention in the case of each shipment of a merchant and a bank in India and a merchant and a bank in London, the largest seller in the world of seeds, cotton, tea, indigo, &c., his annual importations amounting to about £17,000,000. It would be perfectly competent for the Indian Government themselves to make the shipments of produce, as the East Indian Company formerly did, paying for them directly out of the money due to England, only it would be highly inconvenient and undesirable for them to enter on the field of private speculation. It would be perfectly competent for them and less objectionable to take merchants' bills with shipping documents, and forward these for collection to the Indian Secretary in London. But the least objectionable thing for the Indian Government to do would be to take bankers' bills, and this course would be perfectly

unobjectionable if the bankers deposited securities to protect their bills during their currency. But the Indian Government have determined that instead of their trusting the Indian banks by purchasing their bills on London, the same result should be arrived at by the London representatives of the Indian banks trusting the Secretary of State by purchasing his Council Bills drawn on the Indian Treasury with the money derived from the payment in London of the Indian merchants' bills which were drawn against the residue of exports which the Secretary of State practically demands from India.

I believe that it is in the end immaterial as regards the rates of Indian exchange whether the Indian Government lower the rate on London by making excessive purchases of bills in India, or whether the Secretary for India lowers the rate by pressing excessive sales in London of Council Bills. I would hazard the suggestion that in the exigencies of commerce and exchange, it would moderate the fluctuations in the rate of exchange if the Indian Government were to remit bankers' bills, if they could arrange for the deposit of securities by the banks, and the Secretary for India were to sell Council Bills according as either of these expedients might be less likely at the moment to depress the rate of exchange. It must be understood that I am not asserting that the action of either the Indian Government or the Secretary for India can permanently raise or depress the rates of exchange, as in my opinion they have no such power, but they can produce temporary fluctuations by large transactions beyond the ordinary course of their financial operations under normal conditions. If the amount to be transferred from India to London were to be raised from £17,000,000 to £20,000,000, the pressure from time to time of the additional £3,000,000 would lower the rates of exchange, because the trade and the exchanges between India and England would be subjected to the strain of an additional £3,000,000 per annum, and the exchanges would be temporarily depressed until trade accommodated itself to £20,000,000 being the normal amount to be transmitted from India to the Secretary for India, in the place of £17,000,000 as at present. But this accommodation once effected, the exchanges would resume their normal condition.

The value must be transferred from India to England: it can only be done in produce, and whether this value be reduced to a definite sum in gold by the Indian Government pressing their money in exchange for bills on London, or by the Indian Secretary pressing his Council Bills in exchange for money, the permanent effect on the Indian exchanges is precisely the same, although at one season of the year it might suit Indian merchants and bankers if the Government were to pursue the one policy,

and at another season the other. It may be remarked here, also, that the most direct form of laying down funds from India in London is by remittance of bills from India. That is the ordinary course that people in business pursue, and if the Indian Government did this there would be no Council Bills at all.

But there must be some shadow of delusion in the Council Bills that connects them in so many minds with the sale of silver. The fragment of seeming connection lies in the fact that when the Indian Secretary presses an abnormal amount of these bills on the London market, the rate of exchange falls, and it becomes less profitable to ship silver or cotton goods from England to India. This action of the Indian Secretary being an infallible indication that India must send more of its produce to England, exports from England to India are for the moment partially suspended. In this way the excessive sale of Council Bills has precisely the same effect as the excessive purchases of bills on London by the Indian Government would have; while it diminishes exports from England to India, it stimulates exports from India to England; but it is evident that when exports from India are stimulated, the better course for the Indian Government would be to remit bankers' bills to London, rather than sell Council Bills on the depressed London market. The question then resolves itself into this, that the Indian Secretary must have his annual amount of money increased by about 30,000,000 rupees, on account of the low rate of exchange, and for this purpose he must have more produce from India because he has the increased amount of rupees in the Indian Treasury awaiting his orders; but if he must immediately have more of India's produce than hitherto, there will be for a time less Indian produce available for export against imports, and, therefore, there will be for that time less export of cotton manufactures, silver, &c. from England. But to call the virtual purchase of produce in India for the Indian Secretary in London, "selling silver" is a strange misconception.

I may further remark that, as India must pay its liabilities in England as long as the country is not utterly bankrupt, and must yield up its produce for this purpose, so must the silver necessary to keep up the Indian coinage, or in other words, to keep up Indian prices, find its way into India from abroad. To that extent silver will in extremity take precedence of all other imports into India, though at present the cotton manufactures imported into India amount to about three times the amount of the imports of gold and silver together. Prices can only be sustained by the volume of money being maintained, and to maintain the volume of money India must import silver even although it should not import anything else. The export of

produce from India and the correlative sale of Council Bills may be increased so as temporarily to suspend imports of silver into India ; but the suspension of such imports can only be very brief, as silver will force its way into India to keep up the volume of the currency.

Mr. Lowe laid down another proposition of very doubtful validity—namely, that every Power in the world that employs gold instead of silver as its standard of value is a loser by that means. Exactly under what aspect he regards the question he does not explain, but it can only be true to a very limited extent. Taking the case of India, a single silver-tender country, we find that in the matter of the English payments it loses £3,000,000, per annum, and its merchants have sustained great losses by the gradual fall of gold prices in England that began in 1874. Taking the case of England, the great lending country, with enormous loans in every part of the world, returnable in gold, with a gigantic National Debt, the interest of which is payable in gold, with immense quantities of other securities at home payable in gold—to investors in such securities, to lenders of money generally, to banks, to all persons with fixed incomes, the rise in the purchasing power of gold is a decided gain. The National Debt at £775,000,000 was represented less than a year ago, and perhaps is still represented, by a volume of staple articles of consumption or other property that in 1873 or 1874 would have cost probably £890,000,000, so that here is an additional purchasing power of £115,000,000, distributed gratuitously among holders of Consols. These holders have not yet begun to make remissions of interest to the Government, as the landlords have been making remissions of rent to their tenants. The whole amount of the British Government's expenditure in the financial year 1878-79, £85,000,000, represented a purchasing power of at least £12,000,000 more than the same amount of money would have done in 1873-74, the last-year of Mr. Gladstone's administration, when the total expenditure was £77,000,000 ; so that as between 1873-74 and 1878-79, the burden of taxation in the United Kingdom had increased by a purchasing power of £20,750,000, while the increase in money was only £8,000,000. The Bank of England, with its £17,600,000 of Capital and Rest, had an increased purchasing power in 1879 of £2,640,000, as compared with that of the same amount of money in 1873. On the other hand, the whole trading and manufacturing classes are very much poorer, so that the appreciation in gold has been a gain to holders of securities payable in gold and to lenders generally, while it has been a loss to borrowers and to all persons in trade and manufactures, or in agriculture, or with precarious or unfixed incomes. The

United States, as an extensive borrower in gold values, has had an enormous burden added to its debts, for the benefit of lenders both at home and in Europe. The conclusion, therefore, is that the most powerful interests in England have gained very materially by the appreciation of gold, so that Mr. Lowe's proposition has no such universal application as he would claim for it.

Mr. Lowe was bold enough to offer a solution of the Indian exchange difficulty, though in doing so he said he took his life in his hand. He proposed to introduce into India a paper currency on a gold basis by issuing notes redeemable in gold bars rather than in gold coin, so that the bars would not pass freely into circulation as coin might do, and by making silver subsidiary and only legal tender to a limited amount. The first objection to this proposal is that there is no experience to guide us in estimating the amount of gold that might be required for the redemption of the notes that would be presented; and in a country that in the twenty years ending March 31, 1875, absorbed net imports of gold to the extent of £4,389,000 per annum, there would be a constant demand for the gold bars for other uses than those of money. The second objection is that gold being already appreciated, every ounce that might be locked up in the Indian Treasury for redemption of notes would have to be taken from the existing stock and current supplies of gold, and would therefore raise the purchasing power of gold still further, aggravate all existing evils from that cause, and probably precipitate further financial convulsions. It would be equivalent to a still larger falling off in the supply of gold from the mines, the production of which is diminishing. Mr. Lowe objects\* to any argument based on the tendency of his proposal to raise the purchasing power of gold and to depreciate that of silver; but to that I reply that he cannot expect that those who discuss his views will agree to leave out of sight the fatal objections that tell against his proposal.

His scheme would require that a weight of gold should be fixed on, of which the paper rupee would be representative. Would this weight of gold be calculated at 1s. 7½*d.* or 1s. 10½*d.* the rupee, the present or the former value respectively? In the case of 1s. 7½*d.*, the present volume of money would remain unchanged, a certain amount of paper money taking the place of a similar amount of silver, and the Government would sell the silver to pay for the gold bars. If at 1s. 10½*d.* the rupee, the volume of Indian money would have to be contracted by the

---

\* "I object, in the first place, to any argument drawn from the opinion that what we are doing may have some tendency either to raise the price of gold, which is already too high, or to reduce the price of silver, which is already too low."—Mr. Lowe in *The Fortnightly Review* for July, 1879, p. 30.

withdrawal of a much larger amount of silver rupees than the amount of paper put in circulation. If the gold rupee were fixed at 2s., the contraction of the circulating medium would have to take place to a greater extent still. As a result of this policy there would be an enormous amount of silver to be sold, which could not fail to cause terrible embarrassment and ruin in various parts of the world. It is probable there would be more than £150,000,000 at present value of silver to be sold. Now for this additional appreciation of gold and financial convulsion in single gold-tender countries, and this overwhelming deluge of silver in single silver-tender countries, what compensation does Mr. Lowe offer that cannot be otherwise obtained? None whatever. All these destructive results are totally unnecessary, as a gold standard in India can be arrived at very much better without importing an ounce of gold, without making gold legal tender, without appreciating gold, or, except to a limited extent, depreciating silver. I shall at a later stage of my criticism return to the discussion of a gold standard for India absolutely, without the use of gold.

I come now to deal with Colonel Smith's scheme for establishing in India a gold currency, or a gold standard at 2s. the rupee, without a gold currency, and for bringing the rate of exchange of the rupee from its present point, 1s. 7½d. or 1s. 8d. up to 2s., the tenth part of a sovereign, as it is explained and defended at considerable length in a series of twelve essays printed at various times for private circulation, though they have been freely criticized by the press. His proposal has been commended by Mr. Lowe\* and Colonel George Chesney† as offering such a complete and satisfactory solution of the exchange difficulty, as the British Government are highly culpable in not adopting. After a very careful perusal, however, of Colonel Smith's essays, and the articles of Mr. Lowe and Colonel Chesney, I cannot find any warrant for their expectations. I am entirely opposed to the introduction of a gold currency, for reasons already given. The fundamental basis of Colonel Smith's scheme, which he repeats in various forms, is contained in the following sentences:—

“The important peculiarity is that the rupees are now circulating at a local value superior to their metallic worth; and if care be taken to prevent their being unduly increased, they may be fixed at that value, and being concurrent with gold pieces of metallic as well as

---

\* Article, “A Simple Way out of the Indian Difficulty,” in *The Fortnightly Review* for July, 1879.

† Article, “The Depreciation of Silver and the Indian Finances,” in *The Nineteenth Century* for January, 1879.



local worth, they will be clearly understood to be what they now are—namely, ‘tokens.’”\*

“ . . . . . The metallic worth of the rupee has fallen fully 16 per cent.; and, consequently, as they are now exchanging for goods at their old rates, they do so above their present metallic worth. In other words, they are ‘tokens.’”†

Mr. Lowe contended for this view in the Indian debate, and in the *Fortnightly Review* he emphasizes it, asserting that, “owing to a very peculiar state of circumstances, we have a token currency in India already.”‡ For Colonel Smith’s scheme to have any validity it is necessary that the Indian rupee should be a token circulating at 16 per cent. more than its intrinsic value. Now the most cursory examination of the facts will show that rupees are not tokens in the sense intended by these writers—namely, that they are intrinsically worth 1s. 7½d. or 1s. 8d. as bullion, but are circulating in India with a purchasing power of 2s., their former value, as Colonel Smith assumes, before the Indian exchanges underwent any serious fall. The only sense in which they can be regarded as tokens is, that as the Indian Government charge 2 per cent. for coining, the rupees thus turned out at the mints circulate with a purchasing power of 2 per cent. greater than the silver bullion they contain. They are therefore tokens in so far that a holder of rupees cannot melt them down and have as great purchasing power in the bullion so obtained as he had in the coins. But Colonel Smith contends that they are tokens, because while their purchasing power has not diminished in India, their intrinsic metallic value has declined 16 per cent. If I add that the value of rupees as estimated in gold has declined, the case will become clearer. As to all articles of commerce generally, the rupee maintains its former purchasing power; as to gold, the rupee has depreciated 16 per cent. in purchasing power. There has been no material change, as is universally admitted, in the relative exchangeability of silver and all articles of merchandise, gold only excepted. So far as the people of India are concerned, all they know is that no change has taken place as between their money and their property and articles of trade. Except that they have to give 16 per cent. more for gold than they formerly did, their internal monetary affairs are entirely unaffected; but when they come to pay pounds sterling to England, they find that they must give 16 per cent. more silver, and at least 16 per cent. more of their products.

Mr. Lowe says, “that while so fearfully depreciated as an

\* Essay 6, p. 16.

† Essay 11, p. 26.

‡ *The Fortnightly Review* for July, 1879, p. 31.

article of export, the rupee is not depreciated at all as an instrument of internal commerce."\* Now this statement is contrary to all reason. The rupee is in reality circulating at its exact coin value, that is, at the value of the silver bullion *plus* two per cent. for coining. Can it be for a moment maintained that, with mints in India open to all silver, silver is lying in London worth one shilling and eight pence the rupee, and by sending it to one of the Indian mints and having it coined, these coins would purchase goods to the value of two shillings the rupee? Certainly not. Colonel Smith adduces the case of the French five-franc piece, to show that a similar state of things exists in France to what he assumes exists in India. The five-franc piece circulates in France at from 14 to 16 per cent. above its metallic value; and, when it finds its way to London, this artificial value is but slightly impaired. The cause of this is very evident. The French mint is closed to silver, and the five-franc pieces being no longer coined at the option of the holders of silver, have become tokens circulating on a par with gold at from 14 to 16 per cent. more than their intrinsic metallic value. They are in precisely the same category as our shillings and florins, with the difference that they form a much larger proportion of the French currency than silver does with us, and that they are unlimited legal tender, whereas our silver is only legal tender to the extent of forty shillings. It is true also that they are taken in London at very nearly their token value, for the very cogent reason that, on being returned to France at very slight expense, they are valuable as gold.

But the Indian rupees exist under totally different circumstances. In France the mint is closed against silver, and silver coins having become scarce as compared with what they would be if the French mint were open to silver as formerly, they have acquired a monopoly value. In India, on the other hand, the mint has never been closed against silver; and all the surplus silver of the world may be sent thither for coinage, if the holders so will it. The French five-franc pieces do circulate at about 14 to 16 per cent. above their metallic value, because, being no longer coined, they have become scarce. If the French mint were re-opened to silver to-morrow, in the very brief space of time necessary to coin the silver that would be offered, five-franc pieces would be circulating exactly at their intrinsic metallic value. In India, with its open mints, there can be no such thing possible as a monopoly value of coins, because any one can purchase silver and have it coined. And if we compare the purchasing power of rupees in India in regard to cotton, tea, or

---

\* *The Fortnightly Review* for July, 1879, p. 31.

indigo, and compare bar silver in London with cotton, tea, or indigo in London or Liverpool, rupees have the same relative purchasing power in India and in England, allowance being made for the transmission of silver to India and mintage there, and for the transportation of cotton, tea, or indigo and the charges and profits thereon.

To assert that silver, by its mere transmission to India, undergoes some mysterious transmutation in value which largely increases its purchasing power, and that it is relatively much more valuable in Calcutta than in London, is to assert an economic heresy. Is it within the bounds of possibility that silver can be purchased in London, transmitted to India, coined there, the coins invested in cotton or tea, and the shipment brought to England, with any result much more profitable than if a letter of credit had been transmitted to India to draw on London for the gold value of the cotton or tea? Surely in these days any such profit would not remain unappropriated for twenty-four hours. What could be more completely conclusive that silver in London has the same relative purchasing power as silver in Calcutta, than the fact that the gold price in London of a rupee to be paid in Calcutta is practically the same as the gold price in Calcutta of a rupee to be paid in London; while the purchasing power of silver in Calcutta corresponds closely to the price of the ounce of standard silver in London.

Now Colonel Smith's whole argument assumes that gold has remained stationary in purchasing power; and therefore he argues that, as prices have not risen in India, the rupee is circulating there at its former value, which he takes to be 2*s.* The rupee is circulating in India at its former value for everything in a general way except gold; and in his proposal to raise the rupee worth 1*s.* 8*d.* in gold to 2*s.* in gold, he loses sight of the very important fact that 2*s.* in gold will purchase 16 per cent. more of silver or of commodities which have, as is on every hand conceded, remained unchanged in value, than the same 2*s.* in gold would have done before 1874. He proposes to raise the rupee from 1*s.* 8*d.* to 2*s.*, an advance of 20 per cent., without changing prices and without making any monopoly or scarcity of rupees. Now, in my opinion, both of these expectations are delusive. I contend, and in support of my view appeal to the premium on gold in India, that 1*s.* 8*d.*, the present gold value of the rupee, will purchase as much silver and all other commodities in India as 2*s.*, the former value of the rupee,\* before the exchanges began to fall, would have done

\* I should be inclined to estimate the former value of the rupee at from 1*s.* 10½*d.* to 1*s.* 11*d.* rather than at 2*s.* Colonel Smith shows that 2*s.* has in all probability been the average of a very long period of years, but increased

previously to 1874. To raise the rate of exchange of the rupee from 1s. 8d. to 2s., an increase of 20 per cent., would be to depreciate all prices in India  $16\frac{2}{3}$  per cent., because it would take 20 per cent. more silver or commodities to command a rupee worth 2s., than to command the present rupee of 1s. 8d. Maintaining, therefore, that under an open mint rupees cannot possibly be tokens except as regard the 2 per cent. for coinage, I maintain it is impossible to make the rupee worth 2s. which is now only worth 1s. 8d., without depreciating to the extent of  $16\frac{2}{3}$  per cent. the values of silver and of commodities as stated in gold rupees of 2s. each.

Then Colonel Smith intends that the gold price of the rupee shall be raised from 1s. 8d. to 2s., without making any monopoly value for the rupee or producing any scarcity of coins. This, again, is in my opinion an utter impossibility. He lays down his views as to how the rupee is to be raised, in the following terms:—

“The following is the *modus operandi* of my proposal. When the coinage of silver is suspended, the rate of exchange must rise, because the remittances to be made to India have always been greatly in excess of the Council drafts; and if the suspension were to take place now, and only a few Council Bills sold, they would quickly rise to two shillings the rupee, or more if desired, as silver, even if cheap, would be useless. When the rate has risen by competition in the ordinary way, to two shillings the rupee,” &c.

“By a proper allotment of the quantity of Bills drawn upon the Indian Treasury, after the coinage of silver was suspended, the rise in the rate of exchange would be far more gradual,” &c.\*

If this plan is to be carried out without limiting the number of rupees in circulation, what necessity can there be to suspend the coinage of silver? The fact is, that the rate of exchange cannot be raised from 1s. 8d. to 2s., the supply of silver remaining constant, without reducing the number of rupees in circulation—that is, without reducing the volume of the currency. If the money in circulation in India amounts to £180,000,000, with the rate of exchange at 1s. 8d., the volume of money must be reduced to £150,000,000, before the rate of exchange can rise to 2s. Colonel Smith quotes † Mr. Ernest Seyd, as saying that “if the Indian Government decreed the cessation of the coinage of silver, the rupee, instead of rising to 2s., would not even maintain its present value.” He asserts also that it would be a

communication had lowered the rate of exchange before it began to fall in 1874, and 1s. 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. or 1s. 11d., seems to me more nearly what I may call the modern rate. I retain Colonel Smith's rate of 2s., however, in dealing with his views.

\* Essay 6, p. 45.

† Essay 10, pp. 2, 3, and 4.

monstrosity to assume that the £180,000,000 of legal tender silver in India could become tokens. He also ridicules the idea that "a gold currency is not essential to a gold standard."

In all these three propositions Mr. Seyd is, I believe, entirely mistaken. If there is any proposition regarding money that may be looked on as more completely established than another, it is that the value of money for any given amount of business depends upon its quantity. If a certain amount of money performs a certain amount of business at certain prices, it is evident that half the amount of money could only perform the same amount of business if the new prices were half of the former ones. If the Indian Government were to suspend the coinage of silver, the volume of money in circulation would be gradually reduced by the wear, tear, loss, and absorption of the coins. The diminished volume of money would have to effect the same uses as the larger amount had formerly done; and, consequently, it could only be at reduced prices, which is the same as saying at an increased purchasing power for each of the diminished number of rupees. This process of suspending the coinage would have to be continued for six years before the £180,000,000 would be reduced to £150,000,000, that is at £5,000,000 per annum, and when the volume of the currency had fallen to £150,000,000 the rupee would have increased in value so as to be worth 2s. in gold. The suspension might be continued, so long as gold was not legal tender, until the silver rupee worth intrinsically 1s. 8d. was raised to 5s. or 10s. in gold, or to any higher figure. And this would undoubtedly be a system of token money pure and simple, perfectly practicable, without any of the lineaments of monstrosity about it. I might ask, Was the money system of the United States, with about \$345,000,000 of greenbacks and about \$320,000,000 of National Bank notes, anything of a monstrosity? Yet the notes were worth perhaps a halfpenny each, but circulated at their printed value of from one dollar to ten thousand dollars. They were token money of the most advanced type, because they were intrinsically almost worthless, though one of them could be exchanged for ten thousand dollars.

As to a gold currency not being essential to a gold standard, Colonel Smith is in the right. If the rupee were declared by law to be worth 2s. in gold, or rather to be ultimately worth that amount when the means to raise it had been made effectual, it is evident that if the exchange could be kept at or near the fixed rate of 2s., the Indian currency would be on a gold standard without any gold coin. But what Colonel Smith misconceives is the manner in which he could raise the exchange from 1s. 8d. to 2s. He assumes that the rate of exchange could be raised by the Secretary of State for India diminishing the amount of Council

**Bills.** Yet while assuming that the Secretary of State can dictate by his policy the rate of exchange, Colonel Smith provides that the coinage of rupees for the public must be suspended ; although he says that he does not intend to raise the exchange by making rupees scarce, nor to diminish the consumption of silver by India. Now in my opinion the Secretary of State for India has no such power of raising the rate of exchange. Colonel Smith advances theories about the balance of trade, and how silver goes to make up such balance, and remittances in excess of Council Bills are made by shipments of silver bullion. Colonel Chesney also dwells with great emphasis on the distinguishing characteristics of the balance of trade.

But this balance of trade is an utter fallacy assumed to account for the fact that there are considerable shipments of silver to India. Indeed, as I have already shown, if there is anything that can be called a balance of trade at all, it is the £17,000,000 of exports that India must send to England without receiving any imports in return. And if the balance is thus undoubtedly against India, how can there possibly be another balance of trade in favour of India, that is made up for by shipments of silver? It would be just as correct to say that remittances in excess of Council Bills were made in cotton goods, as to say they were made in silver. With open mints in India, silver is imported because it is needed to keep up the volume of the currency and to supply other forms of consumption ; with open ports in India cotton goods enter these because there is a demand for such goods. There is no balance of trade with which the one is concerned more than the other.

Colonel Smith looks to the Secretary for India to raise the rate of exchange, whereas that functionary can have only the slightest momentary effect on it. The gold value of the rupee is dependent solely on the quantity of rupees in circulation, and no power on earth can raise it from 1s. 8d. to 2s., except on the single condition of reducing the number, so long, that is, as the business to be done remains practically unchanged. Colonel Smith's expedient for raising the rate would succeed ; not because the Secretary of State has any power, for he has really none ; but solely because the suspension of the coinage would diminish the number of rupees in circulation. The import of silver would, contrary to his view, be very much reduced ; indeed, if the change from 1s. 8d. to 2s. were to be effected in less than six years, silver would be exported from India, and the decreased volume of money would necessarily, all other conditions remaining constant, give the rupee a correspondingly enlarged purchasing power. A sudden large sale of Council Bills might temporarily force the rate down, just as a similar sale of bills on

New York would force the American rate of exchange down ; but that could not last, as the Indian trade would soon accommodate itself by increased exports from India, or diminished imports into India. The question whether the average rate of the rupee shall be 1*s.* 8*d.* or 2*s.* is simply and solely the question, gold remaining stationary, whether the volume of money in circulation in India shall remain as at present, making 1*s.* 8*d.*, or whether it will be by suspension of coinage reduced by 16 $\frac{2}{3}$  per cent., thus raising the rate to 2*s.* Bankers and merchants have just as much permanent influence on the rate of exchange as the Indian Secretary ; but as in all exchanges where the trade between two countries is on a large scale, there is on each side a rate at which it will pay to export bullion, and a rate at which it will pay to import bullion ; so in India there must be similar bullion points in the exchanges, although the seigniorage of 2 per cent. prevents the export of coin, except for re-import, as rupees are worth less as bullion than as coin. If there were a seigniorage of 2 per cent. on the coinage of sovereigns, the latter could only be exported with a view to re-import, as it could not pay to melt them.

It is evident, therefore, that the Indian Secretary has no special permanent power over the Indian exchanges ; and to suppose that by diminishing the quantity of Council Bills, which I have shown might be dispensed with altogether, and Indian Bank Bills sent to London instead, he could make the rupee now worth 1*s.* 8*d.* rise in value to 2*s.*—that is, 20 per cent.—is to give extraordinary rein to the imagination. The Indian Secretary might withhold his usual supply of Council Bills on which the dealers in such bills depend to carry on their business, and these purchasers might in their disappointment offer a rather higher rate, so as to secure suitable bills ; but we cannot confound such a temporary movement with a permanent advance of 20 per cent. One might as well expect that a strong combination of London bankers could so act as to permanently raise the American or French exchanges by 20 per cent. To state such a proposal is to condemn it.

Notwithstanding Colonel Smith's denunciation of "the lamentable unfitness of silver to be a standard of value," and Mr. Lowe's assertion, "how utterly unfit the rupee is for the duties of a standard," the people of India have found, as these writers fully admit, that there has been no depreciation of silver in India, and, consequently, no material change of prices ; whereas Indian commodities, as estimated in gold, have fallen 16 per cent. How Colonel Smith and Mr. Lowe can speak of silver as utterly unfit to be a standard, in the face of the undisputed fact, admitted by themselves, that silver has shown itself

to be an admirable standard in the case of India, where it has stood alone, passes all understanding. Their cardinal error lies in assuming that silver has depreciated, when, as against all articles except gold, it has been stationary, as they unhesitatingly confess, and in leaving out of sight that gold has seriously appreciated; thus they unaccountably and unreasonably accept gold, which has undergone great fluctuations, as suitable for a standard, and reject silver, which has undergone no fluctuations, as unfit for a standard. There can be no possible doubt, therefore, that during the last six years silver has been much more approximately a standard of value than has been the case with gold.

Colonel Smith offers the following definition of a standard of value :—

“Without pretending to exact logical precision, this [a standard] may be explained to be a clearly defined, and, as far as practicable, fixed and unalterable gauge, employed in regulating other measures in common use. What is a standard of value? This is the value of a precisely defined quantity of a certain commodity, used to regulate the value of a currency, which latter measures the values of other commodities.”\*

A standard of value is not the value of a precisely defined quantity of a certain commodity, used to regulate the value of a currency. Colonel Smith would call a sovereign a standard of value, whereas it is only a standard of weight and fineness; and he would say that the sovereign regulates the value of the British currency, whereas the total volume of the currency regulates the value of the sovereign. The sovereign has no analogy to the yard-stick or gallon measure. These will measure cloth and liquids for unending centuries, and practically there will never be any variation in them. They are standards of measure. But the sovereign is doomed to quite another fate. It scarcely measures the same amount of the same article for two days together. There can be no actual standard of value; but the nearest approximation to a standard is, where the total volume of money in a country varies in quantity as the uses for it increase or diminish. The standard of value in India is the total amount of money in circulation; and if that standard be reduced in quantity, without any diminution of its uses, it is perfectly evident that the purchasing power of the smaller number of coins composing that standard will be increased, and the coins may easily be reduced in number, so that the rupee which now purchases 1s. 8d. of gold will purchase 2s. of



gold. But it will be a change produced by law, and its direct effect will be to raise the value of all the debts and credits of the people of India, that run over a period of a few years, to the extent of 20 per cent. If there are 10,000,000,000 rupees of such debts in India, then the debtors who owe that amount at 1s. 8d. of gold to the rupee, will have ultimately to pay the same amount of rupees at 2s. of gold to the rupee, and will therefore have to give of property or produce of the present value 2,000,000,000 rupees more than their creditors have any possible claim to. Yet Mr. Lowe and Colonel Smith, and Colonel Chesney, write as if it were the easiest thing in the world to raise the rupee from 1s. 8d. to 2s., without any disturbance of values, or any injustice as between debtors and creditors.

Colonel Chesney takes his opponents to task in rather contemptuous terms in the following passage :—

“ After dealing with the real arguments brought to bear on the subject, it is, perhaps, hardly necessary to say much in reply to the nonsense which has been written about it, but as a specimen of the sort of stuff which sometimes does duty for argument, I may just refer to the articles of *The Times* upon this point. It is only charitable to suppose that the gentleman who writes these is often in too great a hurry to write sense, but one article in particular may be quoted in which the writer, after demolishing Colonel Smith's scheme very much to his own satisfaction, and advocating the policy of letting things be, winds up by saying that all the Indian Government has to do under the circumstances is to find the three or four millions a year required to meet the loss on exchange by extra taxation, or, to use his own words, ‘ the single difficulty will be the discovery of the means for redressing the balance of the State income and expenditure.’ The single difficulty ! Why, let any one consider the present condition of Indian taxation, and see the shifts the Finance Minister is put to in order to raise even half that sum,” &c.\*

In the above passage Colonel Chesney is, in my opinion, entirely wrong, and the writer in *The Times* entirely right, so far as Colonel Smith's scheme is concerned. Colonel Chesney does not see that £17,000,000 per annum must be sent to London from India, whether the rupee be worth 1s. 8d. or 2s. If the rupee be at 1s. 8d., then about 30,000,000 rupees must be raised by India to compensate for the loss in exchange ; if the rupee be at 2s., then 30,000,000 rupees less will suffice to meet the £17,000,000, but each rupee at 2s. will in India and in England have a purchasing power of 20 per cent. more than the present rupee at 1s. 8d. If the change from 1s. 8d. to 2s.

---

\* *The Nineteenth Century* for January, 1879, p. 108.

were to take place to-morrow, India would still have to send exactly the same quantity of produce to defray the charge of £17,000,000; there would be no diminution in the burden. The ryot would have to pay 20 per cent. more of his produce than formerly by way of land-tax, because the number of rupees would be the same, but the purchasing power of each would be 20 per cent. greater. Whereas, in the view of the writer in *The Times* it is infinitely better to leave Indian internal affairs undisturbed and unchanged as they have been, and raise the extra three millions sterling by new taxation. That is the simplest and most intelligible method of paying it under present circumstances; and Colonel Smith's scheme could only introduce injustice, confusion, and ruin without alleviating the burden one iota.

In one passage, however, that I cannot forbear quoting, Colonel Smith shows clearly the difficulty in which he has placed himself. He says:—

“Indeed, not until time sufficient elapsed to allow the absorption of the flood excess; and as this absorption would go on at the rate of five millions sterling per annum, and as it would have required a surcharge of about twenty and a-half millions (over and above the five millions per annum absorbed) to dilute the currency down to 1s. 9d., it would take some four or five years to effect the recovery; besides involving a double disturbance of prices throughout India.”\*

This passage completely embodies the view for which I have been contending, that number is the controlling element in money. He states that to dilute the currency down to a rate of exchange of 1s. 9d., about twenty and a-half millions sterling of silver over and above the annual supply of five millions must have been added to it. But here he confuses two things. He never once hints at the possibility that gold may have increased in purchasing power, that 1s. 9d., or more recently 1s. 8d., of gold may purchase as much as 2s. of gold did seven or more years ago. He can only see that the rate of exchange of the rupee has fallen from 2s. to 1s. 9d. and 1s. 8d. in gold, and he at once attributes the fall to the depreciation of the rupee. Yet, on the other hand, he unhesitatingly asserts that silver prices have not risen in India, that, in fact, the rupee has not depreciated in purchasing power.

The rupee would have declined in purchasing power if 20½ millions sterling of silver had been added to the Indian currency, in addition to the ordinary annual supply of five millions. I do not dispute the principle—indeed, I unreservedly accept it—that the purchasing power of the rupee might have been reduced

---

\* Essay 7, p. 24.

from 2s. to 1s. 9d., without any change in the purchasing power of gold, if 20½ millions sterling of silver had been added to the currency in addition to the annual supply. I go one step further and say that the rate of exchange, gold continuing of the same purchasing power, could not have fallen to 1s. 9d. without this extraordinary contribution of 20½ millions of silver. But, unfortunately for Colonel Smith's views, there has been no such additional contribution to the Indian currency as 20½ millions sterling. The gross imports of silver into India in the five years 1868-72 amounted to £35,905,019, while those for the five years 1873-77 only reached £25,586,503, showing a falling-off in the later five years of £10,318,519. Yet the five years 1873-77 were those during which the fall in the Indian exchanges was taking place, and during which it is negligently assumed that excessive quantities of silver were being poured into India. Colonel Smith assumes, notwithstanding these figures, that not only the usual supply was imported, but 20½ millions more, and that the weight of the 20½ millions brought down the exchange to 1s. 9d. These 20½ millions of silver would have had that effect or something approximating to it; but they not only did not enter India, but there was a deficiency of more than 10 millions sterling as compared with the five years 1868-72. The reason why silver prices have not risen in India is because the standard of value—that is, the total amount of money in circulation—has not been increased, as the above figures show. The fall in the exchange to 1s. 8d. is, therefore, not due in any degree to a fall in the purchasing power of silver as regards commodities, but solely to a rise in the purchasing power of gold, making 1s. 8d. in gold at present of as great purchasing power as the rupee formerly was at 1s. 11d. or 2s.

My conclusion, therefore, is that Colonel Smith is mistaken in supposing that the rupee circulates in India at 16 per cent. above its metallic value, as in that case there would be a profit of 13½ per cent. in shipping silver from London to Calcutta; that silver has not depreciated in general purchasing power except as regards gold; that the increased purchasing power of gold is the source of the evils for which a remedy is sought; that the raising of the rate of exchange from 1s. 8d. to 2s. can be accomplished only by limitation of the quantity of rupees in circulation, and would give the limited rupee an increased purchasing power of 20 per cent. to the injury of debtors and the benefit of creditors, without lightening in the slightest degree the burden of the £17,000,000 which must be sent annually to London.

If, however, it be determined to introduce a gold standard into India, although I do not recommend it, I would suggest a scheme in strict conformity with Mr. Lowe's principles, which

are, that the currency should be legal tender, and that it should be based upon gold. Political economy teaches that if the silver rupee is worth at present, 1s. 8d., it can be raised to 1s. 10½d., or any other higher price by limiting the quantity in circulation. This limitation might be brought about by suspending the coinage of silver, or by withdrawing coins from circulation, or by both these methods. If the limitation proceeded so far as to bring the rupee up to 1s. 10½d., it would circulate as a coin at 1s. 10½d., though intrinsically worth only 1s. 8d. This would bring the rupee up to nearly what its value in gold would be on the former French basis for coinage of one pound of gold to fifteen and a half pounds of silver; and it would, therefore, be an arrangement which would admit of unlimited coinage of silver in India in the future, if France resumed the free coinage of silver on the former ratio with gold, a contingency that may not be very remote, if we consider M. Léon Say's views as contained in the *Procès Verbaux* of the International Monetary Conference at Paris in 1878. This plan would neither appreciate gold, nor need gold bars, and yet it would give precisely the same amount of money in circulation in India as under Mr. Lowe's gold rupee if it were at 1s. 10½d. in gold, if he could establish his system without the gold bars, and without further appreciation of gold. While he would be regulating the issues of his paper money to suit the demand for his gold bars, under my proposal all that would have to be done would be to watch the rate of exchange in India, when it tended to rise above 1s. 10½d., the fixed gold price of the silver rupee, more rupees would have to be put into circulation; when the rate tended to fall below 1s. 10½d., silver rupees would have to be withdrawn from circulation; and thus the Indian exchange would oscillate with moderate variation around the fixed gold price of 1s. 10½d., or whatever rate might more closely conform to the former gold price of the rupee.

As the Bank of England raises and lowers its rate of discount in accordance with its reserve of gold, so the Indian Government would issue or withdraw silver rupees or notes to protect its gold rupee rate of exchange of 1s. 10½d. In India the change would be a perfectly silent one, though the rupee would be increased in purchasing power by 12½ per cent.; the mints would be closed to all private holders of silver, the Government purchasing for the necessary additions to the coinage, and the variations in the rate of exchange would be less than they were previously to 1874. The Indian Government might object to this, as they did to the proposal of the Bengal Chamber of Commerce, that the coinage of silver should be temporarily suspended, on the ground that it would give "a monopoly value to the existing stock of rupees," and that "no civilized Government can under-

[Vol. CXIV. No. CCXXVI.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LVIII. No. II. K K

take to determine from time to time by how much the legal-tender currency should be increased or decreased."\* To this I reply, that silver coins would be appreciated, and there certainly would be a monopoly value for them ; but it would be a strictly regulated monopoly, because the quantity of coins would correspond exactly to gold ; and, therefore, the Indian currency would act precisely in accordance with the gold currencies of the world, which are based upon free mintage and unlimited legal tender. Then the increase or diminution of the legal-tender currency would not be within the discretion of the Government ; it would be fixed by statute ; and although Mr. Goschen demurs to placing the power of limiting the currency in the hands of Lord Lytton or Sir John Strachey, he does not imply that the Indian silver rupee, being declared to be of a certain gold value by statute, he would not entrust those officials with the control of the machinery by which the statute could be carried out.

The Indian currency, thus reduced and regulated, would add India to the single gold-tender countries without the need for an ounce of gold, and, indeed, in face of the imperative provision that gold should not be legal tender. The Indian silver coinage would then, like the British, French, and American silver coinage, be an overvalued and regulated coinage ; but it would resemble the French five-franc piece and the American standard silver dollar, in so far that it would be unlimited legal tender. The extreme importance of limiting the extension of the area of the single gold tender, makes it imperative that gold should not be made legal tender in India. It is very disappointing to see Mr. Goschen congratulating the Government on having had the courage to resist all proposals for solving this monetary difficulty ; and it is a rather gloomy outlook for monetary progress, when a financier of such eminence deliberately declares his preference for the vagaries of the precious metals rather than for the vagaries of legislatures ; his preference, in so many words, for blind chance, rather than for his own knowledge and powers of reasoning, and those of all the financiers and economists of the past and present. In taking this position, Mr. Goschen abdicates his claim as an authority on monetary laws and principles, admitting that, as to systems of money, his intellect can offer no suggestion.

It is somewhat singular that no one should have called attention to the fact that the Indian Government themselves add about £5,000,000 to the Indian currency in the form of notes payable in coin on demand, but against which no coin is held in the Treasury. This causes a continuous depreciation in the rate

---

\* Blue-book, "East India (Silver)," 1877, pp. 17-20.

of exchange, because it adds so much to the volume of the currency, and thus depreciates the value of the rupee. It is so much money in circulation, whether it is convertible or not; and it is perfectly evident that, if the Government were to issue notes only against coin, about £5,000,000 of coin would have to be withdrawn from circulation, and placed in reserve in the Issue Department of the Treasury. It does not follow that, because the people of India may be willing to hold notes, the Government are justified in inflating the currency by issuing notes without any reserve in coin. In England, where the contraction of the currency is undoubted, the addition of further notes without specie reserve would be a measure of justice. No better field could be found for Mr. Lowe's scheme than in England at the present time. What is needed now is what was needed when Ricardo put forth his proposals—namely, to counteract the contraction of the currency;—and, to issue notes redeemable in gold bars, would doubtless increase the volume of money. Mr. Lowe's proposal is therefore perfectly applicable in England, and the sole effect would be to lower the purchasing power of gold, and thus tend to restore the former order of things. To Mr. Balfour's remark that a currency, artificially managed, is subject to violent fluctuations, I would ask what currency in the world, except, perhaps, that of China, is not artificially managed? Our own is carefully prescribed by statute; gold, and not silver, is unlimited legal tender; silver is legal tender for forty shillings; all the note issues are carefully fixed and limited, so that, practically, the utmost sovereign is there by law.

Gold and silver having been the material of money from the remotest ages, there is a joint responsibility among the civilized nations of the world not to act in the matter of these metals so as to ruin one another, and, more particularly, not to ruin those peoples inferior in civilization, whose money systems are entirely of silver. If Mr. Lowe were to demonetize silver in India, £150,000,000 or more of it would have to flow over into China, the Straits Settlements, the Philippines, Java, Mexico, South America, Western Asia, and the more backward regions of Europe. There would be no double-tender France or single silver-tender India to stand in the breach, and save those more backward peoples from such monetary confusion and ruin as would appal the world. It is fortunate that Mr. Goschen has thrown his influence in the scale to dispel the English superstition that the single gold tender is capable of universal application without incalculable injustice; as that is a great point gained in dispelling fast-rooted prejudices, and in stirring the English mind to the consideration of their whole monetary

relations. His contention that the business of the world must be transacted on the basis of the aggregate of the gold and silver money in existence is undoubtedly sound and indisputable ; but under what special conditions the future alone can disclose. The revival of the bi-metallic system of France, in co-operation with other nations, would be by far the most complete solution of the present monetary difficulties, and India would then take care of itself, without any gold currency, or any new regulation of its currency. All the leading authorities in England are unfortunately bitterly hostile to bi-metallism ; but I do not hesitate to say that the subject, judging from the utterances of English public men, is very imperfectly understood, and I propose on a future occasion to try to show that bi-metallism is the only solution of the Indian financial difficulty as deduced from the principles of money, and the most defensible system of money in the present condition of the world that human ingenuity has yet offered.

J. BARR ROBERTSON.

## INDIA AND OUR COLONIAL EMPIRE.

---

**A**FGHANISTAN.—While Abdurrahman was still a Russian pensioner in Turkestan, he had of course many interviews with Europeans, and as some of these had published accounts of what he said, our political officers at Cabul had means of knowing what he wished to be regarded as his sentiments. They knew that over and over he had expressed the most bitter hostility to the English, who had helped Shere Ali against his father, and had thus driven him into exile: and that he had expressed a belief that the Afghans would always be ready—with or without special inducement—to unite with any power in an attack on India. When we wrote in June last we noted the indications that he looked for counsel and help to Tashkent; that he seemed disposed to claim far more than we were willing to concede, and to keep up at least an appearance of friendliness to and claim for help from the factions that were most hostile to us. We have now official authority for saying that he did in fact show great hesitation and distrust, and that to conciliate the Afghans he had to practise the usual Afghan dissimulation. And we have further sufficient evidence that, if finally he frankly accepted our terms, the acceptance was, if not due to a sense of absolute weakness, at least concurrent with a conviction that he had as yet no party among the Afghans. He had indeed on his side the troops who had first declared for him in Turkestan. But these did not number more than 2000 at most, and it would perhaps be more correct to say that they controlled him than that they supported him. His want of means compelled him to have recourse to exactions which made him unpopular with the trading classes, and as he approached the Hindu Kush he found the people generally unfriendly. But beyond the mountains in Kohistan—the great recruiting ground of Afghanistan—the majority of the fierce tribesmen were enthusiastically devoted to his cause. Could he but get there, he could at least discover what hope he had of forming a party. During his fifteen years of exile he had lost much of his influence with factions elsewhere, and had indeed lost touch of the feeling of the country. At last, then, he agreed to the understanding



we proposed. It was in truth simple enough, and if it did not give much that we were not anxious to be rid of, it also asked him to promise little and give even less. For by this time Lord Ripon (to whom practically the Home Government had delegated all its authority), acting no doubt on the weight of official opinion at Simla and Cabul, had decided that out of Cabul we must get, Amir or no Amir, settlement or no settlement. Delay seemed to be likely to lead only to subsidiary complications, and in no way to advance the chance of a permanent settlement. And meanwhile the financial drain was alarming—the discovery of the blunder in the estimates having made official personages peculiarly sensitive on this score. The great thing, therefore, seemed to be to find some means of getting out of Cabul with tolerable credit and safety. Abdurrahman was not all that one could wish, but his sense of self-interest would induce him perhaps to be faithful for a few weeks at least, and it seemed possible that the advantages and countenance we could give him would make him strong enough to facilitate our departure. He had indeed an obvious motive for allowing us to depart in peace. But it is now known that had Abdurrahman proved impracticable, our troops would still have evacuated Cabul on the day on which ultimately they did leave, and that, if necessary, they would have fought their way back to India. However, Abdurrahman proved reasonable. On the 22nd of July a durbar was held at Cabul. It does not seem to have been attended by the leaders of the great factions of Northern Afghanistan; but the ordinary residents of Cabul—especially those of non-Afghan race, such as the Kizilbashis—were well represented; and the few Sirdars who had found it their interest to throw in their lot with us were present. At this assembly our political officer announced that the British Government recognised Abdurrahman as Amir of Northern Afghanistan, and with reference to the approaching withdrawal of the British troops, a hope was expressed that the Afghans would not retain an unfriendly recollection of our presence there. The object of the durbar had been known beforehand, and the announcement of our recognition of the new Amir was received with decorous, if mechanical, enthusiasm. Even before this, matters of State had been referred by our officers for his disposal. The pleasant fiction was sustained that he was the chosen of the Afghans. Every one knew that he was merely the candidate to whom we were willing to transfer the advantage of possession and such goodwill as we commanded. The Khutba was read in his name in the mosques of the town, and the worshippers murmured the proper blessings; and at least there was no demonstration of dislike to the new order of things. Soon after, Mr. Lepel Griffin

left Cabul for Zimma—a place about twenty miles off—where the new Amir came to meet him, and settle, we will not say the preliminaries, but the details of the purely temporary and tentative settlement, which avowedly was all that was aimed at. We were willing, indeed, to strengthen him as far as we could without entering into any engagements which might embarrass us afterwards, or—according to the new idea of Afghan relations—weaken his hold on the Afghans. He was not to appear as our creature. We accepted his apologies about the compromising letters which he said were meant only to conciliate his countrymen, and we even were willing to have it appear that he was the means of ridding Cabul of our presence. We gave him up—though it would seem after much hesitation and debate—the fortifications we had constructed on the Bala Hissar and the heights round Cabul. We put him in possession of the fortified camp and palace of Sherpur. We gave him, what he sorely needed, large sums of money—£80,000, we believe—and the captured Afghan guns remained for his use. And, to anticipate matters, we may add that we presented him also with large stores of supplies and ammunition, and handed over to him the forts we had constructed at Jelalabad, Gandamak, and elsewhere along the line of communication with India. The Prince, on the other hand, professed, in general terms, his friendship towards us, and promised specifically to do all he could to facilitate our withdrawal and prevent further attack. No formal engagement was entered into. But Abdurrahman was informed that if he conformed to our advice, the British Government would be “prepared”—according to the old formula—“to assist him against any unprovoked aggression by foreign powers.” We did not “desire to interfere in any way with his internal management of his own dominions.” He would not be required to receive an English Resident, and though it was proposed to send a Mussulman Envoy to his Court, yet Lord Hartington has announced that at present no agent of any kind will be deputed to Cabul. It is, indeed, we think, obvious that the objections which exist as regards the presence of an English Resident would in a less degree apply to the presence of a native Envoy. As a Mussulman he would not, indeed, affront the feelings of fanatical Afghans, but as the representative of a Christian power he certainly would. If he were to make himself useful, even as an observer, he must have relations with influential Afghans, and in the existing state of things he would inevitably become identified with some faction. Representing English interests, his presence would embarrass Abdurrahman in his dealings with the “patriotic” faction, and would also commit us in some degree to the complications from which it is the desire of the Liberal

Ministry to be wholly free. We cannot find any warrant for the belief that Abdurrahman has agreed to have relations with no foreign power—*i.e.*, with Russia—save through us. But Lord Hartington has stated that the conclusion of a formal treaty depends on the willingness he may show to be guided by our advice, and the degree of friendship and fairness with which he may treat the tribes who have proved themselves our friends in the last two years.

It is probable, we think, that had the Conservative Ministry remained in power, it would have exacted more definite pledges of friendship, and a clearer recognition of the right of England to control the foreign relations of the ruler whom by recognizing it had in fact created. But otherwise the general features of this tentative settlement were such as Lord Lytton himself probably contemplated. Had not Lord Lytton opened up negotiations with the adventurer from Turkestan, he would have come to Cabul—had he come to Cabul at all—as an enemy; or rather he would have joined forces with our other foes, and probably we should have been forced either again to put forward Yakub Khan as a candidate—discredited first by our having sent him in disgrace to India, and discredited again by appearing as our nominee—or we should have abandoned Cabul to anarchy. The fundamental part of the policy of Lord Lytton was, however, the arrangement made at Candahar. With a British garrison there, we could venture to leave Northern Afghanistan to be the field of an experiment; nay, we could control the process so as to secure a favourable result. Lord Hartington, then, can claim that he is working on the lines of Lord Cranbrook's policy if he establishes at Candahar such a state of things as his predecessor contemplated. Events presently to be related have destroyed the dependent kingdom we created there. But even before the invasion of Ayub Khan the fate of Candahar was left in doubt. Abdurrahman was indeed recognized as ruler only of Northern Afghanistan. Candahar and the districts occupied under the Gandamak Treaty were expressly excluded, but it would seem that he was not left without some hope that we might finally recognize him as lord of the undivided heritage of his great-grandfather, Dost Muhamad.

Before Abdurrahman had crossed the Hindu Kush it had been the policy of the Government to avoid any action which might lead to further fighting. But communications had to be secured and supplies to be provided. As Abdurrahman, too, drew near to Cabul there was naturally great excitement in the surrounding districts. His friends flew to arms to welcome him; those who feared him fled and tried to organize risings against him and us. Among these was Sirdar Hashim

Khan, who had long been regarded at Cabul as the most able of the available candidates for the Amirship. His flight was probably at first due to the fear, engendered by the letters Abdurrahman had sent, that we were about to withdraw from Candahar, and that thus he would have no place to fly to for refuge from his old adversary Abdurrahman. But soon he appeared as one of the heads of the malcontent faction who affected to be zealous for the cause of Yakub Khan, or his young son Musa Jan. It is impossible to analyze the mixed motives of these men. No doubt they were prompted in a certain degree by national or anti-English spirit. But, speaking generally, we may, without injustice, say that they held together because the success of Abdurrahman would thwart their several ambitions. Thus we purchased his temporary friendship at the cost of the good-will of some old supporters. Whether what we lost was worth what we gained is a matter which history has still to decide. It was a game of chance as much as of skill, and Lord Ripon backed the player that for the moment had the best of the game. But he was soon to find that the most pacific resolves could not enable us to hold our own without fighting. In June an expedition of chastisement had been necessary in the Lughman Valley. Later on, a force sent from Cabul to the Logar Valley was forced to disperse a great gathering of tribesmen; and a brilliant cavalry engagement at Padkhao, ending in great slaughter of the enemy, furnished a text for humanitarian complaints in the House of Commons. The districts on the east and south of the Logar Valley, forming the high central region of Afghanistan, have from the first been the great cradle of agitation, and those who argue that the country, as a whole, would soon grow tolerant if our occupation of it were regarded as permanent and inevitable, found much to strengthen their belief in the fact that the people of the fertile Logar Valley, at last growing weary of the presence in their villages of fanatics, had refused to shelter them. Certainly they refused to join in a fresh rising; but those who know the Afghan nature best are of opinion that the reason simply was that as yet the harvest was ungathered. When the stores of food were in, they would be ready, as before, to risk life and all against the intruding infidels.

We have now reached the time when in the ordinary course of affairs the splendid force which was collected at Cabul ought to have marched out, secure in its own strength and with such military pageant as might best impress the Afghans with a conviction that we chose to withdraw—not that we were compelled to retreat. According to the original plan, indeed, the troops were to retire in the first instance to healthy positions, whence they could observe events at

Cabul, and, if our interests or those of our friends required it, again intervene. Not till the autumn heat had abated would they retire through the passes to India. But events elsewhere were soon to mar this fair programme. No judicious observer had allowed his attention to be diverted by the interest of occurrences at the points of contact between us and the Afghans from the possibly more important movements taking place elsewhere. When Lord Beaconsfield's negotiations with Persia for a Persian occupation of Herat fell through, Herat for the ordinary Englishman ceased to exist. But it was in truth the most important point of the situation. When the late Amir Shir Ali had fled from Cabul to ask help from Tashkent, his son Ayub Khan, who had long been an exile in Persia, presented himself at Herat, and was admitted by the Afghan governor. When Yakub Khan agreed to the English terms and became Amir, Ayub expressed the strongest disapproval of his subservience to the foreigner. But Yakub had neither the will nor the power to remove him from his post at Herat, and when Yakub's sovereignty perished in the Cabul massacre, Ayub remained, as he had hitherto been, the quasi-independent ruler of the great fortress and the coveted province. General Roberts and General Stewart both, we believe, made overtures to him, but he took no notice of them. Possibly had he shown a conciliatory disposition he might now be ruler of Cabul. He had collected a force of Herati troops, and to these were added a body of Cabulis—consisting, it would seem, of Kizilbashis and other mercenaries. What Ayub's real capacity is we cannot say. According to the reports which reached Candahar, he was a weak sickly young man, and a mere puppet in the hands of the leaders of his soldiery. Between the two sections of these there were constant jealousies and occasionally open fighting. Apparently the project of a march on Candahar was first started as a means of patching up these feuds. It is probable that, while our officers at Candahar knew little of what was occurring at Herat, Ayub was accurately informed of the state of affairs at Candahar. He knew that the garrison was weak, and that the people in the fertile valleys around, though quiescent, if not contented with our rule while no danger menaced it, would forget all the arguments of material interest if he appeared on the scene as the champion of Afghan independence. To the troops the plunder of Candahar (which was believed, rightly enough, to have grown enormously rich under our rule) was inducement enough. The Prince or his advisers probably thought that if he could not take the city, he could at least throw the province into disorder, and prevent *our* Wali from consolidating his power. It is conceivable that he profited by the example of

Abdurrahman, and thought he could get Candahar as his cousin got Cabul—by showing a disposition to take it. It has been asserted that he was acting in concert with Abdurrahman. As Abdurrahman has hopes of getting Candahar some day, it is not likely that he would wish to see it fall into the hands of a rival who would probably claim Cabul also. Certainly, as matters now stand, Abdurrahman must consider it much to his advantage that Ayub marched on Candahar. The power of his most formidable rival has now been broken, and the English (he doubtless has reason to believe) have had it forcibly brought home to them that the same objections exist to the retention of Candahar as existed to the retention of Cabul. Therefore, if he clearly foresaw the issue, it is conceivable that he might have lured on Ayub to his destruction. But such diplomacy is too subtle, we think, even for an Afghan. It seems sufficiently well established that Abdurrahman was in communication with Ayub before he resolved to accept the English terms. In itself, indeed, such a course is obviously probable, and possibly the march was the result of the concert then established. Had it been deferred, and had the English ceded Candahar to Abdurrahman or left it to be fought for, Ayub might have defeated Abdurrahman as easily as he defeated General Burrows. Then a ruler would have been installed at Cabul avowedly hostile to us. We offer the fact for meditation to those who contend that we can secure a friendly Afghanistan only by non-intervention. Happily for Abdurrahman, Ayub, having long hesitated, took action just when there was a chance that, by judicious reserve, he might have had a clear field for effective action later on. He seems to have left Herat on the 9th June. On the 26th the Viceroy heard by telegraph from Teheran (*i.e.*, from Meshed) that he was marching "with a large force" on Candahar. The only road, we may explain, by which an army can advance westward from Herat lies first due south, in a direction roughly parallel to the Persian frontier, from which it is distant about fifty miles. At Fara, about one hundred and fifty miles from Herat, it turns sharply to the west, and runs thence (with impassable desert on the south and all but impassable hill country on the north) a distance of about two hundred miles to Candahar. From Candahar the roads branch off to Cabul, and by the Bolan Pass to India. It is this central position of Candahar, barring the southern road to India and threatening the flank of the northern roads, that gives it all its strategic importance. The plain round it is an oasis, and fertile valleys—the Argandab, the Tarnak, and the Arghesan—radiate from it to the north. On the 1st of July the Viceroy, hearing that Ayub had reached Fara, telegraphed to General Primrose, who

commanded at Candahar, sanctioning that officer's proposal to send a brigade to Girishk to support the Wali's troops. But the theory that the kingdom of Candahar was the Wali's, not ours, was rigorously carried out by Lord Ripon. The road from Fara crosses the Helmand at Girishk, about half-way to Candahar. As the passage of this river might threaten the military position of our troops at Candahar, General Primrose was told that no hostile troops must be allowed to cross it, and the Wali was, if necessary, to be supported in maintaining order on the west side; but peremptory orders were (so far as published documents show) given that our troops were on no account to act beyond the river. Yet all this time, according to Lord Hartington, it was known that the Wali's troops could not be relied on. Orders were given at the same time to a portion of the reserve division in the Bombay Presidency to proceed to the front, but owing to the floods, which prevented the working of the railway to the Bolan, their start was delayed; and, in fine, very trifling reinforcements reached Candahar from Quetta before communication between the two places was wholly cut off. Why proper reinforcements had not been sent when first Ayub's march seemed probable is a matter still to be explained. The garrison at Candahar and Quetta had long been regarded as inadequate even for normal local needs. But the spirit of retrenchment and withdrawal seemed to dominate in all our arrangements. General Primrose, however, had to do the best he could with the force at his disposal. As we have said, he thought it better to oppose Ayub on the Helmand than to allow him to overrun the country. On the 13th July a British brigade under General Burrows was encamped on the Helmand, opposite Girishk, the Wali with *his* men being on the other side, and Ayub's army being three marches off. Already his influence was felt. With him were many men who had influence at Candahar. The tribesmen from the districts through which he passed, and fanatics from beyond Candahar, flocked to his standard. An old officer, whose hospitality at Candahar had won for him the warmest regard of our officers, suddenly disappeared to join him. A regiment which the Wali had brought with him from Cabul some years before, was disaffected, and corrupted their comrades. All had been tampered with by Ayub's emissaries, who were active throughout the whole province. After anxious debate, it was decided that it would be well to disarm the Cabuli regiment. But General Burrows' orders prevented him from sending troops across the river to do so. It was arranged, therefore, that the Wali's whole force was to retire and take up a new position near the English camp. While their tents were being struck, however, they

rose in mutiny, and proceeded to march off with guns and baggage. After some deplorable delay, General Burrows at last decided to pursue them beyond the Helmand. A brief engagement followed; the mutineers were defeated and dispersed; but it is almost certain that the stragglers re-united at Ayub's camp. However, the guns and baggage were secured, and most of the Wali's cavalry were said to remain faithful. They too, however, subsequently disappeared. It was found that the mutineers had taken away much of the necessary stores collected at Girishk. As supplies were thus deficient, and it seemed probable that Ayub would cross the stream higher up, General Burrows decided to retire to Khushk-i-Nakhud (thirty miles from Girishk and forty-five from Candahar), where supplies were plentiful, and where the northern and southern roads to Candahar most nearly approached each other. Here, after some changes, General Burrows finally established himself in a position chosen as giving advantages to the defence. As to the circumstances which followed much still remains to be explained. On the 21st the enemy crossed the Helmand north of Girishk, and soon the clouds of cavalry they sent in front limited the scope of our patrols. Thus, though accounts had at first reached Candahar of the strength of Ayub's regular army, which we now know to have been correct, General Burrows seems to have wholly underestimated it. Reconnaissances beyond the Helmand had been forbidden by Government, and the information brought in by spies was wholly false. General Burrows seemed to be apprehensive that Ayub meant to evade him, and strike northward towards the Argandab valley or Ghazni. Hearing on the morning of the 27th July that the enemy was at Maiwand, a place a few miles north, he determined to attack him. Up to the last there was much vacillation and disagreement in our camp, and when the start was made there was deplorable confusion. At nine o'clock some of the enemy's cavalry were encountered. Two guns started in pursuit of these as they retired, and on passing a slight crest confronted the main body of the enemy drawn up in battle array, with four miles of front. General Burrows pushed forward his guns and opened an ineffective cannonade. Our troops were in the open—the enemy occupied in front and on both sides positions which gave excellent cover and concealed their manœuvres. Their artillery was splendidly placed and splendidly served. They had over thirty-six guns. We had twelve (including six of the Wali's smooth-bores). Ayub had 5,000 regular infantry, 2,000 cavalry of the formidable Afghan type, and about 5,000 fanatical tribesmen. General Burrows had about 700 Europeans and 2,000 natives. At a quarter past eleven the enemy fired their first gun, and



this was the prelude to a destructive cannonade. By two o'clock the fanatics had surrounded our force, and the artillery on both sides enfiladed our position. The 66th (Berkshire) Regiment steadily withstood the onslaught of the fanatical swordsmen, and our fire mowed down their ranks. Just as these desperate men made a final effort, the ammunition for our guns in front seems to have failed. The Afghan cavalry renewed their attack on our left—the Ghazis pressed on again. Jacobs' Rifles yielded first, then the Bombay Grenadiers (who hitherto had fought with admirable steadiness), and both were rolled back on the 66th. These too were carried away, and there was a general retreat to the camp, over ground cut up with water-courses and enclosures. After a stubborn attempt at resistance here, an absolute rout ensued, the 66th alone retaining any appearance of order, and the cavalry making a few charges. The fanatics could not pursue very far, but the cavalry harassed the fugitives nearly all the way to Candahar. Two guns were left on the field, and the smooth-bores were abandoned in the flight. Only 250 cavalry reached Candahar in anything like order; and not till two on the day after the battle did the rear-guard reach Candahar. Troops were sent thence to bring them in, but already country people had cut up many of the fugitives. All along the road there was no water, and the mortality from thirst and heat was very great. Altogether 1,000 men perished. A few natives and one officer were taken prisoners. It is an English fashion to expect explanations of a defeat. Here it is simple enough. A battle was fought that ought not to have been fought. At Ahmed Khel the valour of the Afghan swordsmen almost proved fatal to General Stewart. At Maiwand, being seconded by cavalry and artillery, it "annihilated" General Burrows' brigade. We were overwhelmed and out-generalled, and the only pleasing feature is the splendid courage shown by the commander and all the officers. The Rifles and the Grenadiers, though Bombay troops, were recruited from the same races as the crack regiments of the Bengal army are composed of. Perhaps if they had had more officers the retreat would not have been a rout. At Candahar, when the first fugitives brought in news of the disaster, there was an absolute panic. It was decided at first to abandon the town and withdraw into the citadel, but as Ayub did not follow up his success there was time to expel the Durani inhabitants (from whom treachery was feared), and to make the necessary preparations for the defence of the whole town. Ayub's delay or hesitation was due to many causes. Disputes broke out between the sections of his troops. His soldiers were disconcerted both by their losses and their victory. Ayub or his chiefs could not make up their minds whether it was best to lay siege

to Candahar or take it by assault, or march to Ghuzni and Cabul, or oppose the relieving forces. Finally, after many *délays*, the Afghan army approached the city; but while the regular troops took up a strong position on the western side, the fanatics alone surrounded it and conducted siege operations. The British garrison consisted of about 4,500 men, who certainly might have done something against such an enemy. One effort only was made—a sortie on the 16th. Its object was to demolish a loopholed village on the east; but though the position was won it had to be abandoned, and our troops lost heavily in the retreat. There was also a garrison at Khelat-Ghilzai, for the safety of which much anxiety was felt. But it was not attacked; and both there and at Candahar supplies were abundant.

We now return to Cabul, where the news of Burrows' defeat came as a painful shock. It was at once decided that General Roberts, with a picked force, should "withdraw from Cabul" by a forced march to Candahar. He started on the 9th of August, with about 2,500 Europeans, 7,000 natives, and the same number of camp followers. As to the regiments and the officers, we need only say that they are those which have become familiar in the story of Afghan battles. Every man was medically examined before the start; baggage was cut down to a minimum; and all the guns were loaded on mules. Only five days' provisions were taken as a reserve. Never did a more mobile force take the field. Much was in their favour. The weather was splendid, and—the crops having been just gathered—supplies were abundant. Abdurrahman, faithful to his engagements, sent on his agents to conciliate the people; and no doubt money—the usual persuasive—was freely used. Yet allowing for all advantages, the march may be regarded as one of the great feats of history; and the success is due not only to the genius of the general, but to the spirit and endurance of the troops. The distance was three hundred and thirty-three miles, and on the 31st Candahar was reached. From Cabul to Khelat-i-Ghilzai the average daily march was sixteen miles. From the latter place, the safety of Candahar being assured, the relieving force advanced by easier stages. Meanwhile, Ayub, hearing of General Roberts' approach, withdrew, first to a place westward of Candahar on the Girishk road, and then to what seemed a singularly strong position on the crest of the pass over which a road runs from Candahar to the valley of the Argandab. That river is separated from Candahar by the range of hills on the north-west of the city. The pass is called the Baba Wali, and a few miles to the south of it is the gap through which the main road passes westward to Girishk. Between the pass and the gap is the terminal spur of the range. It was

doubtful whether Ayub would await attack. His own wish was to retreat to Girishk; and had he done so—in time—he would have caused grave embarrassment. On the day of his arrival General Roberts reconnoitred his position. Next morning he sent the troops of the Candahar garrison to make a feigned attack in front; the infantry of the relieving force was sent by the hills on Ayub's right to turn his position; and the cavalry were stationed to pursue if the enemy broke towards Girishk or Herat. The infantry met with a stubborn resistance at several points on the flank, but by sheer fighting they pressed on, capturing guns at every step. When Ayub's camp came in sight, on the other side of the hills, the enemy broke and fled. The cavalry pursued beyond the Argandab. Early in the day, however, the Cabuli troops had marched off up the Argandab valley—possibly to offer their services to Abdurrahman. Ayub himself escaped also, with an escort of Herati horsemen, and a week later was heard of at Zamindawar, being then on his way to Herat. But there he probably heard the news that in his absence another revolution had occurred at Herat and that his governor had been murdered. He will probably again take refuge in Persia. Before the engagement Hashim Khan and other Sirdars who had espoused the cause of Musa Jan joined him. These two are with him in his flight, and as they have still wealth and influence, it would be premature to assume that they have not the means of vexing Abdurrahman and us. Just before the rout of Ayub's army the English officer who was his prisoner was murdered by his guard. For this act Ayub is to be held responsible.

At first it had been hoped that General Phayre could relieve Candahar from Quetta. But troops had first to arrive from India, and as the country had been swept of supplies and transport, the preparations for an advance were tedious. There were many risings all along the line—still more rumours of risings. Indeed, even at our own port of Karachi there was a disgraceful panic owing to a rumour that the Pathans were preparing to descend on the town. The Bolan railway was open as far as Sibi, but the working parties beyond (on the Harnai route) were withdrawn. One of these was attacked and overpowered. Even at Khelat there was a slight mutiny among the Khan's troops. General Phayre having concentrated his troops in the Pishni valley, was able at length to start the day General Roberts reached Candahar. After his victory, the presence of so large a force was of course embarrassing, and part of the Quetta force was sent back, while the rest was quartered in a district south of Candahar. The question now is only what our future arrangements regarding that place are to be. It involves, we need hardly say, the whole matter

of the aims and methods of Afghan policy. These we have often discussed before. Here we need only say, that whether it be true or false that Ayub had Russian money to help him and Russian military advice (we confess we see no proof of either allegation), the success of his enterprise up to a certain point proves distinctly two facts often denied by the advocates of a policy of indifference. It is clear, in the first place, that a large well-equipped army can, without difficulty or delay, march from Herat to Candahar; and next, that an Afghan leader can organize an army formidable to a European force.

The success of General Roberts' "march in air" gives the best practical justification for the policy which suggested it. The withdrawal of the rest of the force can best be justified perhaps by the plea of necessity. Lord Ripon, indeed, may plausibly say that by remaining it could do no good, and would have weakened Abdurrahman's influence by keeping him out of Cabul. But a more frank explanation would be, that it was thought that if disaster occurred in the south, there would be a general rising round Cabul, and General Stewart would be too weak to hold his own. Therefore, while our prestige was still sufficiently unclouded to secure us the good offices of Abdurrahman and his friends, we had to leave. Two days after General Roberts started with the flower of the army, General Stewart, with all the weedy animals and less vigorous troops, and accompanied by crowds of Hindu traders and others who felt no great confidence in the new ruler's humanity, started for India. In spite of all previous assurances no force was left at Gandamak or elsewhere. But "not a shot was fired." We had in fact fairly purchased immunity on our retreat. But that it was a retreat, not a withdrawal, every Afghan knows, and they will certainly argue that no small provocation will tempt back those who were so anxious to get away. Some demonstrations followed at Cabul, directed against "unpopular" citizens, but, contrary to general anticipations, the new ruler's troops did not loot the town. He has secured, by largess and flattery, the support of the old priest, "The World's Perfume;" but Mahomed Jan is still an irreconcilable, and, as we have said, the party of Musa Jan has powerful supporters. All our troops have now reached India, except a few left to guard the Khaibar Pass. No epidemic appeared, and there is said to have been none of the anticipated loss from sickness.

We went to Cabul last September on a mission of vengeance. In August of this year we left it fortified, flourishing, and enriched by our lavish expenditure. Even the fine imposed was remitted to make things pleasant for the new ruler. As to his disposition and power, we need but say that he was personally anxious to meet General

Stewart in formal durbar, but was prevented from doing so by the threats of his soldiers. However, the morning our troops left he rode in to say good-by, and during a brief and formal conversation with the English General, behaved with true Afghan decorum and complaisance. For the future he will do just what his interests require, and it is clear he has still support to win, which he cannot win if he does not assume anti-English airs. The governors he has already appointed to Jelalabad and Khelat-i-Ghilzai are "patriots" whom our arrival displaced.

---

### THE COLONIES.

Since July there have been many noticeable signs of the necessity to England of her Colonies; of the intimate part they play in the national life. And although in the last few years we have had ample evidence of the use England is to the Colonies, during the last quarter more prominence has been given to the use the Colonies are to England. The opening up of new lands is a prolific source of national wealth, and it is a source which flows readily at the slightest bidding. Remarkable evidence of this value of new lands to a nation has been afforded by the recent contributions to alleviate Irish distress. The Dublin Mansion House collected no less than £180,000; but £94,000, or more than half, came from our Australian Colonies.

And yet this positive aid to the mother country when evil seasons befall her, falls far short of the negative but none the less substantial aid held out to the mother country by the practical opportunities Colonies offer; and these opportunities suffer undeserved neglect till short harvests and commercial depression rouse the dense population of the old country to a fresh survey of its position. It is no wonder, then, that during the last quarter the teachings of adversity have borne due fruit, and that in many ways attention has been given in practical manner to the Colonial opportunities of the English race.

In all countries a series of bad harvests inevitably opens up the Land Question, and in England, of late years, this question has come vividly before men's minds; and the fact has been undeniably shown that the population of the old country is not only too large but too well-to-do to utilize the soil of the British Isles for purposes of food supply alone. Vast areas are becoming absorbed for the industrial purposes of railways, docks, mines, and manufactories; and yet greater is the demand for land for purely residential purposes; cities with far-reaching suburbs, favourite resorts environed for miles with park-surrounded villas have banished wheat-growing and farming

from many a fertile district. Sporting of all kinds, the relief and relaxation which wealth enables so many now to enjoy, have not only given value to otherwise waste moors, but have invaded areas good for agriculture. What allows of all this is the fact that commerce and industry supply the wherewithal for the purchase of food grown elsewhere.

In the meantime there are those whose tastes, antecedents, and opportunities make them "natural" producers of food from the soil. These men are driven to see that in the Colonies, at all events, they may have their fill of opportunities to practise their calling with profit. And the consequence has been a large measure of attention paid by our tenant farmers to New Zealand, to Canada, to South Africa, as paying fields for their labour, their skill, and their capital.

It would seem that this land idea will grow into one great bond of empire. Increase of population and prosperity in the centres of a nation gives impulse to the cultivation of its extremities. So Rome spread over Italy. So the east-coast farmers of the United States have opened up the far west. So now the pressure in the British Isles is sending a wave of energizing activity to the more remote over-sea provinces held by the English race. A meeting has just been held in London to consider the desirability of forming a company for the purchase and sale of land in the different British colonies, with a view to furthering the emigration of small capitalist farmers. The course suggested is the purchase of land wholesale and the putting it into condition for occupancy, and generally the supporting the holders in their holdings for the necessary interval till profits accrue. The idea is excellent, and in entire keeping with the actual tendencies of the times.

What closely resembles a strong perversion of these tendencies is the scheme this summer inaugurated by Mr. Thomas Hughes. He has sought to plant an English colony in Tennessee of middle-class emigrants with 300,000 acres and all the definitely planned accompaniments of farms, townships, and what not. In accordance with "Tom Brown" traditions, this new "Rugby" is to be a little Britain in the midst of Yankeedom: but with what end? Its national individuality must at no long date assimilate to its mightier surroundings. It can scarcely be sanely contemplated that this insignificant oasis of opinion can act as the lump of leaven, and win *back* to modern English ideas the vast United States. It has been said that enthusiasm is not of this world, and in this latest instance worldly minds will ask in astonishment why this English colony was not planted on English soil. There are millions of acres under the

English flag awaiting such enterprise, and ready to greet so thoroughly English, a centre, and ensure so far as may be its unchanged future. The great North-West of Canada, the newly-discovered fertile districts of Western Australia, appear to offer greater advantages, even from the material points of view of cheapness of land and greater fertility. But enthusiasm has riveted her eye on Tennessee; and we suppose a certain number of the required emigrants will be got together, but by no means the full number. The colony will then be started; and in a few years it will merge itself in its environments, and be no more heard of. It is to be hoped Mr. Thomas Hughes' next effort will fertilize English soil, and seek "to perpetuate English pluck and traditions" in localities where there is at all events some chance of their survival.

The *Canadian Dominion*, owing to its proximity to England, has naturally attracted a lion's share of this desire for cultivating soil. Delegates from English farmers have made careful inspections both in the settled and the new districts, both for purposes of pioneer and of more stable systems of farming. Professor Shelldon, of Cirencester fame, is there making a more scientific survey of these farming capabilities.

In this way, as in others, the strong logic of facts is proving the close connection between England and her offshoots, and the questions of the theory and of the details of this connection is naturally claiming public ventilation. In the last number of the *Contemporary Review* Mr. G. Anderson, M.P., discusses this important question in connection with Canada. Among other suggestions he alludes to the assimilation of colonial public debts with that of England, on the ground of the lower interest of the latter. The enormous amount of British capital already in Canada binds the newer and the older community in close union, and the identity of their interests and sympathies is a necessary outcome.

At the present moment the one great stumbling-block is in the questionable licence enjoyed by Colonies of interfering with the commercial intercourse of the Empire; and it is to be hoped that the recent visit of leading Canadian Ministers to England will fructify the desire on both sides to remove all obstacles to free exchange of products. The Canadian political move which had tacked to it a protective tariff is having its expected effects; among others, the high duty on coal is hampering the setting up of smelting works. The price of coal is now raised to six and a half dollars a ton.

In the *West India Islands* the chief incident of the summer has

been a severe hurricane at Jamaica, followed, a few days later, by a similar disturbance at Bermuda. Great destruction of property and some loss of life have unfortunately occurred. Hurricanes are, of course, unpreventable; but it seems probable their evil effects might be largely mitigated by that forearming which comes of forewarning. The most recent achievement of the Jamaica Government is the provision of telegraphic communication all over the island; the other larger West Indian Islands are following suit; and, combined with cables, it is probable that meteorological reports, established according to a right scheme, would enable ships to put to sea in time, and those on shore in great measure to prepare for the unwelcome visitation.

The annual report of the Jamaica savings bank affords ample proof of the widespread prosperity among the negro peasantry. As we pointed out in the last number of the *WESTMINSTER REVIEW*, the negro population, thanks to the kindness of Nature, have in Jamaica, since the emancipation, enjoyed an easy competence, which lies at the bottom of the present prosperity of the island. There is already considerably over £1,000,000 deposited in the savings bank; and the curious story comes to us that this savings bank has been welcomed by the negroes as an alternative to burying their savings in the earth, for these hordes were not unfrequently swept away by the periodical floods.

Also in our last number we noticed that the news from *The Pacific* is chiefly concerned with the course pursued there by foreign Governments. Since then France has made a move by annexing the Society Islands. These, with the Marquesas and Pearl groups, it is now to be hoped, will fall under responsible control. The French already contemplate the commercial value of these islands in view of the completion of the Panama canal; their territorial area is however, insignificant, even when compared with that of the Fiji group. But the advent of French administration will, at all events, bring this portion of the Pacific under the influence of order and civilization; and, whether for commercial or political reasons, Englishmen will welcome the change.

If Europeans are to occupy the Pacific, it is well that the occupation should take place under responsible authorities. The recent amateur attempts, one from France in the *Chandernagore*, and a second from Spain in the *Port Breton*, have not only been attended with suffering and even disaster to the emigrants, but their settlement in any islands will breed no good until they fall under the rule of some responsible State.

The missionaries report grievous cases of cannibalism from New



Guinea; and the traders are eager to secure the trade of that territory. The interested Governments of France, England, and Holland will ere long be thus driven to intervene and establish some kind of protectorate over that district. When this comes about the whole Pacific will be under European control.

Sir Arthur Gordon's governorship of Fiji has terminated, and he has been promoted to New Zealand. He, however, retains the office of British High Commissioner for the Pacific. It seems a questionable proceeding to unite this office with that of Governor of a self-governing colony. The precedent of Sir Bartle Frere as Governor at the Cape, and at the same time High Commissioner for South-eastern Africa, does not afford good promise. The High Commissioner must be a purely imperial—in many respects a quasi-diplomatic—officer; his province is largely composed of aliens and powers more or less independent. All this is entirely beyond and beside the functions of a governor of a colony enjoying Parliamentary government. Nor is it to be desired that the administrative and judicial authority of such a Commissioner should be vested in the Parliament of a distant self-governing colony. The Fijis are a far more appropriate head-quarters, from a constitutional no less than from a geographical point of view; and it is to be hoped that this transference of the locale of the High Commissioner and his Court is only temporary, and consequent on the purely personal qualities of the present incumbent of the office. The new Governor of the Fijis, Mr. Des Vaux, has already, as Acting Administrator, proved his capacity for the appointment. The Fijis are making great strides in their development. A Sydney company has erected sugar mills at a cost of over £100,000. The ex-King, Cacabon, has made a speech congratulating his former subjects on the great progress of the Fijis since they have fallen to the care of the British Crown.

Turning to *Australia*, we have to congratulate the *Melbourne* police on the capture of the notorious gang of bushrangers which has for so long eluded the strong arm of the law. The four leaders of the gang, acting with an exceeding boldness, but with a criminal heedlessness of human life which has always marked their reckless career, seized a railway station, and compelled the one or two officials to pull up the lines, with a view to wrecking the train in which a strong police force was following on their trail. Luckily the police had wind of this diabolical project, stopped the train before it arrived at the fatal spot, and promptly attacked the bushrangers in the hotel in which they had taken refuge. The combat was marked by extreme caution on

the part of the police; they seem to have kept at most respectful distance from the three desperadoes in the hotel till these three were shot down. The leader of the gang had meanwhile slipped into the bush in the darkness, and boldly attacked, in the rear and single-handed, the police force of over thirty men. He had shrouded himself in a cunning armour of ploughshares, and this, concealed under a light great-coat, gave him the appearance of possessing a charmed life. The bullets of the police had but little effect save in rendering his arms and legs useless. His cunning armour thus protected him from falling "in the field," but preserved him for capture and ignominious but richly merited hanging.

Bushranging will die a natural death with the spread of population; but the exploits of its leading spirits are dangerously incentive, and their more degrading villainy is overshadowed by their reckless daring; and they are not unusually dashed with a foolhardiness which has little to say for their sanity. On this last occasion we find this bushranger devising armour, and attacking thirty armed policemen single-handed, when he might with certainty have made secure his escape and when there was nothing to be gained. His three comrades were doomed; he was powerless to rescue them; his conduct was simple suicide. The sole present cure for this evil is the prompt capture of bushrangers before notoriety surrounds them with a halo of fame which invariably increases the numbers of their sympathizers among the lower classes, and thus hampers pursuit and renders capture trebly difficult.

The Melbourne Exhibition promises to be a fair success. The Melbourne papers are full of details of the completion of buildings and arrangements. Up to the last there was some hope that the Prince of Wales would delight Victorians with his presence, but now these hopes have been finally abandoned, and the official message has gone forth: "The Prince of Wales has been compelled by his numerous engagements to abandon, with much regret, the project of visiting the Australian Colonies on the occasion of the Melbourne Exhibition. His Royal Highness had greatly desired to carry out this arrangement if circumstances had permitted." The Prince's well-known desire for himself to see the new Englands in Australia will no doubt some day be gratified. Victorians find some consolation in the probable presence of the Duke of Manchester and other leading public men.

Politics in Victoria are again in a ferment. The unexpected defeat of the Service Government has reinstated Mr. Berry as Premier; but his own actual followers do not give him a working majority, and in addition to the regular Opposition — the party and personnel of the late Ministry — he will have to face the old Corner

party and the new Roman Catholic party. The latter, headed by Sir J. O'Shanassy, is tied down to the grant of separate educational provision in the State schools for Roman Catholic children. Sir Bryan O'Loughlan, otherwise a thorough-going Berryite, has declined office till the Roman Catholics obtain this demand. It remains to be seen how far the granting of these demands will influence the political allegiance of such men as Sir J. O'Shanassy. His party has steadily declined to coalesce in any way with the Berry party; and although the refusal of his demands greatly contributed to the downfall of the Service Ministry, it by no means follows that the granting of these demands will cause these members to change their political creed. Altogether the Berry Ministry entered into power with but little prospect of long-continued success.

Mr. Berry has, however, completely changed front on the burning question of Reform. He has taken a leaf out of the book of his rivals; and now, instead of proposing to abolish the Council, he would popularize it in every way, and give it more than ever reason to consider itself a representative chamber, and of equal popular power to the Assembly. It remains to be seen what sort of a majority this coalition of party opinions, if not of party allegiance, can bring about. The Duke of Manchester's proposal, in the current number of the *Melbourne Review*, is for a Council with power to amend money bills. This is a step in the same direction. It is making of the Assembly "a second House of Commons"—representative, popular, and with command of the public purse—instead of leaving it a corrective and deliberative body to revise and advise the Lower House.

In *New South Wales* the political news is of action and progress indeed, but of no severe struggle. The increase of the colony has now been found to result in increase of its European business, and has induced the Colonial Parliament to increase the emoluments of its Agent-General in England by one-third, in order to enhance his influence and position in England. This is a sign of the times.

Among other questions, that of the immigration of the Chinese has again reared its head, and the Premier has most justly declared that the matter is one for concerted action on the part of all the Australian Colonies. This question has been enhanced in importance by the recent concession on the part of the Peking Government, of leave to its subjects to trade to foreign ports. It is certain that, in order to maintain the supremacy of English ideas, moral, social, and political, as the governing ideas of Australian nations, the incursion of Mongolian immigrants must be carefully watched. At present this

incursion has not assumed large proportions. There are not more than 50,000 Chinese in all the Australian Colonies, and it is probable that the raising of revenue by means of a Chinese poll-tax will prevent any greater influx. The Chinaman is useful in all the more menial drudgeries of life; he is content with the lowest of profits; and does his work well when he works. But his morality is not of the European standard; his ideas of the sanctity of human life are embryotic; his opium smoking, if less noisy and evident than the drunkenness of the European, is nevertheless far more wasteful of energies and time. His presence in a colony is avowedly and really temporary; he carries back with him whatever savings he can scrape together. The balance is in favour of his presence only in large European communities, where his useful attributes are made use of, and his bad restrained and hidden. His presence in the settlements on the northern shores of Australia is, however, becoming a source of trouble. There he predominates in numbers, and actual loss of life has already occurred in conflicts between him and the whites. And yet in these tropical territories his labour, or Asiatic labour at all events, is a first necessity. Thus, we again find support of our contention in former numbers of this Review, that eventually, if Australians and their advisers are wise, they will institute an Australian tropical colony—a Northern Australia, governed more after the fashion of a Crown colony—to include all districts of Australia where European labour is impracticable.

Throughout Australia the Raikes' centenary was duly celebrated. In each capital was held a muster and march past of Sunday School children—a facsimile in spirit and matter, if not in proportions, of that at which the Prince and Princess of Wales officiated in the Lambeth Palace grounds. Such events mark the identity of ideas and sentiments that prevail throughout the British Empire. It is certain that no religion can boast of such a world-wide exhibition of its *bonâ fide* hold on the minds of the rising generation.

In *Queensland*, as well as in New South Wales and Tasmania, more discoveries of gold are reported; and the richness of these new deposits seems greater than that of recent discoveries. This fact is of some import to economists when Germany and the United States have so simultaneously determined on establishing a gold currency.

From *South Australia*, under the governorship of Sir W. Jervois, it is but natural to hear much of the defence question. The governor himself has recently delivered a lecture on the subject, which was

received with much applause. In this he insisted on the fact that the trade communications of the Empire are as important to the Colonies as to England, and that in the future it is probable aid will come from the Colonies for the protection of these routes, a protection heretofore undertaken by England at her sole charge. In regard to this question of defence of the empire, the right principle of procedure is undoubtedly an expansion of the present English system of regulars, militia, and volunteers—regulating and leading the latter by the means of the professional skill trained in the wide-experienced school of the regulars. Again it would seem desirable, considering the scientific character of modern maritime warfare, that the seagoing navy should be altogether a regular or professional force; it may be largely recruited from and assisted by militia and volunteer marine reserves—these latter also to assist in time of need in all defensive measures. A great link in this design is the presence of Colonial riflemen at Wimbledon year by year; and it is to be hoped that an Australian or Cape team will put in an appearance in years to come, and cause the Kolapore and other trophies to sojourn for a twelvemonth on the other side of the Line.

The question of the inevitable trans-Australian railway is again to the fore; the question now being narrowed to the detailed manner of paying for the railway by the sale of Crown lands. It has been calculated that one-fifth of the Crown lands of South Australia, sold at the low price of 2s. 6d. an acre, would yield the £8,000,000 of money that would easily pay for the railway. And there seems little doubt that vast tracts "fronting" the railway line would be easily vendible for squatting or farming operations, for the railway would banish that one great obstacle to Australian progress—the want of assured carriage through drought or flood.

The transference of Sir Hercules Robinson from *New Zealand* to the Cape gives New Zealand to Sir Arthur Gordon. This veteran administrator will in New Zealand find less scope or need for his individual labours, more especially in regard to his *propria provincia*, the management of natives. He will find all in the hands of his responsible Ministers, but himself will be able to rest on his laurels at the light expense of sound advice, but relieved of all anxiety or personal toil. The Maories still continue mildly to oppose the making of roads through their districts, as though their instinct told them that these roads lead peaceably but surely to their own extinction. It is remarkable to witness this dying out of a nation existing in the midst of Europeans who are doing all they can to protect and encourage the civilized existence of these same natives.

Meanwhile the New Zealand Ministry continues to carry out their programme of vigorous retrenchment. But it is significant to notice that, while they are cutting down such votes as "assistance to botanical gardens," they lack boldness to suggest even the temporary withdrawal of the fee to members for attendance in Parliament, though probably all of these members could easily afford to dispense with the resulting £200 per annum.

The attention of the home public has this quarter been largely given to *South African* affairs. The recall of Sir Bartle Frere and the threatening aspect of affairs in Basutoland have been supplemented by debates, in Lords and Commons respectively, on Isandlana and the restitution of the Transvaal, two subjects which otherwise have passed away to the charge of history. Isandlana, as an episode in military history, will no doubt assist those officers who may in the future have to deal with an unknown force of natives; but the abandonment of the Transvaal by the English Government is a course of action that is to be condemned not only as impolitic but as impossible. Indeed, the new Administration in the Transvaal, bringing peace, law, and order, where before was war, anarchy, and confusion, has naturally succeeded in winning the favour of the very great majority even of the Boer population.

The natives are of course very much in favour of British rule. The new Administration has, however, introduced the system of native policy prevailing in Natal. This system can hardly work well; it was modelled for the one race of natives in Natal; but in the extensive Transvaal there are many and various races, and their customs and laws are correspondingly complex and difficult of selection.

It has been asked whether there could not be devised with ease a new native code applicable to the whole of South Africa, founded on the more civilized principles of English law, and of sufficient elasticity to be profitably superimposed on the various native systems. Thus, for instance, all over South Africa much difficulty has arisen in connection with the native marriage question. There is also much present and prospective complexity about the whole native land question—the ownership and rights of the natives, and the necessary details of the transfer of these to whites or others. The disposal of Morios's lands is an instance in point. Altogether the treatment of the natives in South Africa is a subject by itself, and one that would form the proper province of a special South African Administration, on the one hand guided by the enlightened principles of the Home Government, and on the other by the practical experience of the Colonial Government.

The threatening aspect of affairs in Basutoland has given fresh prominence before the home public to this native question. On the one hand the policy of the Cape Government has been closely criticized, and on the other the strength of the Cape Government to cope successfully with a wholesale Basuto insurrection has been gravely questioned. The policy of native disarmament is no doubt essentially correct in principle, and would be one great foundation for the edifice of European supremacy. The Basuto incident is merely a contested step towards the desirable end; but it is a step fraught in itself with grave issues. Sir Bartle Frere's main reason for crushing the Zulus was the putting an end to the dangerous "state of unrest" that had developed in the native mind. But this very unrest, this lingering idea that, after all perhaps, the black man was the better man of the two, has considerably revived with this successful opposition of certain of these Basuto chiefs. It is much to be regretted that there is thus a revival of native irritation, for, even though the recent skirmishes do not lead to actual war, it is none the less a difficulty requiring anxious treatment.

The Basuto chiefs have as yet been unable to settle matters amongst themselves, and the active intervention of Colonial forces has become necessary, while we hear once again of Imperial troops being moved on to the frontiers. We may hope the moral effect of this display will remind the recalcitrant Basutos of the fate of Moriosi, Sekukuni, and Cetywayo. In the Queen's speech proroguing Parliament the trust was expressed "that a moderate and conciliatory policy may allay the agitation caused by the enforcement of the Disarmament Act."

The failure of the confederation scheme for the present leads us to look for some substitute. At the present annexation seems to have taken its place. This policy has been more active of late. The influence of the Cape Town Parliament has recently been extended over Griqualand West and over the remaining Transkei districts, including Galekaland and Zembuland. These new native territories are to be governed by Act of Parliament, and not, as in the case of previous annexations, by proclamations of the Governor. This policy is being assisted by concomitant railway extensions; these will soon connect Cape Town with Griqualand as well as with the eastern provinces. The Cape Town Parliament will thus rule the greater part of English South Africa: but the Transvaal and Natal are yet outside the charmed circle, and the latter colony is making efforts to revive its old more independent system of self-government. There remains the objection, however, of the necessity for self-defence to accompany self-government; and it is difficult to see how

20,000 Europeans in Natal, in the midst of 300,000 native fellow-colonists and surrounded by dense native populations in Zululand, the Transvaal, Basutoland, and the coast territories, can secure this self-defence, unless they abdicate their present position as agricultural or industrial colonists, and resolve themselves into a regular garrison.

The history of our presence in South Africa points the unsatisfactory lesson, that experience is little heeded in that part of the world. After each struggle with the natives the over-confidence of restored white authority has led to a too hasty adoption of self-governing and independent powers by the various white communities. In due course the natives again become troublesome ; this asserted independence is put to the test, the aid of the Home Government once more arrives to save the whites from annihilation. There seems grievous danger of a repetition of this story to-day. The words used once by Sir Bartle Frere concerning our slave trade policy on the east coast of Africa are most applicable to our policy in South Africa, specially in dealing with the natives :—"The cardinal evil with which you have to deal is the oscillations of our own opinions in the matter." Now the balance is with English home opinion, and now with that of the pioneer colonist. All hinges on the treatment and behaviour of the natives as the moment. Remove this native question to an independent and isolated position by the means of a native dominion in South Africa, and English policy and English development in South Africa will become consistent and assured.



## CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

## THEOLOGY.

THE "Hibbert Lectures" of M. Renan<sup>1</sup> cannot be better described than, in the language of Dr. Martineau, as a series of historical sketches, at once constituted into a whole by a tissue of philosophical conceptions, separately rich in picturesque colouring and dramatic situations, and presented with a marvellous charm of literary form. His subject—the influence of the institutions and culture of Rome on Christianity and the development of the Catholic Church—is perhaps the most important that a historian of religion can select, and M. Renan has adequately executed the task which he so obligingly undertook. In four lectures he explains to us in what sense Christianity was the work of Rome; relates the legend of the Church of that city, with its paradoxical duality, Peter and Paul, replacing that of Romulus and Remus; exhibits Rome as the centre of growing ecclesiastical authority, and shows us how the great idea of Catholicity was worked out through various agencies—political and social position, organizing talent, force of discipline, and "policy which never recoils from fraud." Though draped in M. Renan's robes of mystical rose-coloured rhetoric, the image of colossal magnitude which he has placed before us rises up with sufficient distinctness of outline and proximate accuracy of form and feature. To the ancient civilization, to the old faith of Israel, to the moral severity of the Petrine Christians and the lofty idealism of Paul, M. Renan has accorded their just claim. If he does scant justice to the Tübingen school, he at least acknowledges "the capital discovery of Dr. F. C. Baur—the rivalry of Peter and Paul." Though usually liberal in his criticism, he is sometimes unexpectedly conservative or provokingly wavering in his conclusions. On one page he is not sure that Peter *did* write the first of the epistles which bear his name; on the next page he refers to a passage in that epistle as if it were undoubtedly Peter's. He accepts the somewhat mythical account of James which he finds in Hegesippus with such confidence that he speaks of him with ludicrous inexactness as "James Obliam." He discerns the legendary character of the story of Simon Magus, but rejects with dictatorial decisiveness the Tübingen solution of the difficulty. He reasons conclusively enough against the hypothesis that Peter arrived in Rome before Paul—that is, before A.D. 51 or 62—and yet vindicates the tradition of Peter's residence in Rome,

<sup>1</sup> "The Hibbert Lectures, 1880. Lectures on the Influence of the Institutions, Thought, and Culture of Rome on Christianity and the Development of the Catholic Church." By Ernest Renan, of the French Academy. Translated by Charles Beard, B.A. London: Williams Norgate. 1880.

while by this chronological limitation he greatly reduces its "probability;" and the more so as he insists that the apostle suffered martyrdom soon after this late arrival. The Epistles to Timothy and Titus he pronounces apocryphal, agreeing here with the more liberal school of critics. We may say, in passing, that his abrupt citation from these epistles, to prove the existence of episcopacy at the time when they were written, surprises us, since the text shows that *bishop* and *presbyter* were still convertible terms, and the utmost that can be inferred from it is that the episcopus in his unity is, as Baur puts it, distinguished from the plurality of the deacons and presbyters, and that the tendency to episcopacy is visible there. These pastoral letters attributed to Paul are repudiated by M. Renan with as little hesitation as he rejects the ever-debated correspondence ascribed to Ignatius. In both cases we accept his conclusion. In general M. Renan observes the rule of proportion in the distribution of his material, but in the pages devoted to the persecution of the Christians under Nero he appears to us superfluously diffusive. The same fault, too, meets us here which mars his "Life of Jesus." Again we are told of the "sweet Galilean vision;" again the pictorial imagination is invoked, and the probably mythical Clement portrayed as "a mild and grave legislator with a venerable face, though lost in the luminous dust of a fine historic distance, . . . a head in fresco of Giotto's, old and faded, but still to be recognized by its golden glory, and the pure and mild brilliance of its indistinct features"!! The Lectures, however, are in the main the production of a master in his craft.

In the "Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism"<sup>2</sup> we have an analogous series of pictures of the past, executed, not unskillfully, by Dr. Gerhard Uhlhorn, the Abbot of Loccum, a mediæval Cistercian Abbey, which toward the close of the sixteenth century accepted the principles of the Lutheran Reformation, and is now a seminary for the education of evangelical preachers. In these pictures the religious and moral condition of the heathen world in contrast with the life of the early Christian community is delineated with perhaps as little exaggeration as is possible, if we consider the bias of natural prepossession. Dr. Uhlhorn himself suggests that by a graphic concentration of the grossest excesses, profligacies, and atrocities of a period, you may make some of the Christian centuries assume a bad pre-eminence. To overlook the regenerating influences of Catholic Christianity would be as unwise as it would be unjust; but the evil done by ecclesiasticism and the fanatical spirit inseparable from Biblical Christianity or its perverted applications constitute a serious deduction from the creditor side of the account. Yet, though some of Dr. Uhlhorn's statements appear to require qualification, he seems desirous to do justice to the title of the ancient world on our gratitude. Thus he does not fail to appreciate rightly the various instalments of moral

---

<sup>2</sup> "The Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism." By Dr. Gerhard Uhlhorn. Edited and translated with the Author's sanction. From the third German edition by Egbert C. Smith and C. H. Ropes. London: Sampson Low & Co.

and social reform in the Classical period; the amelioration in the slave's lot, the encouragement given to free labour, the recognition of the claims of women, the growing tenderness for children shown in the institutions for their support under Nerva and Trajan, the charities of persons in private station, as of Pliny at Como, and other manifestations of love and mercy. All these humane reforms, he allows, must be regarded as an independent development within heathenism. Even in the time of Marcus Aurelius the influence of Christianity on the Pagan world is not, in his opinion, traceable; not till the reign of Septimus Severus was there, according to Dr. Uhlhorn, any but a silent and intangible influence at work. Modern philosophy, however, has had little effect on Dr. Uhlhorn's orthodoxy. He not only believes in miracles reported in the third century, but he accepts the story of Constantine's Cross and Dream, and persuades himself that these prodigious occurrences were acts of Divine condescension; astrological superstition, it would seem, being a favourite instrument with the Deity for working out his "pure intents." The translation of the book, which we have thus endeavoured to characterize, is intelligible enough; but such phrases as "advanced thinkers"—applied to the bolder speculators of Classical antiquity—and "cuts loose from his faith," are little to our taste.

In "The Gifts of Civilization,"<sup>3</sup> by the Dean of St. Paul's, we have a work, in spirit and in intention, not unrelated to that of Dr. Uhlhorn, but giving evidence of a maturity of thought and a mental harmony which we do not find in the German preacher's. The volume consists of sermons and lectures delivered by Dr. Church at St. Mary's, Oxford, and at St. Paul's. Simplicity, earnestness, reflective power, and quiet beauty of language are among the qualities that recommend these essays to us. They are distinguished, too, by a sounder principle of interpretation than that which is commonly adopted by the *roturiers* of the pulpit, who only seem able to accept Christian precepts when they have *non-naturalized* them into the practicable platitudes of drawing-room theology. Thus Dr. Church contends that the Sermon on the Mount was once taken very literally; that the religion of Christ, though founded on a law of liberty, began also in poverty and the deepest renunciation of self; that the precepts, "Sell all that thou hast," "Resist not evil," were to those who heard them literal facts and duties. Whether, having rightly contrasted Christian society in its first shape with that society which has grown out of it, Dr. Church is equally right in identifying the two, or whether the history of Christian society may not be appropriately described as the history of a great evasion, is a question which we shall not discuss. In the lecture on Roman Civilization which follows the introductory sermons will be found many admirable thoughts. We agree with the writer that no civilization, however brilliant, can be called a true civilization,

---

<sup>3</sup> "The Gifts of Civilization, and other Sermons and Lectures delivered at Oxford and at St. Paul's." By R. W. Church, M.A., D.C.L., Dean of St. Paul's, &c. New edition. London: Macmillan & Co. 1880.

if men do not discharge their duties as *men* in society; that the true subject of civilization is the man himself, and not the circumstances, the instruments, the inventions round him. Dr. Church satisfies us, too, in his appreciation of the civilization of Greece, with its great idea of citizenship, with all that flows from it of duty and ennobling service and cherished ties. Not less satisfactory is his estimate of Roman civilization, to which he assigns a high and unique place. Rome produced not only great but good men, with grand views of human life and human responsibility. The conquest of the world was not her principal work; through the principles of a sound jurisprudence she has educated the world. Law, in that sense in which we know it and are living under it, in its strength, in its stability, in its practical business-like character, may, he supposes, be said to have been born at Rome. Roman civilization fell because the old Roman ideal, the old public spirit, declined; because the old traditional ancestral religion was "played out." The new religious enthusiasm, that of Christianity, succeeded, and in the next lecture Dr. Church explains, in part, how and why it succeeded. That there is a permanent element in the spiritual life which has come down to us with, and even through, the Christian Legend, we can admit; but we cannot admit that Christian civilization is the final voice of Humanity, or hesitate to affirm that, like the civilization of Greece or of Rome, Christianity will "suffer a *world-change*." There is in it a force of decomposition which will inevitably destroy all but the indwelling soul of goodness, which will survive all changes. In the two lectures on the Sacred Poetry of Early Religions, we note some interesting illustrations of Vedic hymnology, one of which is picturesquely described as the poetical counterpart of Guido's *Aurora*; but "the natural religion" of the Psalms, centuries before natural religion was heard of, is exalted high above the devotional sentiment of the Vedic Hymns, for the majesty and vividness of conception, the moral grandeur and deep yearning affection, which give soul and colour to these Songs of Zion.

The subject of Christian civilization is somewhat differently handled in Mr. William Cunningham's expository treatise.\* In treating of Catholic experience and Christian morality and policy the author has embodied the substance of three sermons preached before the University of Cambridge. To the gospel of self-interest Mr. Cunningham opposes the gospel of divine love; to the doctrine of free competition he strongly objects, maintaining that relatively to the rich men of the day the poor are worse off than in the ages when steam was unused; against the commercial dishonesty of our gigantic industries he emphatically protests, while to the splendid unselfishness of many trades-unionists he offers a tribute of praise. As a remedy for existing evils he proposes the realization of the "Christian Ideal" through episcopal organization, and of differing forms of episcopacy he advocates the establishment of

---

\* "Christian Civilization with Special Reference to India." By William Cunningham, M.A. London: Macmillan & Co. 1880.

that form which best harmonizes with the life of the people. For the administration of the Church in India—the special subject of his present interest—he recommends the institution of tribal or linguistic bishops, with jurisdiction over a particular race, to be ultimately replaced by the usual territorial divisions, as native languages die out and race differences disappear. Naturally, Mr. Cunningham deprecates non-religious education, and civil marriages, and State intervention of Government colleges. He is sanguine enough to hope for co-operation in Church work from the Methodists, and the re-absorption of Presbyterians into the Church. Finally, it is to the Church that he looks “as the only body that, devoid of commercial interests and military ambition, has the will as well as the power to foster the growth of free political life among the populations of India.”

The eight sermons which form the Bampton Lectures for 1879 deal, not with the Christian ideal or Christian civilization, but with the supreme claim of the Christian religion to the allegiance of men.<sup>5</sup> Lamenting that the “Principle of Faith” has not due honour done it, the author has endeavoured to illustrate the necessity and supremacy of this supposed constituent of our nature, and to vindicate its operation in those successive Acts by which the Christian creed, as confessed by the Reformed Church of England, has been constructed. The remark that upon faith, in the general sense of the word, every civilization has been based, and that in proportion as such faith has been weakened has every civilization tottered to its fall, has a considerable amount of truth in it. As a matter of fact, men have believed in supernatural powers, though those powers have been usually very “unspiritual gods,” and the world assigned them as a dwelling-place by no means always a supersensuous world. The belief in the invisible is no proof of the soundness of any of the creeds of civilization. Faith in the Noumenal Sphere cannot be justified by the universality of the conception, for it cannot be shown to be universal. Faith, again, is not its own virtue, neither do we know of any organ or principle which directly acquaints us with supersensuous realities. We believe a proposition because we have evidence of its truth. Professor Wace does assign reasons for his acceptance of traditional Christianity, though, as we suppose, he regards faith as in itself an authoritative principle. Thus he vindicates the Biblical miracles, citing a rather paradoxical passage from a “frank representative” of science, who is pleased to describe certain extraordinary events as possible, apparently because he has brought himself to believe that such events may appear in the *order of Nature* to-morrow, in which case we submit they would cease to be miracles. As our author has cited what we cannot but regard as an unnecessarily generous concession to the supernaturalists, we will supplement his statement by quoting the “frank representative’s” formal and final verdict, which he has refrained from citing.

<sup>5</sup> “The Foundations of Faith. Considered in Eight Sermons preached before the University of Oxford, in the year 1879, at the Lecture founded by John Bampton, M.A.” By Henry Wace, Chaplain of Lincoln’s Inn, Professor of Ecclesiastical History in King’s College. London: Pickering & Co. 1880.

“When apparent disorders are found to be only the recurrent pulses of a slow working order, and the wonder of a year becomes the commonplace of a century; when repeated and minute examination never reveals a break in the chain of causes and effects; and the whole edifice of practical life is built upon a faith in its continuity; the belief that that chain has never been broken and will never be broken becomes one of the strongest and most justifiable of human convictions. And it must be admitted to be a reasonable request, if we ask those who would have us put faith in the actual occurrence of interruptions of that order, to produce evidence in favour of their view not only equal but superior in weight to that which leads us to adopt ours. . . . Those who study the extant records of miracles with due attention will judge for themselves how far it has ever been supplied.” “Hume,” by Professor Huxley, pp. 127-139.

Another testimony in favour of Christian supernaturalness is, we are told, the intense conviction of prophets and apostles of the reality of the revelations which they gave to the world. An argument which does not strike us as being very convincing, since the history of religious enthusiasm in all ages supplies us with abundance of illustrations of men who have identified the overpowering impressions, the besieging ideas, the daring hopes of their own exalted minds with Divine communications, or have taken subjective visions for real appearances of celestial persons. In Professor Wace's defence of Biblical inspiration we are instructed how, “under a large and generous treatment,” the first chapter of Genesis will be found one of the most pregnant revelations in the whole compass of the Scriptures. By the help of vague generalization, a reference to Longinus, and a quotation from Job, the anti-scientific statements in this chapter are made to disappear. Our author is not far wrong when he says that this portion of Genesis is not a revelation of *Nature*, but a revelation of *God*. From his point of view it becomes a wholly subordinate question “whether” the discoveries of science respecting the past history of the globe correspond exactly to his (the sacred writer's) narration. As that narration is a revelation of God, and not of *Nature*, the Bampton lecturer might as well have said that it is of no consequence whether they correspond or not. Exactness of statement, definiteness of conception, logical precision, apprehension of fact, strict critical accuracy are secondary considerations to too many of the defenders of the faith. Emotional excitement, æsthetic satisfaction, congruity with educational prepossession are effective substitutes for the cold passionless processes of logical analysis and cross-examining thought.

The Mosaic narrative is once more put to the rack in Mr. R. W. Wright's ingenious speculative treatise on “Life and its true Genesis.”<sup>6</sup> The one “vital point” which the intrepid author is desirous to establish is, that the primordial germs of all living things, man alone excepted, are in themselves upon the earth, and that they severally make their appearance when the requisite environing conditions exist. The foundation of this emphatic formula is suggested by a re-interpre-

<sup>6</sup> “Life: Its True Genesis.” By R. W. Wright. London: Trübner & Co. 1880.

tation of Genesis i. 11, *Whose seed is in itself*. These simple words are explained to mean, "Whose primordial germs are implanted in the earth." The representation in the text, however, is very intelligible. Three kinds of vegetable growth are specified in verse 11, the tender green, or grass, springing up spontaneously; the seed-producing plant; and the fruit-tree, whose seed also is in itself. The objection to the literal rendering, *seed*—that, previously to the creative act, there was no tree or plant from which the seed could be derived—is not valid. The context does not require that they should be derived from previous seed. All that is meant is, that when the Divine word brought them into existence, it brought them into existence as seed-producing plants. We can find no trace in the Hebrew of a germinal principle implanted in the ground. Mr. Wright's impeachment of the accuracy of the Hebrew text is not to be tolerated. The expression in verse 11 is repeated in verse 12, which is, at any rate, a presumption of the soundness of the text. Mr. Wright professes a decided preference for the Septuagint translation; but in this case the Greek version so closely follows the Hebrew that it was scarcely worth his while to turn to the Alexandrian version. Nor can we admit that he is justified in translating *αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ*, *each in itself*. Moreover, he sets an undue value on the Septuagint translation, for though a discriminative criticism may sometimes correct the errors in our Hebrew Bible by the cautious use of the Greek version, the imperfect knowledge of Hebrew which it betrays, the gross blunders, arbitrary interpolations, and studied variations which occur in it, render it impossible for us to admit its authority, except within very circumscribed limits. The argument of the book, resting, as we think, on false premises, is expanded into ten chapters on Life, Forest Growths, Vitality of Seeds, Plant Migration, Distribution and Permanence of Species, Force, Correlation and Darwinism, &c. With fervid eloquence and passionate protestation the zealous vindicator of the old creed assails Mr. Spencer and ridicules Mr. Darwin. Refusing to believe that "the little whirligig of Darwin is the author of it all," and recoiling before the dismantled planets of "bright-eyed science," he avows his preference for blear-eyed bigotry in his cloistered den mumbling unintelligible prayers, and abides in the simple faith of the Star-led Magi, who, he informs us, with an enviable accuracy which shows his proficiency in chronological and meteorological studies, "came on that bleak December night 1880 years ago, to pay their homage to the Christ Child."

In Dr. Calderwood's "Parables" we have, happily, no pseudo-scientific attempt to justify *revelation*.<sup>7</sup> They are written in a simple intelligible manner, and may be read with satisfaction by all who accept his general premiss. They do not satisfy us, because we are not in agreement with him. The historical colouring, the primary import, the suggestive circumstances, are not at all, or only very inade-

---

<sup>7</sup> "The Parables of Our Lord. Interpreted in view of their Relations to each other." By Henry Calderwood, LL.D., &c. London: Macmillan & Co. 1880.

quately apprehended; but from the point of view of the ordinary orthodox reader they will be found sufficiently critical and instructive.

Our next work belongs rather to the biographical than the theological library. Though published in the author's lifetime, it may almost rank as a posthumous book, since the narrative of judgments, impressions, and struggles which it chronicles was written in 1853, for the instruction of children then in infancy. "A Life's Decision" will interest all those who have shared the painful experiences of the author, or who, living in our own day, and having to face the problems of religion and philosophy which meet them now, are treading the same path which Mr. Allies, its author, trod thirty years ago.<sup>8</sup> The school of thought to which this gentleman once belonged was that of the Anglican Church, as represented by the thoughtful and earnest promoters of the Oxford movement. His experience at home and observation abroad, his patriotic studies, and, we should say, the natural tendencies of his intellectual and moral nature induced him to abandon Anglicanism and make his peace with the Roman Catholic Church. There can be little doubt that that harmonious, logical cohesion of doctrine and practice, which Mr. Allies so impetuously demanded, was not discoverable in the Church of England. We can quite understand, for we have not been without analogous reflections and sympathies, the almost irresistible craving for a source of Truth, for an oracular authority, for infallible, intellectual guidance, and as that is not to be found in the English Church, and is not offered by any Church in Christendom except that of Rome, it is in Rome, which does offer it, that men, urged by this passionate lust for the impossible, will seek and, as we admit, will fancy that they find it. Starting with certain beliefs and desiring satisfaction for certain mental cravings, Mr. Allies, unable to find his "system," his "guardian and exponent," his "cohesive structure," in Anglicanism, broke, after a conflict of five years, with the English Church, and was received into the Roman Communion of Cardinal (then Father) Newman in 1850. Mr. Allies's mental conformation is sufficiently illustrated by his interpretation of the "phenomena" described in his letter containing an account of his visit to the Addolorata and Estatica in the Tyrol, as a direct exertion of Almighty power, and his conviction that through his prayers to our "Blessed Lady" the symptoms of typhus fever in his wife disappeared, and that as a consequence of Her interference he and his family were preserved from that fatal scourge. Mr. Allies's volume contains many sketches of contemporaries, chiefly ecclesiastical, whom he knew, and some of whom, to use the expression which Lord Beaconsfield, when Mr. D'Israeli, thought himself justified in applying to Sir James Graham, he did not so much respect as regard. Pre-eminent among these is the late Bishop of Oxford, Samuel Wilberforce, whom he portrays as now soft, sleek, and silky, now prompt and bristling, a man of two weights and two measures, the brandisher of episcopal authority, under whose

---

<sup>8</sup> "A Life's Decision." By T. W. Allies, Author of "Per Crucem ad Lucem," &c. &c. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1880.



stick, for he will not call it his crosier, he lived in the years 1845-50. Bishop Blomfield, whose chaplain Mr. Allies was appointed in 1840, he paints in colours nearly as dark. Truckling to expediency, attempting to sit between two stools, accepting so much Puseyism as tended to make him a greater man than before, London's prelate was sometimes rebuked for his "extremely uncatholic sentiments," by this theological Bantam-cock, as one of the bishop's admirers, not very respectfully, but perhaps not unappropriately, designated Mr. Allies. On one occasion Dr. Pusey is profanely described as "squeezable to anything;" and Keble on all occasions apparently figures as an ecclesiastical Walton, fishing by the side of quiet streams, and enjoying the lights and shadows as he dangled his hook at the end of a rod—no Athanasius as Mr. Allies had dreamed, but, what in his estimation seems now to be the most contemptible of all things, an Anglican parson; or if there is anything more contemptible it is the Anglican episcopate in general. Disgusted with old Howley, especially with his moderation and venerableness, disgusted with Bishop Blomfield, and still more disgusted with the Gorham Judgment, Mr. Allies does not surprise us by coming to the conclusion that life in the Church of England was not worth living, and sought a happier existence, where authority might triumph over private judgment, and the demand for infallibility and the thirst for the supernatural be satisfied, if not in reality, at least in dream.

The phenomena which Mr. Allies records in the case of the Tyrolese devotees seem closely related to phenomena noted in mediæval Hagiology. A Lilliputian Christ on the cross is reported to have been found in the heart of Clara of Montfaucon. Prodiges, as startling, if not so well attested, occurred in the case of St. Theresa, Christina Mirabilis and others of the rapturous or delirious order of Mystics, some of whose strange experiences are related in Dr. R. A. Vaughan's "Hours with the Mystics," first published in 1856, and now reproduced in a third edition.<sup>9</sup> The work cannot be regarded as a profound or exhaustive history of Mysticism, but it exhibits learning, research, and good taste, is always interesting and sometimes entertaining. Christian mysticism, though, in certain cases, delirious, sensuous, and altogether unwholesome, has its favourable phases—grace, goodness, beauty, poetry, gleam like sunbeams through clouds of morbid bewilderment. But mysticism is not exclusively Christian, it combines with Theism, Pantheism, and even Atheism. The mystic who closes his eyes on the world of sense, that by religious or intellectual insight he may discern the realities of the supernatural universe, has many varieties. Hence Dr. Vaughan includes in his portrait gallery not only Bernard, Hugo Tauler, Angela de Foligni, Catherine of Siena, &c., but Plotinus, Porphyry, Proclus. Analogies, too, are detected between Schelling, Coleridge, and the Neoplatonist, between Hegel and Eckart,

---

<sup>9</sup> "Hours with the Mystics. A Contribution to the History of Religious Opinion." By Robert Alfred Vaughan, B.A. Third Edition. Two Volumes. London: Strahan & Co. 1880.

Emerson and Angelus Silesius. The republication of these volumes is opportune, if, as the author's son, Mr. Wycliffe Vaughan, affirms, "in much of the more spiritual progress going on around us there is a good deal of Mysticism." If the horror of Rationalism, of which he speaks as likely to drive men to the opposite extreme, is destined to have that effect, we trust that the excesses of the hysterical mystic at least may be avoided.

Mysticism penetrates into religion, into poetry, into prophecy, with varying and qualified force and character. 'Traces of it may be found in the grand and obscure Ezekiel and the lofty and enthusiastic deuterot-Isaiah. As an auxiliary to the study of these writings we recommend the fourth volume of Ewald's "Commentary on the Prophets of the Old Testament;"<sup>10</sup> the last annual instalment of Messrs. Williams and Norgate's popular library of German theology.

Three volumes of "Sacred Books of the East," translated by competent Oriental scholars, and edited by Professor Max Müller, deserve a cordial recognition.<sup>11</sup> "The Institutes of Vishnu," rendered into English by Mr. Julius Jolly, may be described as a collection of ancient aphorisms on the sacred laws of India, supposed to be communicated by the god Vishnu to the goddess of the earth. Of unknown authorship, this literature appears to have sprung up, in particular certain portions of it, near the primitive home of the Aryan civilization, several centuries before our era. The laws contained in this volume relate to political and social duties, crimes, ceremonies, and religious practices. Of the Pahlavi Texts in Mr. E. W. West's volume,<sup>12</sup> the *Bundahis* deal chiefly with cosmogony, myths, and traditions, and are by him roughly compared to the Book of Genesis; the *Bahman Yast* he likens to the Apocalypse; and the *Shâyast lâ-shâyast* bears some resemblance to Leviticus. All three are full of translations from old Avesta texts, collected together probably in the latter days of the Sasanian dynasty, and finally rearranged some time after the Muhammadan conquest of Persia, so that practically they may be taken as representing the ideas entertained of their prehistoric religion by Persians in the sixth century, but modified so far as to suit the taste and exigencies of the tenth. Two most important rectifications of popular misconceptions are derived from this "contribution towards a correct account of mediæval Zoroastrianism." The Parsi religion has long been represented by opponents as a dualism. The *Bundahis*, however, distinctly limit the power, the knowledge, and the existence of Aharman; the Persian and Christian ideas of the evil spirit are so nearly alike that Mr. West is unable to assign them a different origin.

<sup>10</sup> "Commentary on the Prophets of the Old Testament." By the late George Heinrich August von Ewald. Translated by J. Frederick Smith. Vol. IV. Hézequiél, Yesaya xl.-lxvi. London: Williams and Norgate. 1880.

<sup>11</sup> "The Sacred Books of the East." Translated by various Oriental scholars, and edited by F. Max Müller. "The Institutes of Vishnu." Translated by Julius Jolly. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1880.

<sup>12</sup> "The Sacred Books of the East," &c. "Pahlavi Texts." Translated by E. W. West. Part I. "The Bundahis, Bahman Yast, and Shayast La-Shayast." Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.

Zoroastrianism, however, is less hazy and more logical, and does not believe in an eternity of evil as Christianity does. Another misrepresentation of the Parsi religion has no basis in fact. The supposed doctrines of boundless time being the origination of everything is not to be found in the *Avesta*. The Persians did *not* believe that the two Principles Aûharmazd and Aharman were produced by an eternal being, Zorvan, a personification of time, and a more mature conception of reflective and progressive intellect. While Mr. West thinks it still unsafe from a scientific point of view to disbelieve in the historical existence of Zarâtust because mystic tales have gathered about his name, Mr. James Darmesteter, the translator of our third volume of the "Vendîdâd," a part of the "Avesta," entertains no doubt that Zoroaster, a more familiar form of name, is an essential part of the Mazdean mythology. In the admirable "Introduction to the Zend-Avesta"<sup>13</sup> (a very improper designation, as Zend means a *Commentary* or *Explanation*, and *Avesta the law*), Mr. Darmesteter gives us an interesting account of its discovery, interpretation, and formation, explains the origin of the Avesta religion, and investigates the character and culture of the Vendîdâd, which is mainly a code of purification, with moral digressions and mythical fragments, interspersed and augmented by the appropriation of the remnants of an old epic and cosmogonic literature. The original texts of the Avesta were not written by Persians, but in the language of Media, and they exhibit the ideas of the sacerdotal class under the Achæmenian dynasty.

---

#### PHILOSOPHY.

THE drift of the first book<sup>1</sup> on our list may be surmised from its opening page—"Dedicated (by permission) to Herbert Spencer and his friend, John Fiske." Although published in Old England, it is the production of a clergyman of Boston, New England, and is certainly very unlike the kind of work to which we are accustomed from members of the same profession nearer home. We should very much like to meet with the pulpit orator, who would treat us to a dozen extempore sermons as healthy in tone, and as devoid of archaisms, as are the contents of this little book. There is not a trace of any antagonism to venerable creeds—on the contrary, the author's acceptance of Christian Theism is clear and firm; but there is so complete an absence of the traditional phraseology of the pulpit, and such an inartificial representation of the best spirit of the age, that the reader totally forgets he has before him the stenographic report of a series of seventh-day homilies. In accordance with the circum-

---

<sup>13</sup> "The Sacred Books of the East," &c. "The Zend-Avesta." Part I. "The Vendidad." Translated by James Darmesteter. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1880.

<sup>1</sup> "The Morals of Evolution." By M. J. Savage, author of "The Religion of Evolution," &c. London: Trübner & Co., Ludgate Hill.

stances of its origin there are no learned references, and few historical illustrations, but merely a plain and straightforward account, level to the meanest capacity, of what will, perhaps, in future be known as the Ethical Principles of the nineteenth century; those revised moral conceptions which have attained shape under the influence of the historical or evolutionary spirit. The familiar ethical terms—duty, obligation, self-love, sacrifice, moral sanction—all receive attention, but they are divested of their mysterious or transcendental connotations, and are shown to have a real, and even solemn, significance, although one strictly relative, and derived from observation of the facts of human experience alone. “If by the will of God you mean these laws of body, of brain, of heart, of mind—these laws of human relationship and association, these laws of the universe about us—if you regard these simply as the expression of the will of God, then, of course, it makes no difference whether you call it law of Nature or will of God; for the two are identical . . . . Are not the laws of society existing in themselves and by their own nature? . . . . These laws are essential in the nature of things; and they stand, and you live by keeping them, and die by breaking them, whether there is a God or not.” The author is equally rational on the supreme importance of the Hedonistic principle. He declares without any vain refinements that “the ultimate end of life . . . is happiness. You may call it pleasure; you may call it happiness; you may call it blessedness; you may call it what you please;” but all the calling in the world won’t alter the plain fact, that no other end has been, or is conceivable. Sacrifice for sacrifice sake is a delusion; nay, it is criminal; and an ultra-altruism which would set up universal self-renunciation as an ethical aim either is sheer madness, or issues in a subtle form of Egoism. The author excellently refutes the charge so often brought against the Ethics of Evolution, that it is only an endorsement of the wicked doctrine, “might makes right.” “The struggle for life, and the survival of the fittest,” is capable of bearing an interpretation in harmony with our highest intuitions, if we will only abstain from reading it in the narrowest possible way, and will admit that the “survival of the fittest,” applied to man, means a continual supplanting of lower physical by higher spiritual energies. Who can doubt that survival in the future will depend on a greater social cohesion, which again can only result from a fuller development of sympathy, and a more spontaneous tendency to sacrifice individual claims for the sake of a gain to the community? It is plain enough from the teaching of this book that the perils of the future do not lie in the growing tendency towards a scientific Ethics, but in the continued reliance on external authority, some privileged civil or spiritual Power, or on the disintegrating influence of an *a priori* or individualistic psychology.

Professor Monck’s book contains a very full account of formal deductive logic.<sup>2</sup> It is divided into two parts; the first part, about

<sup>2</sup> “An Introduction to Logic.” By W. H. S. Monck, M.A., Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Dublin. Dublin: Hodges, Foster, & Figgis. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

a third of the work, being devoted to the elements, and written for school use; the latter, and larger, part consisting of discussions of some of the more difficult questions which have to be considered by students desirous of going somewhat deeper into the subject. With regard to the first part there is little calling for special remark. The ordinary topics are treated clearly, and at quite sufficient length. There is no attempt at innovation, even the quantification of the predicate being ignored. The "supplemental chapters" treat of such topics as the "Definition and Province of Logic," "Analytical and Synthetic Propositions," *Reductio ad Impossibile*, and "Sophisms." The author does not seem quite clear with respect to the relation of formal to material logic. Material logic cannot dispense with the calculus of probability. No verbal artifices will bridge the chasm between necessary and probable inference. "How," asks Professor Monck, "should the proposition 'Nearly all B's are C's,' be treated in logic? Most writers would say either that we are to drop the 'Nearly,' and treat it by a sort of courtesy as a universal proposition, or else since *Nearly-all* falls short of *All* we must cut it down to the bare logical *some*. I think it better to treat *Nearly-all-B* as a distinct term from B—a sub-class of the B's nearly, but not quite, coincident in its extension with the higher class B. The proposition is, therefore, a universal proposition, but its subject is not B, but *Nearly-all-B's*." A subject may be formed of "*Nearly-all-B's*," but how much better are we off than if we "cut it down to the bare logical *some*?" Real universality is not gained in the conclusion; and what precisely is the sense of the proposition "All *nearly-all-B's* are C's?" Formal logic only admits the quantities *all* and *some*, and any attempt to evade, or smuggle in, degrees of quantity is either vain or extra-logical. Professor Monck is no friend to the Hamiltonian innovations, preferring to abide by the four Aristotelian forms of proposition, and entirely rejecting the equational rendering of propositions. There is nothing particularly novel in his arguments here, the same objections having been already raised by Mill and De Morgan. He believes that he is at issue with Mill on the subject of Definition, declining to recognize the implication of existence in any form of definition; whereas Mill had distinguished *real* from *nominal* definitions by the implication of the existence of the subject in the former case; the former being two propositions packed together, the one merely explicative or a *nominal* definition, the other synthetical, assertory of the existence of the subject. "The assumption or assertion of a corresponding class of things is not made by the assertion itself, but by the context in which it is found." There is really no difference between the two writers, as Mill, equally with Professor Monck, holds that the logical copula does not connote existence, and declares that no science can be based merely on definition—that is, in effect regards *all* definitions as *nominal*. There is rather more space allotted to the process of *Reductio ad impossibile* than appears requisite for any expository purpose. The process once clearly explained, it may be left to the ingenuity of the student to apply it to any of the figures.

Mr. Milnes's primer<sup>3</sup> might serve as an excellent introduction to the larger work of Professor Monck. The book is sufficiently modest in its pretensions, giving a bare outline of formal logic, and not even encumbering the memory of the student with the time-honoured mnemonics lines and the mysterious processes of reduction. The author gives evidence of possessing all the qualities of an excellent practical teacher, keeping strictly to the point, and treating his subject in as simple and untechnical a fashion as is compatible with scientific clearness of exposition. He rightly enters with a little detail into Immediate inference, the point where the student usually encounters his first difficulties. All arguments are rendered perspicuous by the employment of straight lines, which the author prefers to the representation by circles. We are glad to observe the process of contraposition is simplified, in the fashion advocated by Professor Bain, by employing first the process of obversion and then converting the obverted form. We trust that this method will soon be generally adopted. Some space is given to the Compatibility of propositions, a matter frequently passed over in logical text books. We must, however, demur to the statement that "adjectives have only connotation." The reason assigned is that adjectives "do not serve to designate any particular objects." But it is not necessary that the class should be limited in order that a term may be *applicable*. The denotation of "white" or "round" is assured, although the sum total of the objects to which the term applies is never likely to be definitely ascertained. At the end of the book there is a collection of elementary exercises, which have been selected with some care.

Notwithstanding that excellent translations of the Platonic Dialogues already exist, Mr. Church has performed no fruitless work in re-translating and bringing together in a handy volume the *Enthyphron*, *Apology*, *Crito*, and *Phaedo*.<sup>4</sup> These dialogues, whatever their precise historical value may be, give so very vivid a picture of the man Socrates, as he appeared in retrospect to the most gifted of his contemporaries, that they will always be preferred to any modern version of the trial and death of philosophy's first great martyr. A careful introduction is prefixed to the selection, which will still further assist the reader in realizing the various scenes.

The diffuse title of Dr. Painter's book<sup>5</sup> leaves the would-be reader in no doubt as to what he may expect. When we add that it is dedicated "to the praise, honour, glory, and worship of God," and is the first of

<sup>3</sup> "Elementary Notices of Logic: being the Logic of the First Figure designed as Prolegomena to the Study of Geometry." By Alfred Milnes, M.A. (Lond.), Scholar of Lincoln College, Oxford. London: W. Swan Sonnenschein and Allen.

<sup>4</sup> "The Trial and Death of Socrates: being the *Enthyphron*, *Apology*, *Crito*, and *Phaedo* of Plato." Translated into English by F. J. Church. London: Macmillan & Co.

<sup>5</sup> "Science a Stronghold of Belief: or, Scientific and Common-sense Proofs of the Reasonableness of Religious Belief, as based on a plain and candid study of Nature and of the Scriptures. The whole forming a general practical view of belief, and an opposition to modern doubt and infidelity." By Richard Budd Painter, M.D., F.R.C.S. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, & Rivington.

five volumes in which "the errors of the cultured Sceptics, Positivists, Agnostics, Monists, and Materialistic scoffers," will be thoroughly exposed; a table of contents will be rendered almost superfluous. Dr. Painter is a retired physician, who is bent upon setting a wrong-headed world right before he dies, at the cost of something over two thousand closely printed pages. The magnitude of his task sits lightly on him, however, and his courage certainly deserves a word of praise. To the natural reflection that the materials of this volume are somewhat heterogeneous, the author frankly replies that he does not hold with the modern practice of parcelling out the domain of knowledge into departments. "You must keep separate the consideration of physics and metaphysics," say the philosophers. 'But why the *'must'*? I contend that it is not in accordance with true philosophy to attempt any *artificial separation* of the various facts, and evidences, and modes of thought in regard to any subject in the whole range of things that come within the scope of man's cognition. . . . You must study both together—the book of Revelation and the book of Nature—just as you study physics and chemistry together," &c. After this hopeful beginning the reader will not be surprised to find sundry incongruities and odd juxtapositions. After a chapter entitled "Conceit in Science and Philosophy," in which some heavy blows are dealt all round the inquiring world, the theme of the present volume, "God in Nature," is taken up and exhaustively treated in eighteen chapters, commencing with Matter and Force, and ending with Reason and Instinct. The first volume is intended to be eminently expository, but ever and anon the author breaks the thread of his narrative to put some poser to the "unbelieving Materialist," or to show how neatly these discoveries of the scientist fit in with the unscientific assertions of the Biblical authors. The writer ever and anon puts the man of science into a fix by demanding bluntly of him, when the latter has done his utmost, "Why is this?" Why is attraction and repulsion manifested between the various states of matter? If the inorganic world "is a mighty mystery," much more the living world, and nerve energy is the crowning mystery of all. Of course the mental operations, especially the unconscious ones, are a great "stronghold of belief." "This unconscious part of the organic mind is the essential spirit of organic life, and by God's will and pleasure the cause of life. . . . It is in the blood and sap and bioplasm that matter and spirit meet. But here we can go no further—spirit must be to us a sealed problem this side of the grave." Of course the writer revels in these "sealed problems." It is very curious how strong the tendency to Agnosticism is on the part of fanatical Gnostics, provided the Agnosticism do not touch the "Great Original." To be ignorant of the First Cause is impiety and blasphemy, to be ignorant of the *modus operandi* of the First Cause is reverence and humility. Thus our present author positively gloats over the circumstance that scientific men have been hitherto baffled in attempting to explain a large number of Instincts. Every laboured, but doubtfully successful, attempt to trace unconscious mental action a step back is laid hold of with avidity to checkmate the Evolutionist. "How came

these remarkable differences and peculiarities, Materialist?" Here's a piece of the unknown to take down your conceit and pride, Mr. Atheist. Writers of this class have a most extraordinary idea of the proper method of vindicating the ways of God. They seem to think that the demonstration of human incapacity is the only way to save the credit of the Omnipotent. It is as if the subjects of an emperor would perforce deny his authority if his decrees were carried out by deputies, if they were not taken to prison, or had their taxes collected, by his own hand. But if God be all in all, what is the gain to dogmatic Atheism, and loss to positive Theism, in our exact comprehension of all the links of the marvellous phenomenal chain? The present volume, we are frequently reminded, is only a first instalment. The greater problems are still to come. Here we have only Astronomy, Physics, Chemistry, and Anatomy. But there is still Chance and Necessity, Evolution and Darwinism, the God of the Scriptures, and the "Great Blight." A Positivistic Monistic critic may wearily wonder—who reads such books as these? Echo answers—"Who?"

"The Past in the Present: What is Civilization?" are "ten of the Rhind Lectures on Archæology delivered in 1876 and 1878,"<sup>6</sup> furnishing an interesting account of a number of old Scottish superstitious ideas and practices which have survived to the present time, as well as answers to the difficult questions naturally suggested by the foregoing review. Where is the line to be drawn between savagery and civilization, and may our so-called civilization be hereafter lost? The author would draw a marked distinction between civilization and culture. We consider ourselves a civilized people now, but why? Not because the multitudes have attained so very high an intellectual and moral level as compared with the primitive inhabitants of these islands, but because there is a thin stratum of superior culture which engrosses attention, and is taken as representative of the nation as a whole. "In point of fact, our high culture does not embrace the millions, but is confined to the thousands. It would no doubt embrace every one if the test of culture were to be found in the mere *use* of such things as fabrics from power-looms, steam-engines for locomotion, and electricity for the interchange of thought. These things are, of course, the outcome of culture, but what have the millions to do with their existence? They are not the products of a culture personal to them. The millions, as a result of the state of civilization in which they live, use, and benefit by, these and many other things. But what part did they play in calling them into existence, and how would it fare with the prospects of their continuance if the upper ten thousands died suddenly out?" This perilous state of things suggests a further question. Is it possible, or likely, that we shall lose the civilization that has been acquired by the character and genius of the few? On this subject there has been for some time a rather too complacent optimism. As the old doctrine regarded man at his best as fallen from a higher estate, so a sort of inevitable tendency to perpetual progress

<sup>6</sup> "The Past in the Present: What is Civilization?" By Arthur Mitchell, M.D., LL.D. Edinburgh: David Douglas.



has come in recent times to be looked upon as something too certain to need proof. But the one doctrine is as far from truth as the other: The human race in part has degenerated, and will, doubtless, again, in part degenerate. Dr. Mitchell is quite at one with Mr. Spencer and others in regarding a large number (perhaps the majority) of savages as inferior, both in technical skill and incapacity for entertaining abstract ideas, to their almost forgotten ancestors. In fact there is always a struggle going on between the necessary restraints of a society, growing ever more numerous and complex, and the instinctive craving, representing a rude form of life, to regain the liberty only possible in a simpler social state. Besides the natural tendency to undo the web of progress, there is the *democratic* danger, or the tendency to level social inequalities, by expending effort solely in improving the masses or keeping alive the weak, and leaving superiority both of mind and body to take its chance. The consequence is that mediocrity acquires the management of affairs, and "leaders cease to be raised." This latter danger must be counteracted, not by the cruel method of withholding aid from the weak, but by fostering strength equally with weakness. A sign of decadent civilization is an undue prolongation of the military and paternal governmental *régime*. Dr. Mitchell agrees here also with Mr. Herbert Spencer in deprecating the political theory, which favours the direct management of the rising generation by the State, in preference to the indirect control through the family. Lastly, there is the religious difficulty. The chief hindrance to progress lies in the great diversity of creeds. A universal civilization will only be possible for "one people worshipping one God in one tongue."

"Scientific Transcendentalism" is a clever book,<sup>7</sup> with a freshly written and suggestive introduction. The author relates how some years ago he was in the service of a South American Bank, with no literary ambition, and no conscious bias to metaphysics, when he awoke one morning "to find himself possessed of a curious power of inventing allegories or parables on all sorts of moral and metaphysical subjects." This strange experience was so persistent and puzzling, that the subject of it determined to throw up his employment, and devote all his time to "a careful study of the phenomena." For this purpose he took up his abode in Paris, and later on in London, not with the object of "poring over miserable books" of philosophic lore, but, in an environment of the richest variety, to ponder on the mysteries of life, and to evolve a theory of mind and matter from protracted reflection on the facts of positive experience. His observations and meditations led him to perceive the highly symbolical nature of all our mental and material expressions. We are all trying, he found, to communicate by means of symbols to which there is no universally recognized key. The bulk of us are content with the descriptions of other men, who are supposed to have had first-hand experience themselves, but they fail as completely to bring us in contact with reality as the

<sup>7</sup> "Scientific Transcendentalism." By D. M. London : Williams & Norgate.

books of American travel a European, who has never crossed the Atlantic. This is the relation of a prophet to the masses. The prophet states what he has directly "seen" and felt, bewilders his contemporaries, and is followed by a host of interpreters who develop his vivid allegories into a fantastic mythology. The author starts with the proposition that wherever there is the possibility of assimilation there must be radical identity. Now we cannot think except in terms of matter—*ergo*, matter and mind must be essentially one. The facts of matter and the facts of mind exactly square. The material mosaic is exactly represented by the spiritual mosaic. "From the food received into the system we extract that which, is similar to the body and expel the rest. From our material perception we abstract the similar or essential attributes and ignore the accidental." After many wanderings, "meditations in Flemish churches and quaint Rhine towns," he comes, in London, to the conclusion that "Mind is matter in a highly condensed or abstract form; matter is mind in a very diffused, developed, expanded form. Mind is what matter has been; matter is what mind will be." Having grasped the central idea of his theory, he plunged into "material" studies, and began with a new logic "from the vitality stand-point," and did not neglect the very estimable procedure of making himself acquainted with all possible objections to his theories. The present little work is the "logic" referred to. The author apologizes for its skeleton-like appearance and "barbarous style," but thinks the sacrifice of a little sentimentalism no great price to pay for the quintessence of truth. The little book is, indeed, no agreeable reading, and is also as little like the school logics as a book could well be; but it is by no means barren of suggestive remarks, and, if expanded, might have a very presentable appearance as a system of metaphysics. We must be content with stating its positive results. There are three principles—one of *substance*, another of *motion*, and a third of *order*. Motion is known under the forms of *creation* and *destruction*, there being a thorough-going parallelism between the phenomena of matter and mind a—parallelism, however, which will probably strike the reader as more superficial than real. The leading phase of *order* is the law of *development*; *substance* is either *matter*, *mind*, or *spirit*. Man is the synthesis of these three. In "a well-developed specimen of humanity" there is a *body* of matter containing a *soul* of mind, within which is a *spirit* of spirit. "When the first is an adult the second should be an embryo and the third should be a germ." But alas! well-developed specimens are rare. Not all have "souls," and few, indeed, have "spirits." Whence, however, the gulf of incommunicability between different classes of men. One at the lower level cannot comprehend a voice from above, and when there is an awakening of the spirit a few may mutter "an angel spake to him," but the majority will only remark "that it thundered." The value of this little book consists, perhaps, less in the intrinsic novelty of its positions, than in the evidence it affords of real personal thinking.

"A Letter on the 'Exact God'" is a little *brochure* of eighteen pages

dated from South Kensington.<sup>8</sup> The writer is apparently sick of the pretensions of Exact dogmatists both of the theological and the secular school. Materialist and anti-Materialist are incessantly throwing stones at each other, although the house which holds the one is as fragile as that which shelters the other. But why should not these bellicose parties come to terms? Practically, the writer argues, all parties are agreed that there is a Supreme management or control. It is the spiritualist's assumption when assailing the anti-supernaturalist, and it is the tacit trust which enables the non-spiritualist to have unlimited faith in the inferences from experience, and to characterize the idea of "miracle" as unthinkable. Along with this universal belief we have the equally undeniable fact, that, attenuate the notion as we will, we cannot get rid of the idea of material substance. These two *principia* being granted, we have all we want for a universal and irresistible creed. There is no compulsion to pin our faith to this or that mode of material manifestation, to declare what must be the next minute, or a million years hence, but whatever happens we cannot help believing will be conformable to *an established and comprehensible order*. "I would say, that not more surely do I believe that when we next meet I shall grasp your tangible fleshly hand, than I am also assured that I shall some time stand before the face of a Reasonable, and Personal, ay, and a Material God."

The author of a Paper read before the Wellington Philosophical Society<sup>9</sup> claims to have independently arrived, as far back as the year 1870, at the metaphysical theory broached by the late Professor Clifford. This doctrine is *Omnisentiency*. The only existences are strands of feelings variously combined, such as make up the consciousness of the individual self, and of those other "ejects" which answer to feelings beyond individual consciousness. The reality is mind-stuff, what is phenomenal to one mind being merely portions of mind-stuff regarded from a point without it. The author, while in fundamental agreement with Professor Clifford, aims at supplying omissions on the latter's part. Clifford had accounted for the "relations of nextness in space and sequence in time," but omitted to take note of "*degrees of intensity*," "*differences of volume*," and "*causal relations*." "Without attempting to justify it in these pages, I would hazard the conjecture that motion *is* mind-stuff, that volume of feeling *is* mass, and intensity of feeling velocity." The writer finds a verification of his theory that *matter in motion* is mind-stuff in the hypothesis of Sir W. Thomson "which makes all the atoms of ordinary matter, and all the particles of ether, to consist of a rotational motion in an incompressible frictionless fluid. The stoppage of the vortex-motion would be the obliteration of both atoms and ether," the sensible universe would vanish, and likewise the noumenal reality of mind-stuff. With regard to theology the doctrine is perfectly neutral. The Paper is certainly able.

<sup>8</sup> "A Letter on the 'Exact God.'" By a Mechanist. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co.

<sup>9</sup> "On the Doctrine of Mind-stuff." By Frederick W. Frankland. (Read before the Wellington Philosophical Society, 27th September, 1879.)

## POLITICS, SOCIOLOGY, VOYAGES, AND TRAVELS.

**T**WELVE years ago Mr. C. Buxton, M.P., published a book entitled "Ideas of the Day on Policy," its aim being, as we are informed by his son, Mr. S. C. Buxton, "to show what were the actual principles at that time swaying public opinion on the more important questions of the day." The latter gentleman has now compiled a volume on a somewhat similar plan,<sup>1</sup> though rather more rudimentary in form. Mr. Buxton, instead of giving us any ideas of his own, has contented himself with preparing a sort of tabular and synoptic statement of the various arguments commonly advanced by those who support or oppose particular reforms or changes in public policy. Mr. Buxton says that he has striven to be impartial, but that he has failed in his endeavour "probably goes without saying," which is, at all events, a candid confession. He enumerates a dozen subjects discussed in his father's book and since decided, and among them we find the questions of "University Tests, Limited Liability, Charitable Trusts, Competitive Examinations, and Irish Tenant Right." We need scarcely profess our inability to concur in this sanguine assumption of finality. He goes on to say that "among those which have advanced in popularity, but are not yet accepted, are Disestablishment, Intestacy, Entail, and Abolition of Flogging." The meaning is obvious, but Mr. Buxton's way of putting it is comically ambiguous. It looks as if he thought that there was a growing prejudice in favour of entailing property and dying intestate. The book scarcely pretends, on the author's own admission, to be either impartial or exhaustive; but it may be found a useful and, on the whole, a fairly trustworthy guide to the more salient aspects of the topics which it treats by those who like to gain a smattering of information with the least possible expenditure of time and trouble. It is a curious fact, if true, that, notwithstanding all we hear of ecclesiastical activity during the last half-century, the number of curates in the course of that period has only increased from 5,230 to 5,765, an increase certainly not in proportion to that of the population; while that in the number of beneficed clergy is but slightly greater. When Mr. Buxton says that "the only question of franchise reform within the range of practical politics is that designated county franchise," he shows strange obliviousness of the circumstance that the assimilation of the borough franchise in Ireland to that enjoyed by other parts of the United Kingdom is a measure to which the present Government is pledged by a Bill introduced before the publication of his work. In another passage he tells us that one of the objections urged against the Ballot, as far as it provides for the case of illiterate voters, is "that literate voters are induced to plead illiteracy so that the briber may know which way they vote." We should like to know what is the supposed connection

<sup>1</sup> "A Handbook to Political Questions of the Day." By S. C. Buxton. London: John Murray. 1880.

between the means to be taken and the end to be attained. We should, indeed, have supposed that the question of the Ballot was no longer "within the range of practical politics;" and the same observation, on the high authority of Lord Beaconsfield, may be said to apply to the author's elaborate marshalling of arguments for and against the singular craze of "Reciprocity."

A treatise on the "Church in Relation to the State," by the Rev. E. Miller, written from the author's point of view with decided ability, is largely occupied with theological and historical considerations, and an attempt to exhibit the relations in question "in Nature, in Revelation, and in History," into which we do not feel called upon to enter. The author has evidently taken considerable pains to acquaint himself with the works of Canon Stubbs, Mr. Freeman, and other writers of the Oxford school, so far as they bear upon his own subject. He proceeds to discuss the remedies for present difficulties afforded by disestablishment, by an increase of supervision and control on the part of the State, and, lastly, by what he terms "constitutional adjustment," which is his own special panacea. The changes which he most strongly urges are a fusion of the two Convocations, their strengthening by the addition of a lay element, and other means tending to make Convocation a more genuinely representative body, and a reform in the system of ecclesiastical patronage. We need scarcely point out that none of these suggestions affect the more serious objections to the existence of an official connection between Church and State, and the endowment of the former by the latter. The same remark applies to the chapter in which the author professes to join issue with the advocates of Disestablishment, who would probably contemplate with equanimity most of the consequences foretold by Mr. Miller, not excluding the possibility of a Lord Chancellor—like some of the most eminent members of the present Bench—not being a member of the Church of England, of the judges omitting to open the assizes by attending church—a ceremony now usually performed in a manner which has suggested the irreverent criticism that the "learned brethren" who represent her Majesty on circuit are not only of one mind, but of one soul—and, most shocking of all—*horrescimus referentes*—of "the retirement of the bishops from the House of Lords." We so far agree with Mr. Miller as to admit that it would be scarcely satisfactory for Disestablishment of the English Church to be carried, as he predicts, by Scotch and Irish votes, instead of by the expression of the deliberate opinion of the majority of the English people.

The name of Professor Jebb is so thoroughly identified with the spirit of ancient and the cause of modern Hellenism, that the attractive little volume which he has published on "Modern Greece"<sup>3</sup> needs but few words of recommendation to those interested in one of the most urgent and important questions of the day. The book consists of two lectures delivered before the Edinburgh Philosophical Institu-

<sup>2</sup> "The Church in Relation to the State." By E. Miller. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1880.

<sup>3</sup> "Modern Greece." By R. C. Jebb. London: Macmillan & Co. 1880.

tion last winter, a paper on "The Progress of Greece," reprinted from one of the magazines, and a brief sketch of the somewhat melancholy story of Byron's connection with the Greek war of independence. In the latter paper Mr. Jebb traces with much care and skill the connection between Byron's first and last visit to Greece, and shows how the views which at the time of his death he entertained with respect to the Greek cause were substantially identical with those of Canning, and, we may add, of the most enlightened statesmen of the present day. The article on the progress of Greece, political, agricultural, and commercial, contains much valuable information, compiled from various sources, as to the present position and future prospects of the country, as to which Professor Jebb expresses himself in terms which we believe that no unprejudiced student of his pages will consider unduly sanguine. But the chief interest in the book centres in the two Edinburgh lectures, the delivery of which must have been a rare treat to the members of the Philosophical Institute. In the first the lecturer sketches the history of the Greek nationality, his main point being to prove the continuous preservation, notwithstanding Slavonic incursions and foreign domination, of that "strain of Hellenic blood" of which events have tended to the modern regeneration. He gives an interesting sketch of the effects of the Roman administration down to the inauguration of the Byzantine empire under Leo the Isaurian; and we must not omit to mention his striking picture of the aspects of social life in Greece as they would have presented themselves to "the intelligent foreigner" between 900 and 1100 A.D. The destruction of the Byzantine empire dates from a period almost coincident with the Norman conquest of England, just as the Venetian conquest of the Morea is synchronous with the English Revolution. The following passage, describing the character of the Turk as a ruler of subject races, is worth quoting, both as a thoughtful piece of analytical criticism and as a characteristic example of the author's literary and historical candour:—

"The Turk," he says, "has been called unspeakable; a bold rhetorical figure, when we consider how much he has been spoken of. In one sense no epithet could well be less happy. There is nothing ineffable about the Turkish system as such. Its distinctive feature is its rigidly matter-of-fact character. It consists in literal adherence to a few general rules. Even among well-educated Christians it may frequently be observed that few persons are apt to be more cruel than a conscientious man who has no imagination. Now, the average Turk has not much imagination; his conscience is such as is formed by his religion—that is, by the broad views and injunctions of the Korân, and his education is not calculated to correct or moderate this. The average Turk is absolutely indifferent to the results produced by applying his general rules; all that is the will of Allah. What he, as a servant of the Prophet, has to do, is to do what the Korân says, or the Sultan; and this he does with varying degrees of integrity, but not generally with any diabolical malice; often, however, without that decent moderation which armed strength is apt to forget, unless it is restrained by conscience, by cant, or by some power of seeing as the victim sees."

In the second lecture Professor Jebb gives a very readable, and in

some places amusing, account of a recent tour in Greece, "under the leadership of Miltiades," not the hero of Marathon, but a dragoman who seems to understand the requirements of English travellers. "His method," we are told, "of dealing with the natives was sometimes more summary than we could quite approve, but he had the practical merit of generally carrying his point."

"On one occasion," says Mr. Jebb, "we arrived at a village in the Morea one evening, and did not know where to look for a lodging. After some inquiries Miltiades knocked at the door of a cottage. The head of the family, a farmer, was still in the fields, and the farmer's wife naturally demurred to admitting Miltiades and his party. The dialogue that ensued is worthy of record. Miltiades, finding that persuasion failed, boldly but gravely asserted that one of the party was 'an official person.' The Greek word for 'official' is of vague and alarming import in the Greek provinces. The hostess replied, 'What sort of official?' Miltiades, unabashed, made answer by uttering the long and solemn word *καθηγητής*, 'A Professor.' This species of official was evidently a new terror in those parts. Opposition quailed. Miltiades had a keen eye for signals of distress, but like a true Greek he used his diplomatic advantage with dignified moderation; and the garrison would have surrendered at discretion, if the master of the house had not come back from the fields just then and given us a hospitable welcome."

Before parting with Professor Jebb, the critical instinct must perforce assert itself in one or two observations on minor points. We cannot understand the figures he gives about marriage portions. He says that among the agricultural classes "the parents"—of a peasant girl—"seek a young man of good character, who has laid by 3,000 or 4,000 francs; and, according to the prevalent tariff of matrimonial exchange—eligible husbands being at a premium—such a youth may reasonably expect a dower of quite six times that amount." It is difficult to believe that a young Greek peasant when he sets up house-keeping as a rule finds himself in possession of a capital of over £1,000 sterling, especially when we take into consideration the author's remarks as to the poverty and frugality of these people. One does not see where the money is to come from. In another passage Mr. Jebb speaks of going "down places certainly more difficult than the descent to Avernus," which does not strike a classical man as a very forcible illustration. Again, we twice meet with the expression, "the marked distinction," and "the innate distinction of the Hellenic character," where we fancy that the word "distinctiveness" would have more accurately expressed the author's meaning. Our last criticism is that the proofs do not seem to have been very carefully revised. The book contains a somewhat remarkable number of misprints, considering the high reputation for accuracy which Messrs. Macmillan's press deservedly enjoys. Between pp. 121 and 125 we found no less than four of these disfigurements. We have only to add an expression of our hope that the book, which is both scholarly and popular, will obtain all the success which it certainly deserves.

Messrs. F. Lloyd and C. Tebbitt<sup>4</sup> seem to have entered into one of

<sup>4</sup> "Extension of Empire, Weakness? Deficits, Ruin?" By F. Lloyd and C. Tebbitt. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1880.

those literary partnerships which we had hitherto imagined to be limited by the exigencies of composition to the art of novelists and playwrights. We can only suppose that one of these gentlemen supplies the argument and the other the rhetoric, in which case we are at a loss to know which most to admire. Beginning with the modest and important admission that they "did not create the world and are not responsible for the intellectual capacity of its denizens," Messrs. Tebbitt and Lloyd proceed to startle us with the apparently self-contradictory assertion that "we are on firm ground; we rule the seas, and on that rule depend for our existence, and in that simple dictum, which none can overthrow, lies our argument." Probably, however, we should not have felt so much surprise at this statement had we improved our "intellectual capacity" by a diligent study of the joint-authors' earlier lucubrations. "As we have shown," they inform us, "in our previous writings, the sea is but, as it were, countless rivers amalgamated and flowing at the will of the wayfarer in the direction his business takes him." The subordination of natural phenomena to the human will has seldom been expressed in a more forcible and gratifying manner. In another passage Messrs. Tebbitt and Lloyd predict that "within the lifetime of persons already in existence *hundreds of millions of men* will assert for the new continent the primacy of the universe." From this statement, which in its eloquent imagery at once recalls to the mind Burke's celebrated appeal to the recollections of Lord Bathurst, we gather that Messrs. Lloyd and Tebbitt are in possession of special and remarkable information as to the probable results of the census now in progress in the United States. It is interesting to learn from the lucid and precisely reasoned pages of our authors that "minds trained like that of the late J. S. Mill to purely abstract thinking are not healthy phenomena, the sublimity claimed for them by a certain school being due simply to a lack of that definiteness of expression which characterizes the highest form of intellect." Should our readers wish to know what it is that Messrs. Lloyd and Tebbitt are writing about, we can only say that after a conscientious study of their discursive pages we scarcely feel competent to enlighten them. On the whole, it seems that their object is to prove that the more our national responsibilities are extended by the pursuit of an "imperial" policy the greater will be our national strength; that deficits are admirable things in their way, and that the nearer we approach to public bankruptcy the greater will be the measure of the prosperity of the public. These observations unfortunately come too late, to convince a sceptical electorate of the benefits conferred on it by the foreign policy of Lord Beaconsfield and the fiscal policy of Sir Stafford Northcote. The book also contains a lengthy disquisition on the merits of repeating rifles, light net hammocks and strips of newspaper, "now easily, too easily, procurable in the field," together with some strictures on the inferiority to ensigns of sub-lieutenants. Messrs. Lloyd and Tebbitt wind up with a project for "the reconstitution of Asiatic Turkey" by "a practicable scheme," which we learn has already been submitted to "her Majesty's



Cabinet," and which we commend to the respectful consideration of Mr. Ashmead Bartlett. We are pained to learn that, although Messrs. Tebbitt and Lloyd "have applied to the Ottoman Bank, they have not yet received an estimate of the amount of Turkish pounds in circulation." Mr. Goschen should address a remonstrance to the Porte on the subject of this supine neglect and scandalous indignity to British subjects. On the whole, we shall hope to hear of Messrs. Lloyd and Tebbitt again. Life is not so lively that we can afford to lose two of its choicest humorists.

Messrs. Allen & Co. have sent us the first instalment of a new publication, consisting of a *précis* of the Parliamentary Papers of the Session,<sup>5</sup> which can scarcely fail to prove of wide utility. The work of summarization seems to have been executed with care and judgment. The part before us is largely composed of official reports on foreign affairs, but also embraces returns dealing with such varied subjects as the sale of glebe lands during the last ten years, the Indian rainfall of 1878, and the manufacture in the United States of oleo-margarine. An abstract of this kind ought to find a place on the shelves of many a library which cannot afford space for blue-books.

The somewhat sensational letter to Lord Hartington on the condition of Behar,<sup>6</sup> which has been published by Mr. C. J. O'Donnell, has already been the subject of much discussion, and many of the writer's allegations have been warmly controverted in well-informed quarters. Mr. O'Donnell, whose literary style strongly reminds us of his brother's, holds that the clearly unsatisfactory position of the ryots in the province of Behar has been brought about by an oppressive land system, by the legalized extortions of zemindars and money-lenders, and by the conditions under which indigo-planting is carried on with the favour of an official class possessing extensive relations among the planters. Mr. O'Donnell should certainly be an authority on the subject of which he treats, provided his conclusions can be assumed to be unbiassed. From a recent expression of opinion on the part of the Lieutenant-Governor, Sir Ashley Eden, taken in connection with the administrative report which has been issued by the Divisional Commissioner, we are inclined to hope that the view expressed by Mr. O'Donnell is unnecessarily sombre. He certainly will not aid his cause by speaking of the "vapourings" of Dr. Hurter, and dismissing that eminent official as "a gentleman of exceptionally narrow Indian experience, and exceptionally small Indian repute." We do not know whether the courage or the impropriety of such language, applied by a former subordinate to his superior, is the more worthy of remark or animadversion.

For further information on the indigo trade, Mr. O'Donnell's readers may turn to a useful volume on "Indian Industries,"<sup>7</sup> which, without

<sup>5</sup> "Précis of Official Papers, Session 1880." London: Allen & Co. 1880.

<sup>6</sup> "The Ruin of an Indian Province." By C. J. O'Donnell. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1880.

<sup>7</sup> "Indian Industries." By A. G. F. Eliot James. London: Allen & Co. 1880.

much pretence to originality, has been compiled in a very convenient form, the various subjects being arranged alphabetically, by Mrs. Eliot James. She says that

“The indigo factories when conducted on a large scale cannot fail to give a good interest for the money invested in them. It is the ryot who suffers in a bad season. They say ‘indigo is a fine thing to put money into the purse of the *baboo*, but the poor people do not want to see it, it raises the price of rice, and the rent of land.’ The small owners argue in this way when they have entered into a contract with a planter to deliver to him so much *pât*, and accept his advances for bullocks, seed, &c., because too often there is a bad season, and they, falling in debt to the factory they have agreed to cultivate their land for, have to continue season after season working for the planter until the debt is paid, too often only adding to it, instead of reducing it.”

We are glad to learn from another article that the Indian Government has recently turned its attention to the possibility of encouraging the establishment of breweries in the hill districts; we had always supposed that as far as this particular industry was concerned Messrs. Bass & Co. enjoyed a practical monopoly of the Indian market. Mrs. James says :

“The brewing of hill-beer is a question sensibly affecting the Indian revenue, for naturally it can be brewed in the country at far less expense than it can be imported from elsewhere. Beer for the British soldier plays no mean part in military expenditure at home or abroad. It has been roughly stated that in the Bengal Presidency alone the annual consumption of beer by the troops is about 50,000 hogsheads. The saving on this amount, if hill-beer at 10 rupees per hogshead was substituted for imported beer at 65 rupees per hogshead, would amount to five lakhs of rupees. . . . That there is an increased demand for hill-beer, both for ordinary drinking and for commissariat issue, is, I am well aware, a fact. In 1877 the imports of ale, beer, and porter were estimated at over 31½ lakhs; in 1878 they had fallen to 24½ lakhs; and this not counting the liquor imported by Government for storage, the value of which fell from over 21 lakhs to less than 11¾ lakhs.”

Another result of this movement is an increase in the imports of English hops; so that India seems to be conspiring with Mr. Gladstone in his efforts to help the British farmer. Mrs. James gives an interesting account of the present aspects of Indian mining industries. The possibility of obtaining both gold and iron in considerable quantities has recently been the subject of a good deal of attention. The great difficulty with respect to prospecting in the quartz for gold seems to lie in the complicated distribution of proprietary and mineral rights, and the uncertainty which exists as to their respective limits. As to the iron ore, which is found in exceptional purity in very many parts of India, the obstacle which has always prevented the development of this industry is the cost of fuel. Unless charcoal can be obtained at a reasonable price, without excessive denudation of the forests, the expenses of production, we fear, will probably continue to exceed the market value of the product. Many readers will turn with more interest from the subject of mining industries to the author's somewhat optimistic discussion of the opium trade, as to which we observe that the lucidity of its conclusion is marred by inaccurate punctuation. By the way, Mrs.

James should disabuse her mind of the vulgar error which ascribes the "Periplus" to Arrian.\*

Mr. Mulhall, hitherto best known as an authority on South American subjects, has now sought a wider field, and may literally be said in his "Progress of the World"<sup>8</sup> to survey mankind from China to Peru. The object of his work is to illustrate by statistics the advances made by civilization during the present century. When the plan is so extensive, the accuracy of the execution can be only approximate; but the book in its present form should prove a useful companion to Mr. Martin's annual publication, and we may safely trust to a demand for a second edition to enable the author to correct any errors in detail. Figures are often fallacious, and their import not always easy to realize; but many of Mr. Mulhall's tables are worth studying for the striking picture which they present of social and commercial progress, as also for the purpose of comparing the various degrees of development at present attained by different States.

Few more valuable contributions have been made to what we may perhaps be allowed to call the science of International Law than the volume which has been published by Mr. W. E. Hall,<sup>9</sup> who is already favourably known to students of the subject by his useful and conscientious treatise on the "Rights and Duties of Neutrals." The treatment is able and discriminating, the literary style leaves nothing to be desired, and the book is probably as complete as, when it is attempted to deal in a single volume with so many legal and historical topics, could reasonably be expected. Mr. Hall is well acquainted with the theories of his predecessors, and devotes a good deal of his space to exposing the eccentricities of certain foreign publicists. Without going to such extremes in the way of reference as Halleck, he is quite full enough in mentioning the views of such writers as Heffter and Calvo, Ortolan and Hautefeuille; while Bluntschli, whom he seems to know in the French translation only, he treats with deserved respect. One of Mr. Hall's qualifications for the work he has undertaken is a profound acquaintance, rare among English writers, and almost worthy of Von Ranke himself, with the diplomatic history of his subject. The history, classification, and legal value of treaties have seldom been so ably and clearly discussed. If we wished to find fault with Mr. Hall, there are of course many points in his work which suggest criticism, and are open to question; but our general impression is so favourable that we are unwilling, even if space permitted, to enter into much fault-finding with details. We cannot, however, avoid expressing our dissatisfaction with the writer's opening statement. He tells us that "international law consists in certain rules of conduct which modern civilized states regard as being binding on them in their relations with one another, with a force comparable in nature and

\* See WESTMINSTER REVIEW, January, 1880, p. 248.

<sup>8</sup> "The Progress of the World." By M. G. Mulhall. London: Stanford. 1880.

<sup>9</sup> "International Law." By W. E. Hall. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1880.

degree to that binding the conscientious person to obey the laws of his country, and which they also regard as being enforceable by appropriate means in case of infringement." We read in our books that "the Court of Chancery has never ventured to define fraud;" and perhaps on the whole it would be as well for the publicists to follow this prudent example and give up the attempt, which has baffled so many of them, to formulate a satisfactory definition of international law. Mr. Hall's definition is not a definition at all. It is a cumbrous attempt to include in a single sentence the various matters which fall within his projected treatment of the subject. It is loose in the extreme, involving as it does such phrases as "comparable in nature and degree," "the conscientious person," and "enforceable by appropriate means;" it is not exhaustive, since it excludes the whole province of what is known as private international law, a branch of jurisprudence which at the present day has a much more recognized and definite operation than the public law of nations, and which is constantly giving rise to difficult questions which the tribunals of various countries have to adjudicate as best they can. Perhaps, however, Mr. Hall is judicious in his deliberate exclusion of this subject, although he is obliged in several places to modify his purpose, and deal with it in a more or less incidental manner; for further information most readers will be content to turn to the new edition of Mr. Westlake's able treatise. Lastly, as it would not do the student the least good to commit Mr. Hall's definition to memory, it is perhaps no serious objection that it would be impossible for the ordinary mind to do so. The best statement on the subject which we have ever heard is that "international law consists of those rules of positive morality which govern or ought to govern the mutual intercourse, in peace and war, of civilized states and their respective subjects." This is explicit, fairly exhaustive, and at all events concise; but after our strictures on Mr. Hall we will not be rash enough to call it a definition. We must add that, with reference to the American claims against England, arising from the equipment of the *Alabama* and other vessels, Mr. Hall's somewhat summary statement of the law seems to be tinged by a patriotic bias, which indeed is traceable in more than one portion of his work. He does not even mention the remarkable case of the *Alexandra*. His short reference to the *Trent* controversy is, we think, obnoxious to a similar observation. He goes so far as to lay down, in apparent contradiction to some previous statements, that "if belligerent persons, whatever their quality, go on board a neutral vessel as simple passengers to the place whither she is bound, the ship remains neutral, and covers the persons on board with the protection of her neutral character." He thus extends the principle of the Paris Declaration, by which the United States are not bound, from goods to persons, but surely it is more natural to classify the latter among the "analogues of contraband" and the ship which conveys them as engaged on unneutral service. It seems a pity that Mr. Hall confines himself to a fragmentary extract from the "three rules" of the Treaty of Washington. We suppose he is aware that the International Institute, at its Brussels

meeting, declared those rules to be exegetic of existing law, though open to improvement in point of wording. We cannot help thinking that much may be expected in the future from the labours of the Institute and its fellow-worker, the Association for the Reform and Codification of the Laws of Nations, which this year held their annual meetings at Oxford and Berne. Thus at the Antwerp meeting of the latter body something like a common understanding was arrived at on the troublesome question of general average, while at Frankfort that of foreign bills of exchange was treated with similar success. Perhaps there is no subject on which an international agreement is at once more desirable and more feasible than that of nationality, particularly in the case of children born in a country other than that of their parents' domicile, and in that of married women. By the present law of the United States, a Frenchwoman who marries an American citizen acquires her husband's nationality, while an American lady marrying a Frenchman retains her own. In the latter case the French law of course takes a different view, and has at least the merit of being consistent with itself. So far indeed is the French theory carried that, as Mr. Hall points out, a Frenchman making a bigamous marriage with a foreign woman gives her his nationality by the mere form of going through a ceremony which is null and void.

Mr. James Paterson, who, we believe, is a member of both the English and the Scotch Bar, and a considerable authority on the mysteries of Scotch jurisprudence, has published a further instalment of his "Commentaries," and now discusses "the liberty of the Press, of speech, and of public worship,"<sup>10</sup> while he throws in some chapters on the law of copyright, and other topics which he seems to consider more or less connected with the main scope of his treatise. The book contains a good deal of information, though both method and style leave much to be desired. Mr. Paterson says in his preface that "everything of importance relating to Public Meetings, Sedition, Liberty of the Press, Libel, Privilege of Parliament, Contempt of Court, Copyright and Patent Right, the rights and duties as well as the position and property of the Clergy and of Dissenters, and their mutual toleration is here treated." We doubt whether any writer could make good such a claim within the compass of a single volume of moderate size; and we are sure that Mr. Paterson has failed to do so. We might almost fill a page with the mere citation of important modern cases to which we can find no reference. Thus, in discussing the reporting of Parliamentary proceedings, Mr. Paterson omits to state that the common practice of reporting the proceedings of committees is technically a breach of privilege, though in so recent a case as that of the Foreign Loans Committee, over which Mr. Lowe presided, the printers of two leading newspapers were required, on the motion of Mr. Disraeli, to attend at the bar of the House for this offence; and the whole subject

<sup>10</sup> "The Liberty of the Press, Speech, and Public Worship: being Commentaries on the Liberty of the Subject and the Laws of England." By J. Paterson. London: Macmillan & Co. 1880.

of Parliamentary privilege is very inadequately treated, especially in its modern aspects. When we turn to the account of public meetings, we find the old distinctions between a "riot," a "rout," and a "riotous assembly" entirely ignored. Again, in writing of clerical offences and the ecclesiastical courts, though the author refers more than once to Mr. Mackonochie's case, he makes no mention of the important judgment of the Court of Appeal reversing the decision of the Queen's Bench Division as to the jurisdiction of Lord Penzance's Court and the appropriate method of its exercise. One of the subjects with which Mr. Paterson naturally deals at length is the right of petitioning. He does not make quite clear his view of the extent, if any, to which the Tumultuous Petitioning Act of 1661 was modified by the declaration in the Bill of Rights. In our opinion that declaration amounted merely to a general assertion of the right to petition, and in no way affected the points in which the manner of exercising that right was regulated by the Act, which, we take it, is still nominally in force. Space forbids us to follow Mr. Paterson in his elaborate disquisition on the law of libel, which contains much curious and miscellaneous learning, though some of his statements seem open to exception. We cannot agree with his view that the theory that a libel tends to provoke a breach of the peace has fallen into desuetude; it certainly exercises no small influence on the criminal procedure, and particularly on the qualified validity of truth as a defence. When he says that "the man who could not get his money from an evasive debtor would strike a blow as readily and with as much propriety as he who had been accused of theft would strike his accuser," we can only express our disagreement with the writer's view of human nature. In mentioning that "a criminal information has some advantages in bringing about an apology at an early stage, though that result is not deemed a *meritorious ground* for the application," he rather understates the present practice of the Court, which is not to grant a rule without a previous undertaking to prosecute the charge irrespective of any such apology. In conclusion, we may take this opportunity of observing that there is one portion of this subject which neither Mr. Paterson nor, so far as we are aware, any other writer has attempted to treat in a satisfactory manner. We refer to the question of the rights of British subjects of alien race in dependencies of the Crown—rights which, since the time of Lord Mansfield's famous judgment in "*Fabrigas v. Mostyn*," have been steadily growing in importance, but have never yet been scientifically examined, elucidated, or defined. Mr. Paterson has much to say of the liberty of the Press; but the Vernacular Press Act of the late Government is not even mentioned in a footnote. It is very difficult to get satisfactory information as to the working of this Act. Many persons of experience and authority have always thought it unnecessary, while few defend it on principle. By many it is believed to have been practically a failure, and the long absence on furlough of the Press Commissioner gives some colour to the supposition that the Act has proved either uncalled for or unworkable. We cannot refrain from expressing a hope that at no distant date Mr. Gladstone will see

his way to repeal a measure against the enactment of which, both in Parliament and in Midlothian, he raised so earnest and powerful a protest.

The recent publication of the report of the Commission on the Parochial Charities of the City of London, the attitude taken up by the London School Board with reference to those endowments, the appointment of another Commission to inquire into the administration of the revenues of the City Companies, and the presence in office of a Ministry pledged to vigorous reform, are all circumstances which render it extremely probable that the great question of charitable endowments will soon be dealt with in a more energetic fashion than has hitherto been possible, and that some attempt will be made to sweep away and prevent the recurrence of some of the most flagrant abuses which have hitherto seemed inseparable from the foundations of private beneficence. Hence the masterly discussion of "the true principles of legislation with regard to property given for charitable or other public uses," which we owe to the pen of Mr. C. S. Kenny,<sup>11</sup> seems to us peculiarly seasonable in its appearance. This is not the first time that we have had occasion in these pages to commend Mr. Kenny's essays on legal and social subjects; and the present volume furnishes another proof of the manner in which a university prize essay may be judiciously turned to account for the encouragement of literary ability and the promotion of research. Mr. Kenny's book, we venture to predict, will for the future prove an indispensable manual to all students of the subject, and should be in the hands of those of our legislators who would approach the work of reform with a mind informed as to what has been done in the past and what is practicable in the future. After an exhaustive examination of the history of the subject, accompanied by numerous and striking examples of the mischief effected by charities, mischievous in their conception, perverted in their administration, or rendered obsolete by modern progress, Mr. Kenny concludes by expressing his opinion that—

"Foundations in themselves are usually good, but when left to themselves they usually become bad. A course nevertheless is possible by which the badness may be minimized and the good maintained. There must be constant supervision, periodical revision. The one will restrain the principle of caducity, the other will counteract the principle of obsolescence. Moreover, though foundations at their outset are usually good, they are by no means good invariably. A considerable minority either spring from a bad origin or tend to a bad result. Lest this minority should be increased, the law must impose certain restrictions on the establishment of new foundations."

His book contains many highly practical suggestions for facilitating in the future the task of restriction, supervision, and revision, for rendering these essential checks less capricious in their working, and for removing the obstacles which at present impede their regular and effective operation.

The supply of manuals of political economy has perhaps of recent

<sup>11</sup> "Endowed Charities." By C. S. Kenny. London: Reeves & Turner. 1880.

years been somewhat in excess of the demand, but we dare say that Mr. J. L. Shadwell has been well advised in reprinting from the columns of the *Labour News* his concise discussion of the subject;<sup>12</sup> many of those who have followed his observations on the topics of production, population, value, distribution, trades unions, co-operation, and the other matters with which the modern economist has to deal may be glad to possess them in a permanent form. The writer's views on the question of population and the working of the poor law, though sensible enough, are perhaps rather too controversial in their character for an elementary textbook. On the whole, the book is one for which space might well be found on the shelves of a Mechanics' Institute.

We have received a copy of the twenty-third edition of "A Guide to the Law,"<sup>13</sup> by "a Barrister." The number of editions attests the popularity of the work, and we can only express a charitable hope that such compilations, on the whole, do more good than harm. The present work seems to have been carefully revised and brought up to date, and, as far as we can judge, to correspond as well as could be expected with its somewhat ambitious title. In some cases the author seems to have contented himself with a literal recitation of statutory provisions of portentous length, instead of giving a concise explanation of their purport. Thus, under the heading of "Avoidance of Unregistered Bills of Sale," we have thirty-six lines of the complicated terminology of Parliamentary draftsmen with no other break than an occasional comma. In discussing specialty contracts, the writer observes that "a date is not essential to the validity of a deed," and that "it is valid without a signature." These are two pieces of information which it would perhaps have been more prudent to withhold.

Too late for detailed notice we have received a treatise by Mr. Boyd Kinnear on "The Principles of Property in Land;"<sup>14</sup> and a volume of "Lectures on the Science and Art of Education,"<sup>15</sup> by the late Mr. Joseph Payne. Both works deal with subjects of great and immediate interest, and are valuable as well from the authority of the writers as for the intrinsic merits of their contents. Mr. Kinnear is both a lawyer and a farmer; he brings to the discussion of the land question the fruits of much study and wide experience; and both his conclusions and his reasons are well and clearly expressed. He advocates the subdivision of large properties, which he regards as both economically and socially injurious, by removing the present restrictions on free trade in land and limiting the right of testamentary disposition. Mr. Payne's

---

<sup>12</sup> "Political Economy for the People." By J. L. Shadwell. London: Trübner & Co. 1886.

<sup>13</sup> "A Guide to the Law." By a Barrister. Twenty-third Edition. London: Stevens & Sons. 1880.

<sup>14</sup> "Principles of Property in Land." By J. Boyd Kinnear. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1880.

<sup>15</sup> "Lectures on the Science and Art of Education." By the late Joseph Payne. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1880.



lectures and other papers have been edited by his son, Dr. J. F. Payne, and are preceded by an interesting introduction from the pen of Mr. Quick. The fact that there is a science of education is now pretty generally recognized, and its recognition is in no small degree due to Mr. Payne's persevering labours at the College of Preceptors. The scientific training of teachers has now been taken up, as a portion of its curriculum, by the University of Cambridge, and the schoolmaster of the future, taught how to teach by men like Mr. Quick and Mr. Fitch, ought to produce results very different from those of the empirical method which has so long and obstinately held its own in England. In connection with this subject, we may also refer to a lecture by Mr. Sonnenschein,<sup>16</sup> containing some useful criticisms on our present system of elementary education—elicited by Mr. Matthew Arnold's much canvassed report in favour of "simplification"—and contrasting our fashion of instruction, its cost and its results, with those in vogue on the Continent.

Probably not one in a hundred of our readers—if the supposition that these criticisms may peradventure be perused by so large a number of persons is not itself extravagant—has ever heard of Mr. Jonathan Dymond, who, more than half a century ago, took the wayward notions of current morality in hand, trampled Paley under foot, scorned the path of hedonism on the one side and that of eudæmonism on the other, and erected an ethical system on the sure foundation of the revealed will of God. "Those plagiarists, our ancestors," must often have been on the lips of Professor Birks, if ever he looked into the pages of his brother-philosopher Jonathan. The ideas of the worthy Dymond seem always to have found a congenial public, it is scarcely worth while to inquire in what quarter; and a "seventh English edition"<sup>17</sup> of his work has now been dedicated—we should fancy from the preface by one of his children's children—"to that small but increasing number who maintain the great duty of conforming to the laws of Christian morality." The chapter on "legal"—as distinguished, we suppose, from "Christian"—morality is, in its way, quite a curiosity of literature, and we commend it, as vacation reading, to the author of "Hortensius." In another chapter the author suggests that the evil of Sunday papers, with their unprofitable contents, might be remedied by "an additional twopence on the stamp duty." By way of compensation, however, he denounces the observance of Christmas Day and Good Friday as a "turning to beggarly elements." Certain scrupulous Nonconformists may perhaps console themselves for a vote recently extorted from them by party discipline, when they learn that Mr. Dymond devotes more than one elaborate argument to attacking the exaction of an oath of allegiance. We have said enough to show that there is a good deal of entertainment to be derived from the work before us; it is also, in many respects, an able exposition of modern

<sup>16</sup> "Elementary Education at Home and Abroad." By A. Sonnenschein. London: W. Swan Sonnenschein & Allen. 1880.

<sup>17</sup> "Essays on the Principles of Morality." By Jonathan Dymond. Seventh edition. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1880.

Puritanism; but serious students of ethical science will probably prefer Mr. Sedgwick's "Methods."

"Social Rights and Principles"<sup>18</sup> is a very singular book. It is published anonymously at Glasgow, and we read with horror that it is only the first instalment of a treatise on "constitutional liberty." It begins with a discussion of law and liberty, including the development of a theory that "literature is not a profession, but personal and free," and winds up with some remarks on the value of introductions and the proper occasions for morning calls. "There are pleasure and profit," says the author, "in listening, and to try to teach is a wholly different matter, more troublesome and difficult than at first it seems." We should have hoped that by applying this principle the publication of the remaining portions of "Constitutional Liberty" might have been indefinitely postponed; but as the writer goes on to remark that "it is best to have no thought of pecuniary profit," we must not feel too sanguine. We should like to know why he refers to "Dr. Sa. Johnson's English Dictionary." As Miss Betsy Trotwood would put it, "Why Sa?" In another passage the writer quotes Cicero's distinction between *prudentia* and *iustitia*, and then recklessly proceeds to render his quotation, translating *prudentia* by "prudence!" That he is "no scholar" may be not his fault but his misfortune; but still he might have asked a question.

Brazil and the country of the Amazons is a subject which seems to exercise a special fascination for the traveller's pen, but we cannot refuse a welcome to the handsome and beautifully illustrated volume which Mr. Herbert Smith has published,<sup>19</sup> and which reached us too late for notice in our last number, on the ground that we have already been sufficiently familiarized with the scenes which he so vividly describes. Mr. Smith's impressions are not those of a mere superficial sightseer, but of a careful and experienced observer, who has spared no pains to acquaint himself as well with the physical characteristics of the Amazon and its tributaries, and the surrounding districts, as with the social and commercial life of the denizens of the Brazilian Empire. "As my personal adventures and observations," he says, "were in themselves hardly worth writing about, I have avoided a purely narrative form." The idea was, we think, a judicious one; though there is a certain deficiency of coherence and arrangement in Mr. Smith's pages, they are almost always agreeable reading, and free from the tedious repetitions so often met with in the "purely narrative form." Mr. Smith's description of life at Rio Janeiro and Para is particularly interesting; and from his account it seems by no means improbable that the latter city, which boasts the title of the Queen of the Amazons, may in future supplant Rio itself as the commercial capital of Brazil. There can be no doubt that the navigation of the Amazons, especially when taken in connection with the progress of

<sup>18</sup> "Constitutional Liberty. Part I. Social Rights and Principles." Glasgow : Porteous. 1880.

<sup>19</sup> "Brazil, the Amazons and the Coast." By H. H. Smith. London : Sampson Low & Co. 1880.

the railway system of the interior, is destined to attain very great development. As Mr. Smith observes, "even the Darien ship-canal, if it is ever made, cannot compete with this straight, deep channel for the trade of the western republics." We must content ourselves with a bare mention of Mr. Smith's interesting account of the coffee plantations, and the existing conditions and effects of slave labour, which is to be abolished throughout the empire in 1892. Another chapter, which will command the attention of a different class of readers, is that devoted to the "Myths of the Amazonian Indians," a rich field of folk-lore which the author is engaged in investigating with a view to further and more detailed treatment. Mr. Smith's work, taken in connection with the volume by Mr. Ober, which we reviewed in our last number, and to which, in many respects, both in point of manner and matter, it bears considerable resemblance, affords a fresh proof of the formidable rivalry to which we are now exposed on the part of our American cousins, both in adventurous exploration and artistic literature.

Knowing as we do by long and painful experience for how much dreary and foolish literature the friends of bashful authors have been held responsible, we were at once prepossessed in favour of Captain Colville's account of his travels in Morocco,<sup>20</sup> when we learnt from the preface that it had been written with a view to publication "and *not* published at the earnest request of the writer's numerous friends." Our favourable impression was fully confirmed by the perusal of one of the most racy and graphic narratives of travel and adventure which it has been our good fortune to come across. After a preliminary visit to Fez, Captain Colville prepared himself for an exploration of the *terra incognita* which lies between the capital of his Shereefian Majesty and the Algerian frontier, by a conscientious study of the Moorish language, and of the manners and customs of the singular people, so inhospitable as a rule to Christians and strangers, whose country he intended to traverse. After a long delay at Fez, of which curious city he gives a very picturesque description, he was fortunate enough to obtain a circular letter from the Sultan, which ensured him the hospitality and escort of the various kaid's or local governors through whose districts he had to pass; and the journey was made, if not exactly without peril, at all events in safety so far as the principal travellers were concerned, though the writer casually expresses an opinion that his muleteers, who did not turn up to receive their pay at the last stage, "were probably robbed and murdered on the road." Perhaps the boldest thing which Captain Colville did was to take his wife with him. The Captain was dressed as a distinguished Moor; while his lady was got up to represent, in case of inquiry, a complimentary offering from the Sultan of Morocco to "the Sultan of the French." The pluck and intrepidity which "A" seems to have exhibited throughout her adventurous "ride in petticoats and slippers" are quite beyond criticism; but we fancy that few members of the

---

<sup>20</sup> "A Ride in Petticoats and Slippers." By Captain H. E. Colville. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1880.

weaker sex, after reading this book, are likely to feel inclined to spend their honeymoon between Fez and Oudjda. Morocco is not quite a holiday resort for the ordinary tourist; it has not at present been taken in hand by the enterprising Mr. Cook; it does not even seem to have as yet afforded a very favourable field for the labours of missionaries. Captain Colville tells us a story of "a well-meaning gentleman, with more enthusiasm than brains, who made some attempts to convert the Moslems of Tangier. His method was simply to go into the marketplace, accompanied by an interpreter, and read aloud from the Bible, pausing between each sentence for the interpreter to translate the sacred words to the crowd. That worthy having some respect for his own life, explained at each pause that his employer was a madman of a very pronounced type, and must on no account be molested. As the Moors have a great respect for madmen, this explanation probably saved the missionary's life. On another occasion this gentleman sought to overthrow the teachings of Mohammed by stationing himself in a window, overlooking the main street, armed with a prayer-book and a watering-pot. From the one he read the baptismal service, and from the other poured the baptismal water on the heads of the passers-by." We should add that Captain Colville was not actuated in his travels merely by a love of novelty and adventure. He gives us a great deal of information respecting the remarkable agricultural capacities of Morocco, hitherto almost entirely undeveloped. There can be little doubt that for some time the French have had their eye quite as much on the dominions of the Sultan of Morocco on the west, as on those of the Bey of Tunis on the east; and the country explored for the first time by Captain Colville is the natural line of a French advance. Neither can we doubt that, so long as we intend to retain possession of Gibraltar, it can never be a matter of indifference to us that Tangier should be occupied by a friendly power.

Another work on Morocco lies on our table and next claims attention. Nothing could be more sumptuous than the form in which Messrs. Cassell have produced a translation, by Mr. Rollin Tilton, of Signor Edmondo di Amicis' description of his journey from Tangier to Fez as a member of an Italian Embassy to the Sultan.<sup>21</sup> The book was noticed by the press at the time of its appearance, and, though written in a style worthy of its author's reputation as a traveller and journalist, contains no such novel adventures in districts hitherto unexplored as those recounted by Captain Colville. We wish "the European concert" would direct its attention to securing a better treatment of the unhappy Jews in Morocco. Their presence as the only class in the community possessing the commercial instinct is recognised as indispensable by the Moorish authorities, who "oppose an almost insupportable barrier to emigration, prohibiting the departure of any Jewish woman from Morocco." At the same time, the oppressive and tyrannical regulations under which they live, and their periodical persecution by the

<sup>21</sup> "Morocco: its People and Places." By E. de Amicis. Translated by C. Rollin Tilton. London: Cassell & Co.

fanatical hatred of the populace, are nothing less than a disgrace to the nineteenth century. The translation of M. de Amicis' work seems to have been very well executed, and our only regret is that in the matter of illustrations quantity seems to have been preferred to quality. The book is a handsome specimen of drawing-room table literature, only distinguishable from many other works of the same class by the excellence of its letterpress.

We really thought that before now we had heard the last of "Campaigning in South Africa;"<sup>22</sup> but we cannot deny that Captain Montague's contribution to our knowledge of the history of the Zulu war, and of the lessons derivable from that episode in our military history, though unnecessarily spun out, is in many respects worth reading. A great many of the gallant Captain's descriptive passages seem to have been infected by the dulness and tedium, which he so frequently insists on, of campaigning in the savage and sterile country he has to write about. His own share of the military experiences of the expedition seems to have been of the slightest, as he was unlucky enough to be told off for garrison duty at a fort on the route, instead of joining in the final march to Ulundi. Captain Montague's criticisms are quite as outspoken as could be expected from an officer on active service. He seems to have shared Lord Strathnairn's opinion of the soldierly qualities and discipline of our boyish troops. In one passage he speaks of "a disgraceful state of curious excitement, then a common and disgusting feature of our young soldiers;" and he is never weary of repeating that the whole army, from the highest to the lowest, during the whole course of the expedition to Ulundi, was under the domination of "General Funk." The General—Chelmsford, we mean, not Funk—does not seem to have inspired that confidence in the minds of his officers which is so essential a part of strategy; he was too busy, according to the writer, with *minutiæ*, such as getting spans of oxen over a drift, which should have been left to the staff. "He walked quickly," we read, "turning his head from side to side; and stopping frequently to remark on some arrangement which required alteration. He gave one the idea of a man preoccupied, under a spell, and glad to get rid of his thoughts by an incessant attention to details. The sad day of Isandlwana had left its traces plainly marked on his face and manner." With regard to Isandlwana, Captain Montague's account, based on the narratives of survivors, of the manner in which that disaster was brought about, does not precisely tally with the explanation recently given by Lord Chelmsford in the House of Lords. According to Captain Montague, who gives a striking description of a visit to the field of battle some five months afterwards, the position was, as Lord Chelmsford stated, one perfectly easy to defend by an adequate force. But the force in camp was not adequate; moreover, the Zulu system of formation was then not properly understood; and the consequence was that the fatal encircling "horn" was allowed to take our

<sup>22</sup> "Campaigning in South Africa." By Captain W. E. Montague. Edinburgh and London: Blackwood & Sons. 1880.

troops in their unguarded flank and rear. If Captain Montague is not too favourable in his comments either on his superior officers or on the troops he had to command, he speaks still more bitterly of the "new brooms" who, after he and his comrades had undergone the burden and heat of the day, the labour and the peril, came out at the last moment to rob them of all the glory, such as it was. Out of only two things during the whole campaign does he seem to have derived genuine amusement. One was a copy of verses by Robert Buchanan on "Isandula," which one of our contemporaries was cruel enough on print; and the other was the unheroic adventure of Sir Garnet Wolseley and his staff tossing about for hours in a surf-boat, and vainly attempting to effect a landing at Port Durnford. What Captain Montague says about the qualities of the Basutos increases our indignation at the quarrel which the Cape Government has thought fit to pick with our former plucky and loyal allies. In this connection, we may mention that we have received from Cape Town a pamphlet, in which Mr. Orpen, a well-known member of the Legislative Assembly, prints the petition of the Basutos, together with a useful statement of their undoubted grievances.<sup>24</sup>

From America we have received an account from the pen of Judge Cowley of his experiences as Judge-Advocate of the South Atlantic Blockading Squadron, under Admiral Dahlgren, from July 1863 till the end of the civil war.<sup>23</sup> The book contains an interesting description of the Charleston blockade, and the facility with which it was evaded; while it is important to note the writer's admission that a much larger proportion of the cargoes of the blockade-runners was owned in New York than in Liverpool or London. Most of the personal details and criticisms contained in Judge Cowley's volume will scarcely be appreciated on this side the Atlantic. Among the most regrettable episodes of the war was the subjection by the Confederates of military prisoners to the horrors of bombardment and exposure on the Charleston race-course, and the retaliatory measures which, as Mr. Cowley admits, the Federals were in the end obliged to adopt. We also learn that the conduct of the Mayor of Charleston, on the evacuation of that city by its defenders, failed to commend itself to the Federal Judge-Advocate. "The most ignorant hoodlum," we read, "that the caprices of rumsellers ever tossed into the civic chair could hardly have acted with less dignity, in a critical hour." This is almost as severe as the author's subsequent criticism of a passage written by Mr. John Morley. "Whatever sublime, stoic, philosophic indifference pious positivists like Mr. Mill, Mr. Morley, and Miss Martineau may educate themselves to feel touching their own immortality," is the beginning of what Judge Cowley's countrymen would probably call a "tall" sentence, but does not seem to have much to do with a lawyer's reminiscences, whether afloat or ashore. We

<sup>23</sup> "Some Principles of Native Government and the Petition of the Basuto Tribe. By J. M. Orpen, M.L.A. Cape Town: Saul Solomon. 1880.

<sup>24</sup> "Leaves from a Lawyer's Life, Afloat and Ashore." By Charles Cowley Lowell: Penhallow Printing Co. 1880.

must add that the book is execrably printed. Twice we come across references to Nelson's alleged "delatoriness and incapacity." We feel sure that no French general ever informed his troops that "*La France regarde vous.*" On a later page we find such curiosities as "disloged the enemy," "Cæser's descent," and "cavorting on a horse." This latter word, however, frightful as it is, does not seem to be a misprint, as we afterwards encounter General Sherman "cavorting over Georgia" and other districts. In the abstract of the contents of one chapter we find "Admiral Farragut's bon mot;" when we come to the "bon mot" it appears that the Admiral had remarked that "you can't make omelettes without breaking eggs." So original a witticism clearly deserved a special record.

We have also to acknowledge an account of the measures taken for the relief of the distress caused by the Irish Famine of 1846-7, which first appeared in the *Edinburgh Review* for January, 1848, and has now been opportunely reprinted by Sir Charles Trevelyan.<sup>25</sup> Vols. 13, 14, 15, and 16 of the Italian "Annali di Statistica,"<sup>26</sup> of which Vol. 13 contains an interesting account, by Vittorio Ellena, of the principal Italian industries, with a comparative survey of those of Germany; Vol. 14 deals in a somewhat esoteric manner with the science of "Social Arithmetics," while the remaining volumes contain discussions of numerous topics of general and varied interest to statesmen, economists, and other students of social science, among the topics discussed being the "Transactions of the Natural (*sic*) Association for the Promotion of Social Science," at its Cheltenham Congress of 1878: also the annual report on Italian emigration for 1879.<sup>27</sup> A pamphlet on the organization of middle-class education,<sup>28</sup> addressed by Earl Fortescue—whose active support of the new Cavendish College at Cambridge and of the county-school system entitles him to a respectful hearing on the subject—to the Bishop of Exeter, in which his lordship deprecates the dangers of officialism, and argues against the centralization of educational control. A pamphlet on "Bank Note and Banking Reform, with Suggestions for a New Banking Act,"<sup>29</sup> by Mr. J. K. Greig, who is a bank manager at Leeds, and who believes that the adoption of the changes he advocates would lead to "the establishment of our banking and currency system on a sound and permanent footing." A lecture on "Associated Homes,"<sup>30</sup> by Mr. E. V. Neale, illustrated by engravings of the Familistère of Guise, and containing an interesting account of its founder, M. Godin, who seems to be just the person for Mr. Smiles, when in search of a

<sup>25</sup> "The Irish Crisis of 1846-7." By Sir C. Trevelyan, Bart., K.C.B. London: Macmillan & Co. 1880.

<sup>26</sup> "Annali di Statistica," Serie 2<sup>a</sup>, vols. 13-16. Roma: Tip. Eredi Botta. 1880.

<sup>27</sup> "Statistica della Emigrazione Italiana." Roma: Tip. Cenniniana. 1880.

<sup>28</sup> "Public Schools for the Middle Classes." By Earl Fortescue. London: W. Ridgway. 1880.

<sup>29</sup> "Bank Note and Banking Reform." By J. K. Greig. London: Wilson. 1880.

<sup>30</sup> "Associated Homes." By E. V. Neale. London: Macmillan & Co. 1880.

subject, to immortalize. The eleventh volume of the "Proceedings of the Colonial Institute,"<sup>31</sup> which contains some valuable papers. A highly rhetorical oration in favour of a protective policy,<sup>32</sup> delivered at Sydney by Mr. David Buchanan, who seems to be a member both of the Legislature and the bar of New South Wales, and which received, we regret to learn, "a perfect ovation" from the working men of that city. Lastly, an essay, published by Stanford, on the constitutional union of the United Kingdom with the colonies enjoying responsible Government.<sup>33</sup> The author begins by the statement that "public opinion, on the part of Liberals and Conservatives alike, has so emphatically declared in favour of a legislative union of the British Parliamentary colonies with the mother country, that it has become no longer necessary to advocate the proposition merely in a general way. The question is now ripe for determining the actual method by which this union is to be effected." As we cannot concur in the writer's premises, we must be excused from discussing in detail the "practical method" which he proceeds to develop.

#### SCIENCE.

PROFESSOR BALL'S "Elements of Astronomy"<sup>34</sup> is an admirable treatise, designed for the use of students. It is a happy exemplification of the advantage of having an elementary book written by a great master of his subject, for while capable of being used for younger students, it also provides such knowledge as will meet the wants of those who wish to follow the subject farther. The volume necessarily concerns the questions discussed in similar works, and is divided into twelve chapters which relate to the instruments used in astronomical observations, the earth, diurnal motion of the heavens, the sun, motion of the earth around the sun, the moon, the planets, comets and meteors, universal gravitation, stars and nebulae, and the structure of the sun. The last chapter, termed astronomical constants, contains a vast amount of valuable information of a technical character. The reader is presumed to be acquainted with Euclid, algebra, and plane and spherical geometry. It is, perhaps, a defect that astronomy at the present day is almost universally taught from text books only, and we would strongly urge that whenever an observatory with astronomical instruments is within reach, the students should be taken to study practically the apparatus which is used in

<sup>31</sup> "Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute," Vol. XI. 1879-80. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1880.

<sup>32</sup> "Speech on the Adoption of a Fiscal Policy, &c." By David Buchanan. Sydney: Lee & Ross. 1880.

<sup>33</sup> "The Constitutional Union of the United Kingdom and the Nine Parliamentary Colonies." London: Stanford. 1880.

<sup>34</sup> "Elements of Astronomy." By Robert Stawell Ball, I.L.D., F.R.S., Andrews Professor of Astronomy in the University of Dublin, Royal Astronomer of Ireland. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1880.



research. Regarded as a textbook, Professor Ball's work would have additional value were it provided with examples which might be worked out; but for clearness, masterly treatment, and extent of information it is second to no book which could be placed in the hands of students.

Professor Mousson has issued the first two parts of a third and enlarged edition of his *Treatise on Physics*.<sup>2</sup> The first part is devoted to general and molecular physics, the second volume treats of heat. This work is mathematical in its treatment, and gives a very thorough account of all the subjects which it includes. There are numerous quotations of authorities, plentiful tables and figures of apparatus, and it is a work upon which the author has evidently spent a large amount of time in the endeavour to make it complete. The more carefully it is read the more excellent it appears to be, and we have no hesitation in regarding it as one of the most valuable manuals of physics at present available for the use of the more advanced students.

In "Nature's Hygiene"<sup>3</sup> an attempt is made to explain the well-known sanitary properties of the pine tree and the eucalyptus, by a theory based on the author's experiments upon certain processes of slow oxidation, and in which peroxide of hydrogen and other substances are generated. In the opening chapters an instructive and valuable history is given of the properties and mode of occurrence in Nature of ozone and peroxide of hydrogen. Succeeding chapters are devoted to natural processes of slow combustion and putrefaction, contagious disorders, and to the general theory of infectious diseases. In chapter five, Mr. Kingzett gives an account of the attempts hitherto made to arrest the spread of epidemics by antiseptics and disinfectants, together with a statement of the theory of the action of the remedial agents so far as is at present known. In chapter six a full account is given of malarial fever and of the alleged anti-malarial properties of the genus eucalyptus. In the last chapters the sanitary properties of the eucalyptus and pine trees are attributed to peroxide of hydrogen, camphoric acid, and another product of oxidation of terpenes, mainly as the result of the author's experiments in the oxidation of terpenes in presence of water or aqueous vapour; these terpenes being contained in the essential oils from the eucalyptus and pines. In the early part of the work the author refers to numerous authorities, and had nothing further been written a valuable contribution would have been made to chemical literature. Authorities are also freely quoted in the latter portion of the volume, but this part consists essentially of a summary of the experiments upon which the author founds his conclusions. The views set forth are plausible, and

<sup>2</sup> "Die Physik auf Grundlage der Erfahrung." Von Dr. Alb. Mousson, Professor an der Schweizerischen Polytechnischen Schule. Erster Band mit 275 eingedruckten Figuren. Zweiter Band erster Lieferung mit 126 eingedruckten Figuren und 2 Tafeln. Zurich: Friederich Schulthess. 1879-1880.

<sup>3</sup> "Nature's Hygiene, a Series of Essays on Popular Scientific Subjects, with special reference to the Chemistry and Hygiene of the Eucalyptus and the Pine." By C. T. Kingzett, F.C.S. London: Baillière, Tindall & Cox. 1880.

probably explain in part, at least, the beneficial effects of the trees to which he refers. But chemists and scientific men generally will no doubt hold their judgment in suspense as to the author's theory being a complete explanation of their medical value. The book, though dealing with matters of a technical character, is written clearly and in a popular manner, and will be useful to both the general reader and the professional student.

The first number of "Brook's Popular Botany"<sup>4</sup> comprises eight pages of printed matter with wood cuts and a coloured plate giving figures of the peony, wolfsbane, columbine, stavesacre, marsh-marigold, and wood aconite. This work appears to be intended to meet the wants of provincial readers who care more for the uses of plants than for their natural history and botanical characters. Each species has from one to two pages devoted to it, and wood cuts where necessary, though these, like the text, do not promise to reach any high degree of excellence.

Mr. Hulme has issued an exquisite volume which forms a second series of his familiar "Wild Flowers."<sup>5</sup> It is illustrated with forty plates which are among the most beautiful illustrations of plants which have appeared in any popular work; and there are elegant wood cuts forming head and tail pieces to the short chapters of history which are given to the several species. The plants treated of include the bind-weed, flowering rush, red-berriced bryony, stork's bill, nodding thistle, tormentil, cinquefoil, honeysuckle, pimpernel, forget-me-not, sea lavender, agrimony, mallow, greater celandine, corn-cockle, bramble, snowdrop, and pansy. There is a short summary of the botanical character of the plants.

The second part of the "Dictionary of English Plant Names" fully maintains the interest and learning which were so conspicuous in the first part.<sup>6</sup> The present portion reaches from Fuzz to Ozier, and includes among many other well-known plants, the gilliflower, which in later times came to signify a different plant from that so-called by the earlier English writers. Among quaint local names, the *Oxalis acetosella* has acquired the designation God a'mighty's bread and cheese; and the *Veronica chamædryis* is known as God's eye; the legend asserting that if any one plucks it, his eyes will be eaten. There are herbs of repentance, herbs of grace, herbs impious, and herbs carrying most of the familiar Christian names. It will possess a charm for many whose interests go back with pleasure from the familiar

<sup>4</sup> "Brook's Popular Botany." Comprising all the Plants, British and Foreign, most useful Man in Medicine, Food, the Manufactures, and the Garden. With Descriptions and an Account of their various Properties and Uses, accompanied with Recipes, Prescriptions, Application, and Modes of Cultivation. With coloured plates and numerous wood cuts. London: J. A. Brook & Co.

<sup>5</sup> "Familiar Wild Flowers." By F. Edward Hulme, F.L.S., F.S.A. Second series, with coloured plates. London, Paris and New York: Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co.

<sup>6</sup> "English Dialect Society." Series C. Original Glossaries. "A Dictionary of English Plant Names." By James Britten, F.L.S., and Robert Holland. Part II. London: Trübner & Co. 1879.

names of childhood to the authors for whom such words were the only language in which reference to the plants could be made, and who do not venture into the wider field to which the English Dialect Society invites its readers.

"English Trees and Tree Planting" is a book of more scientific character that might be expected from its popular title,<sup>7</sup> not that it is in any way technical or heavy. But the knowledge is given which is best worth having for those whose interest in trees is of a practical kind, the work embracing not only an account of the produce of trees and industries which depend upon them, but their cultivation, diseases, rate of growth, conditions of life, and duration. The volume is divided into twenty chapters. The first three give an account of ancient forests and tree planting; then four chapters are given to coniferous trees, and four more to broad-leaved trees. Then follow chapters on trees that affect moist situations, the formations of plantations and ornamental planting, on ozier beds, hedge-row timber, copse wood, seaside planting, and hedges.

The "Winds of Kurrachee" are the subject of an interesting memoir by Frederick Chambers.<sup>8</sup> He finds that in December the wind blows from the north-east with a velocity of about five miles an hour; but from December its direction gradually changes first to the north and then to the west, till in the month of July it blows from the south-east with a velocity of twenty-two miles an hour, after which it gradually returns back again to the north-east. The memoir is founded upon observations made at the Kurrachee Harbour Works during the years 1873, 1874, 1875. The daily variations of the wind are discussed at considerable length; and the relation of wind to rainfall, and other phenomena, receive appropriate treatment. There are various charts explanatory of the matter of the work. We have also received Tables for the months of February and March, 1879, giving the various meteorological observations made in the successive days of each month at the chief towns in India.

Messrs Longmans issue a new edition of the late Bishop Stanley's "Familiar History of Birds"<sup>9</sup>—a work now too well-known and prized by all young readers to need even a word of commendation. It has, however, appeared desirable to the publishers to have the present edition revised, so as to remove the blemishes which inevitably appear with lapse of time in an advancing science, and they have further added to the value of the volume by enriching it with many additional illustrations. The original text remains practically unaltered, and will still charm, it is to be hoped, many generations of lovers of the feathered tribes.

<sup>7</sup> "English Trees and Tree Planting." By William H. Ablett. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1880.

<sup>8</sup> "Indian Meteorological Memoirs." Published by order of His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General of India in Council, under the direction of Henry F. Blanford. Vol. I. Parts IV.—IX. "The Winds of Kurrachee." Calcutta. 1880.

<sup>9</sup> "A Familiar History of Birds." By the late Edward Stanley, D.D., F.R.S., Lord Bishop of Norwich. New edition. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1880.

The Rev. F. O. Morris has during more than twenty years been an occasional writer of Letters to the *Times* about birds and other subjects,<sup>10</sup> and for some reason, that the author does not venture to impart, beyond a confession of pleasure at the reception they have met with among his friends, now reprints every scrap of printed matter that has in this way been given to the public. The majority of these Letters had but a passing interest, and though observations of more or less value are contained in some of the Letters, they are altogether too slight to commend this volume to any except the author's admirers and personal friends.

The Rev. F. O. Morris aspires to whatever distinction there may be in posing before the public as a thorough-going hater of the Darwinian doctrines, and all the harmonies in Nature which they are believed to make intelligible<sup>11</sup>. On the present occasion he appears as the author of a Paper on the Plumage of Birds and Butterflies, which was written for the British Association at Sheffield, but was unable to get itself read. Now, after having been printed in the "Leisure Hour," it is offered to such members of the British Association at Swansea as may be tempted to invest their pence in its pages. First, an abstract of the Memoir is given, then a Preface, in which Mr. Darwin is reviled in that thorough-going way which is only possible to an opponent whose opposition springs from religious weakness and fear. This wonderful Preface includes about five pages of disconnected extracts from the "Origin of Species," containing all the cautious words and sentences with which Mr. Darwin's love of truth has led him to guard and qualify conclusions, wherein the evidence might possibly be augmented. But sadly misunderstanding the spirit of a scientific man's aspirations to discover the laws of Nature's divine government, the author, referring to Mr. Darwin, says: "Does the good man think that we are simpletons to be befooled by such trifling as this? and is it with it, and such as it, a scientific book forsooth, that our 'professors' and 'men of science' would, if they could, beguile believers, and overturn religion?" Outside Colney Hatch, greater nonsense than that has not often been written, and we only wish the author would cultivate a sense of humour to see himself hopping back the progress of human thought which is too great for him to measure. As for his Paper on Plumage of Birds, it is written like the Preface—not in the spirit of inquiry or fair argument, but with a flavour of ridicule which supersedes all need for discussion, when the intellect is hermetically sealed with prejudice. Thus, Mr. Darwin has beautifully set forth in the theory of natural selection the ways in which the plumage of birds may have attained its varied development; but to Mr. Morris's mind, the natural sequel to this argument is the conclusion that the varied colours of eggs have all

<sup>10</sup> "Letters to the *Times* about Birds, &c." By the Rev. F. O. Morris, B.A., Rector of Nunburnholme, Yorkshire. London: William Poole.

<sup>11</sup> "The Darwin Craze." For the British Association, Swansea Meeting, 1880, "On the Plumage of Birds and Butterflies." By the Rev. F. O. Morris, B.A. London: W. Poole. 1880.

been produced by the admiration of one egg for another; and after such a statement, what farther can be said?

Although antiseptic surgery has now been on its trial for the last fifteen years, no textbook on the subject has hitherto appeared on the English language.<sup>12</sup> The evidence in favour of Listerism, has been steadily accumulating, but buried as it is in the medical journals in the form of reports on hospital cases, and discussions of learned societies, it has only been accessible to those who could afford the time to search through the shelves of a public library. The want of some treatise on the subject has now been met, but it is worthy of remark, that the appearance of the present volume is due to the accident of a more than usually interesting medical debate. Mr. MacCormac's treatise on antiseptic surgery begins with the address which he delivered on that subject at the invitation of the South London Branch of the British Medical Association, and it also comprises the speeches of those who took part in the subsequent debate. These are followed by an exposition of the theory upon which antiseptic practice is founded, and the whole is completed by a detailed description of the different appliances necessary to success, and an account of the application of the method in special cases. The antiseptic treatment of wounds is based upon the germ theory, and both laboratory experiments and clinical observation amply testify to its value. If an infusion susceptible of undergoing putrefactive change be exposed to the atmosphere, that is to say to an air filled with microphytic organisms, it soon becomes foul and turbid, from the infinite multiplication of the bacteria which have chanced to fall into it. But if the same infusion be surrounded by an antiseptic mist, produced by a spray of carbolic acid solution, or if it be protected from the air by a linen cloth moistened with the same liquid, no changes will occur, and the solution will remain indefinitely sweet. The same thing holds good in surgical practice when an operation is performed according to the method of Lister, and with all the necessary antiseptic precautions. The wound heals without any more constitutional disturbance than would be produced by a subcutaneous lesion of the same extent. Treated in the same way a compound fracture presents little more gravity than an ordinary broken leg; and when this accident is complicated by the opening of an important joint, Listerism will often save both life and limb, whereas amputation with its attendant dangers would otherwise be the rule of surgery. Some idea of the value of Lister's method may be gathered from the following statements: Dr. Keith, of Edinburgh, has performed the operation of ovariectomy over 300 times, and in arranging them in fifties they show the following mortality.\* First fifty, eleven deaths; second fifty, eight

<sup>12</sup> "Antiseptic Surgery." An Address delivered at St. Thomas's Hospital, with the subsequent Debate. By W. MacCormac, M.A., F.R.C.S.E. & L., M.Ch. (Hon. Causâ), Surgeon and Lecturer on Surgery at St. Thomas's Hospital, Consulting Surgeon to the French Hospital. Smith, Elder & Co. 1880.

deaths; third fifty, eight deaths; fourth fifty, six deaths; fifth fifty, four deaths; sixth fifty, no deaths. The last seventy-six were done antiseptically with only two deaths. The last sixty-eight cases in succession all recovered." Professor Nussbaum, of Munich, says that "the general wards in the Klinik, from being rife with pyæmia and gangrene, now never contain a case either of one or the other. The mortality is reduced to one-half." With antiseptic treatment, 321 cases of amputation for injury gave fourteen deaths, of which eight were from shock, on the day of operation; of the remainder, one depended on senile gangrene, and one on tetanus. *Only three were attributable to septic causes.* The prognosis of an amputation wound, says Mr. MacCormac, is I hope changed from the days when Malgaigne showed that the mortality of all amputations in the Paris hospitals between 1836 and 1841, excluding finger amputations, was fifty per cent. of the cases. If antiseptic surgery had only abolished pyæmia, this alone would be a sufficient reason for adopting it; but it has other claims which must be noticed here. It has been pointed out that it is not only necessary to recover from an operation or injury, but also to recover quickly and without suppuration. Many a patient has been discharged from the hospital, "cured" of a compound fracture, to die a few months later of tubercle, acquired during a lengthened convalescence, or to live, unfit for work, with chronic phthisis. But this is never the case in antiseptic surgery. Not only is recovery the constant rule, but a recovery which takes place *tuto cito et jucundé*, free from present danger, or from the foundation of future disease. These extracts are a fair sample of the evidence given in favour of Lister's method, by the surgeons who took part in the discussion. A few discordant voices were raised—for doctors proverbially disagree—but with the exception of Mr. Bryant, who thinks that "an equally good series of cases might be extracted from the ordinary case-book of the hospital surgeon," all the speakers seem to have freely recognized Mr. Lister's claims to public gratitude. To conclude, Mr. MacCormac's book affords overwhelming proof of the value of antiseptic surgery; and the argument that some surgeons placed in the most favourable hygienic conditions have occasionally produced statistics *nearly* as good Mr. MacCormac's is simply trivial, when it is considered that Lister's method invariably succeeds even in the most unsanitary hospitals.

We have read with pleasure a little volume on "The Nature and Treatment of Syphilis," by Dr. Drysdale.<sup>13</sup> The subject is one of extreme interest both to the medical profession and to the general public, but it is also one of exceptional difficulty, and the wisest authorities have always been those who have refrained from giving a final opinion. As regards the origin of syphilis, authors differ. Whilst some believe that it only made its appearance in Europe towards the end of the fifteenth century,

<sup>13</sup> "The Nature and Treatment of Syphilis." By C. R. Drysdale, M.D. London: Baillière, Tindall & Cox. 1880.

either imported from America or arising spontaneously in the Italian campaign, others relying upon certain passages which are to be found in the Bible and in subsequent writings, think that it existed in former times. Those who take the first view are most probably in error. Whether there was such a disease or not as syphilis before, it seems certain that it was prevalent at the *beginning* of the fifteenth century. In the "Philosophical Transactions" for 1720, William Beckett quotes from the "Theological Dictionary" of Thomas Gascoigne the statement that several of his patients had confessed to this infirmity. "Magnus etiam dux in Anglia" adds Gascoigne, "scilicet J. de Gaunt mortuus est ex tali putrefactione membrorum genitalium et corporis sui causata per frequentationem mulierum." A passage from Rabelais which shows that the Montpellier physician did not think syphilis had been introduced in his time into Europe from America is worth quoting. Relating the death of the great doctor of theology who taught Latin to Gargantua, he changes the date in a couplet—the last two lines of an epitaph by Clement Marot on a monk of Orleans who died in 1520. According to Rabelais, Thubal Oloferne departed this life in 1420 :

"Et fut l'an mil quatre cens vingt  
De la Verole qui lui vint."

Many authorities think that leprosy was confounded with some forms of venereal disease prior to the recognition of syphilis, and Dr. Macpherson has recently called attention to a case in point. "In the account of the miracles wrought at the shrine of St. Thomas of Canterbury (lately published by order of the Master of the Rolls), there is the case of a priest who was immediately struck with leprosy, *quia fœmina adhæserat*. This may have been about the year 1180." Dr. Drysdale's erudition is so extensive that we are surprised to see no mention of the foregoing writers. The question of treatment is very properly left to the reader's judgment. Although averse to mercury, and here we must disagree entirely with our author, Dr. Drysdale gives with great fairness the evidence for and against it. Hereditary syphilis also comes in for consideration, but not at sufficient length, and the marriage of syphilitic subjects is barely mentioned. The delicate nature of this question is some excuse for avoiding its discussion, but it would be well if practitioners would bear in mind that in such matters the health of an individual sufferer is of less importance than the suppression of a certain source of contagion.

Dr. William Junius Mickle publishes an essay upon a trite, but not a well-known subject—"General Paralysis of the Insane."<sup>14</sup> The author's learning is amply exhibited by abundant quotations from English and foreign sources, and a full knowledge of the present state of science will certainly be acquired by the perusal of this book. With respect to the erudition scattered throughout its pages, it might be questioned whether Dr. Mickle has in all cases been fortunate in

<sup>14</sup> "General Paralysis of the Insane," by William Junius Mickle, M.D. M.R.C.P. London: K. Lewis. 1880.

his selection of authorities. We find, for instance, Auguste Voisin's book on the subject, which carries no weight whatever in France, quoted on a par with the most eminent writers on general paralysis and cognate subjects. Another charge that might perhaps be brought against the laborious author is, that whatever originality might exist in his conception of the disease, is entirely stamped out by the superabundance of matter borrowed from the current literature of the day. It will, however, be recognized that this book is a good systematic treatise on the subject. Dr. Mickle ably argues in favour of the view or doctrine of *unity*, which he acknowledges to be his own; and however opposed we may feel to the opinion which he holds in this particular, we must confess that he has made out a good case, as the lawyers say.

The subject of animal magnetism, which has been recently attracting so much attention in the medical world, is handled in a very different spirit by Professor Heidenhain,<sup>15</sup> of Breslau. To assert that the learned Professor is totally unacquainted with the literature of the subject would of course be highly imprudent; but it may be stated, at all events, that he has chosen entirely to ignore it. Beyond an elaborate analysis of Mr. Hansen's experiments, and the occasional mention of the names of Braid, Charcot, and a few others, the writer contents himself with stating the results of his own personal experience, performed, no doubt, upon trustworthy subjects, and curious enough in themselves, but having in reality no originality whatever. There is not a single point brought forward by Professor Heidenhain which has not been distinctly enunciated over and over again by French, English, and foreign mesmerizers, during the first part of the present century, and the only result of experiments such as those mentioned in this book is to prove that in the great majority of cases the magnetizers of the eighteenth and nineteenth century—including Elliotson—were perfectly conscientious and trustworthy in the account they gave of facts observed, although perfectly absurd, in the various explanations they brought forward. Does the German physiologist show himself more rational in his attempts to elucidate the mystery? Time will show; but we must confess that in the elucubrations of modern science we have been unable hitherto to see much to satisfy the mind on that subject.

The Goulstonian Lectures of the Royal College of Physicians of London<sup>16</sup> are generally of great interest, and those delivered by Dr. Lauder Brunton in 1877 on Pharmacology and Therapeutics were no exception to the rule. They have lately been reproduced, and such additions as the rapid progress of these sciences necessitated have been made. The volume will be read with equal interest both by members

<sup>15</sup> "Animal Magnetism; Physiological Observations." By Rudolf Heidenhain, M.D. Translated by L. C. Wooldridge, B.Sc. Lond., with a Preface by J. G. Romanes, M.A., F.R.S. London: Kegan Paul & Co. 1880.

<sup>16</sup> "Pharmacology and Therapeutics on Medicine Past and Present." The Goulstonian Lectures delivered before the Royal College of Physicians in 1877, by T. Lauder Brunton, M.D., F.R.C.P., F.R.S. Macmillan. 1880.



of the medical profession and the lay public, as it contains a large amount of information which is conveyed in an easy and pleasant style. Therapeutics are rapidly gaining a place amongst the exact sciences, and in many cases, the effect of a remedy may be predicted with as much certainty as a chemical reaction. Many instances of this truth will be found in Dr. Brunton's Lectures.

Under the modest title of "The Surgeon's Pocket-Book,"<sup>17</sup> Mr. Porter has compiled a volume which might fairly be called a Compendium of Military Surgery. The work obtained the prize offered for competition by the Empress of Germany, and the rapid sale of the first edition has ratified the decision of the German jury. Besides what may be called surgery proper, its pages contain a large amount of information on the general hygiene of war, the transport of the wounded, hospital management, camp sanitation, and such matters. A number of engravings enhance the value of this publication.

Dr. Dobell's treatise on loss of weight and blood spitting<sup>18</sup> will long remain a monument to the industry of its compiler. Every writer on lung disease has been carefully consulted, and all or nearly all that may prove useful is reproduced. To quote the opinion of Sir Thomas Watson, such a "storehouse of instruction" has scarcely ever been seen. One capital omission however occurs throughout the volume, and this is the insufficient recommendation of counter-irritants. In his concluding remarks the author alludes to this, and states that he considers counter-irritation an indispensable element of treatment. But from what we can gather, Dr. Dobell is only acquainted with the action of blisters. Here he is evidently at fault. Although blisters are most frequently indicated, there are cases where other similar agents are more useful. Cupping is preferable in some instances, and at other times ignipuncture is the best plan. We know of one case at least in which recovery from phthisis in the second degree was due to this treatment. Several monographs on ignipuncture have been written, and Dr. Dobell should consult one of these before preparing another edition.

The most important watering-places and mineral springs of Germany, Austria, and Switzerland are described by Dr. Gutmann<sup>19</sup> in a handy little volume which has been published simultaneously in London and New York. The engravings are better than those which are usually found in such publications, and there is an excellent map, in which the different springs are underlined in various colours according to their numeralization.

<sup>17</sup> "The Surgeon's Pocket Book; an Essay on the Best Treatment of the Wounded in War." For which a Prize was awarded by Her Majesty the Queen of Prussia and Empress of Germany. By Surgeon-Major J. H. Porter. London: Charles Griffin & Co. 1880.

<sup>18</sup> "On Loss of Weight, Blood Spitting, and Lung Disease." By Horace Dobell, M.D. London: J. & A. Churchill. 1880.

<sup>19</sup> "The Watering-Places and Mineral Springs of Germany, Austria, and Switzerland." By Edward Gutmann, M.D., Scarle. London: Sampson Low, Marston, and Rivington. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1880.

Dr. Brandt has selected a French thermal station, Royat,<sup>20</sup> as a fitting sphere for his usefulness, and has now *lancé* a brochure on the virtues of its waters. Royat is a very pleasant place, and if the perusal of this pamphlet should decide any one to go there, we hope for the sake of the author that they will not forget to inquire after Dr. Brandt.

Those who are about to engage in medical study will do well to consult Dr. Hardwicke's<sup>21</sup> *Guide to Medical Education and Practice*; as an exact knowledge of the relative value of the innumerable medical qualifications would often prevent much after-annoyance. The author's object is not distinctly stated, but it is evident that the work is addressed to those who, having obtained a minor grade in England, are desirous of acquiring the degree of M.D. on easy terms. Let us say at once that Brussels is the ideal university for intending candidates. The urbanity of the professors has become proverbial. Answers may be made to the examiners in the English language, and there are other inducements too numerous to mention. Brussels is well worth a visit, and situated as it is on the way home from the Rhine, the general practitioner might visit the town, and take the degree as a fitting epilogue to a continental tour.

The Museum of Hygiène, erected to the memory of the late Dr. Parkes, contains a number of models of orthopædic appliances, presented by Mr. R. H. Bigg.<sup>22</sup> A companion volume to the collection has been written by this gentleman, and will no doubt interest those who are studying the mechanics of the spine.

An "Ex-Commissioner" has published a tract upon the Destruction of Life by Snakes and Hydrophobia in Western India.<sup>23</sup> Although modest in size, this little book contains a large amount of useful information, and we regret that we cannot notice its merits at greater length.

We have received a pamphlet on the Educational Treatment of Incurably Deaf Children, by Dr. Dalby.<sup>24</sup> It contains a good account of recent improvements made in the teaching of those afflicted in this manner, and makes its appearance at a time when public attention has been forcibly drawn to the subject.

The reprint of a lecture, by Dr. Louis Elsberg,<sup>25</sup> is above the usual standard of such productions. It was no doubt highly instructive to those who heard it.

<sup>20</sup> "Royat; its Mineral Waters and Climate." By G. H. Brandt, M.D. London: H. K. Lewis 1880.

<sup>21</sup> "Medical Education and Practice in all Parts of the World." By H. J. Hardwicke, M.D. London: J. & A. Churchill. 1880.

<sup>22</sup> "The Orthopragms of the Spine." By R. H. Bigg. London: J. & A. Churchill. 1880.

<sup>23</sup> "Destruction of Life by Snakes, Hydrophobia, &c. in Western India." By an Ex-Commissioner. London: W. H. Allen & Co. 1880.

<sup>24</sup> "On the Educational Treatment of Incurably Deaf Children." By W. B. Dalby, F.R.C.S., M.B. London: J. & A. Churchill.

<sup>25</sup> "The Throat and its Functions." By Louis Elsberg, A.M., M.D. New York: Putnam and Sons. 1880.

## HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

IN the political and military history of our vast Eastern empire during recent times the figure of Outram<sup>1</sup> stands out a full head and shoulders above his contemporaries. His was a character which did not gain the splendid sobriquet of the "Bayard of India" without just cause. His simplicity of life, his heroic self-abnegation, his generosity, his contempt for all pecuniary advantages to himself, and the power he possessed of exciting the sympathy of all ranks and classes of men, made him, indeed, no unworthy representative of the soldier-poet. Self was never in his thoughts. He was always ready to sacrifice himself for others; he would take without ostentation the post of danger and trial, or of labour and difficulty, and would so order things of his own intention—as he did at Lucknow—that others should, if possible, receive the honour and full reward. The details of his career are well known. Educated at Aberdeen, he was sent out a mere lad to Bombay as a cadet. For seven years he served in Candeish, became aide-de-camp to Lord Keane, and took part in the capture of Ghuznee. As political agent at Guzerat, commissary in the Upper Scinde, and resident at Hyderabad, Sattara, and Lucknow he displayed great ability and vigour, accompanied by his usual high tone of honour. Whilst acting as commissioner to negotiate with the Ameer of Scinde he was drawn into the well-known quarrel with Sir Charles Napier, whose conduct he severely criticized. After having served as resident at Baroda and Bombay, Outram was named Chief Commissioner of Oude, and shortly afterwards was engaged in the war with Persia. He succeeded Sir Henry Lawrence as Resident at Lucknow, and played a most gallant and unselfish part in the suppression of the Mutiny. For weeks he lay at Alumbagh, with a small force entrenched, immovable by all the fierce attacks of the rebel forces, and crowned the heroism of his life by surrendering to Havelock, his junior, but who had borne all the heat and burden of the day, the lead when marching to the relief of Lucknow. He was created a baronet, returned to England in broken health, and died at Pau in the March of 1863. Such is the man of whom Sir Francis Goldsmid has given us the biography. His book will be amongst the most popular of the works of the season; his style is lucid and graphic, he is in complete sympathy with his subject, the career of his hero is full of incident, whilst the thorough knowledge of Indian life which the writer possesses makes him peculiarly fitted to be the biographer of so eminently a representative Indian officer and statesman as was Outram. From these fascinating volumes we learn one familiar truth—that, independently of work which claims and often obtains the recognition of the State, there is something else to be done which brings its own reward. What Outram did was not for self-advance-

---

<sup>1</sup> "James Outram: a Biography." By Major-General Sir F. Goldsmid, C.B., K.C.S.I. Two volumes. Smith Elder, & Co.

ment, but from a stern sense of duty. Nothing would induce him to enter upon a course, no matter how strongly favoured in influential quarters, which was not approved by his conscience; single-minded, loyal, courageous, and the most courteous and sensitive of men to his official inferiors, he well deserved the name bestowed upon him, even by his bitter enemy, of the "Bayard of India." At the present moment of our Afghan difficulties this biography is particularly welcome. We see now that, after forty years' experience of the Afghan people, the estimate Outram formed of them was the right one; the rules he laid down for our guidance in 1839 are now, in 1880, equally applicable to our dealings with these intriguers. He was opposed to the interference on our part with the internal affairs of the Heratis, or generally of Afghanistan. He did not state that the British should never interfere in Afghanistan, only that at present the opportunity had not arrived for the judicious exercise of such interference. "The time is not come," he writes to the late Lord Lyveden, "for British intervention to effect any good among the Afghans themselves; and the consolidation of an Afghan empire, under present circumstances, and in view of the geographical position of that country, might be attended with serious inconvenience, as well to our north-west frontier as to our political relations with Russia and Persia." To those to whom the perusal of the life of a great and good man is both an intellectual and moral pleasure, and who at the same time wish to be enlightened as to the government of our Indian Empire, we cordially recommend the pages of Sir Francis Goldsmid.

In Miss Colenso's book<sup>2</sup> we have another addition to the histories of the Zulu war which have already appeared. Miss Colenso considers, like many others, the war a mistake, and in one ample volume, assisted by her father, the Bishop of Natal, and in that part of the work which deals with the military conduct of the campaign by Colonel Durnford, R.F., she takes us through the whole history of the war, from its first causes to the capture of Cetshwayo. The conflict is not one which we, as Englishmen, have reason to be proud of. Its cause may be attributed to the natives suddenly finding themselves in possession of firearms, on the opening out of the diamond fields, and to the resolve of Cetshwayo to defend his country. In the opinion of our authoress, we had no right to annex the Transvaal; we had no right to crush the power of the Zulus; it has been our war and not that of the savage chief. Peace has been restored, but its conditions are not approved of in the colony, and it is expected that, after a short interval, more bloodshed and more reckless expenditure will ensue. We went to war because the two sons of Tihayo invaded our soil and carried off two women who had taken refuge in Natal, and whom they refused to give up. One of the sons fell in battle, the other was captured and imprisoned. He was tried when there was no evidence to maintain the charge—he had committed no offence on British soil punishable in

<sup>2</sup> "History of the Zulu War." By Frances E. Colenso. One volume. London: Chapman & Hall (Limited).

a Zulu subject by British law—and he was set at liberty. He could have been punished by his own king, but we had deposed and transported that sovereign. Miss Colenso's history is one which should be read; she does not mince matters, and she places before us details which, if not new, are at least presented to us in a new light. "However much we may regret the necessity," she writes, "we do not therefore think it a less imperative duty to bring to the light as much as possible whatever wrong and injustice has been committed and concealed by those to whom England has entrusted her power and her fame. That the light of publicity should be thrown upon them, is the first step towards their cure, or at least towards the prevention of any further wrong; and it is in the truest loyalty to our sovereign, and the deepest love and reverence for our country, that we have undertaken the task now completed."

In spite of the researches of modern historians, and the new phase upon which history has entered, the volumes of David Hume<sup>3</sup> on the England of the past still maintain their position as a classic. His style, his careful reflections, and the clearness and occasional pathos of his story, will always command the admiration and attention of all readers. Nor has research proved that his inaccuracy and partiality are so grave and unsound as have been represented. "The calm philosophy," writes Gibbon, "the careless, inimitable beauties of the style of David Hume, often forced me to close the volumes with a mixed sensation of delight and despair." Messrs. Ward have published a cheap edition of this work, which will appeal to all classes. It is strictly restricted to the history of Hume—from the invasion of Julius Cæsar to the Revolution of 1688—and is a reprint of the edition of 1786, the one with the author's last corrections and improvements. A short account of his life, written by himself, is prefixed.

The editor of "English Men of Letters" has done wisely in entrusting the biography of Pope<sup>4</sup> to Mr. Leslie Stephen. Mr. Stephen has made the period of Pope his special study, and he brings to bear upon his subject, so open to diversity of views, a knowledge of the literature of the eighteenth century, most valuable to a true estimate of the character of the poet. Founding his labours upon the biographies of Warburton, Bowles, Elwin, and the criticisms of the late Mr. Dilke, our author has given to the world a brief but accurate sketch of one who was at the head of our second-rate poets. Mr. Stephen criticizes with great care the chief publications of Pope—the "Homer," the "Essay on Criticism," the "Dunciad," and the "Epistles" and "Satires"—and, thanks to Mr. Dilke, discusses the question whether the "Atossa" was the portrait of the Duchess of Buckingham or the Duchess of Marlborough. Upon the whole, the life of the poet was unhappy. Side by side with great talents and boundless energy were a sensitiveness ever ready to take offence, an insatiable vanity, a want

<sup>3</sup> "History of England." By David Hume. Three volumes. Ward, Lock & Tyler.

<sup>4</sup> "English Men of Letters. Alexander Pope." By Leslie Stephen. Macmillan & Co.

of principle, and a bitterness of character which often hurried him into many meannesses. To those who wish to know what manner of man the poet was, and what was the nature of the work which has given him a niche in the temple of the Immortals, this excellent biography of Mr. Stephen will be read with pleasure and instruction. It should be a class-book for schools.

Edgar Allan Poe<sup>5</sup> was the son of an American actor, and in his childhood, having been left an orphan, was adopted by a Mr. Allan, a wealthy merchant. He was educated partly in England and America, and his school-days gave promise of the talents which afterwards distinguished him, and also of the irregularity which was so marked a feature in his subsequent character. Quarrelling with his protector, he went to Europe, and after idly wandering about the Continent, he was seized by the police at St. Petersburg for being engaged in a drunken riot. Through the influence of his ambassador he was released and sent back to America. He now turned his attention to literature, published a volume of poems (which was well received) and fully embarked in the career of the professional writer. His chief works are "The Raven," and other poems; "Eureka," a prose poem; and his "Tales," which had a large circulation both in America and Europe. His predilection for drink was his ruin. Such is the biography of the man which Mr. Ingram has written. To the readers of Poe's thrilling stories it will be interesting. It is at least a complete vindication against the calumnies of Griswold.

These memories<sup>6</sup> are somewhat disappointing, for they are in reality less of an autobiography than a record of the political activity of the Hungarian exiles in Europe. Nor are they to be entirely depended upon when they depart from the beaten track of those facts which history has preserved concerning the late national popular leader. For instance, take the statement of Kossuth that he had entered into an agreement with Louis Napoleon to bring about the overthrow of the Derby Ministry, through the agency of Messrs. Bright and Cobden, and to establish the Palmerston Government, on the distinct understanding that it would refrain from all intervention during the intended Italian war. This assertion has been denied by Mr. Bright, and declared to be "absolutely groundless." "We were," he writes, "the last persons to conspire with Lord Palmerston, for Lord Palmerston was scarcely less objectionable to us than Lord Derby himself. The allegations are not true, but highly suspicious." It is unfortunate that Kossuth cannot produce the letters on which this statement is founded. Still, in spite of errors of this kind, the memoirs of a man who at one time occupied so prominent a position in the disturbances on the Continent cannot be devoid of interest; the personal details concerning Louis Napoleon, Cavour, Victor Emmanuel, Pietri, and others, would alone make the volume acceptable to readers.

<sup>5</sup> "Edgar Allan Poe." By J. H. Ingram. Two volumes. John Hogg.

<sup>6</sup> "Memories of my Exile." By Louis Kossuth. Translated by Ferencz Jausz. Cassell.

Kossuth, as was to be expected, is very bitter against the present position of Hungary. Yet it is difficult to understand what course other than the one she has adopted would provide her with greater security. She could not have achieved her independence against Austria by any force of her own; and even had she been successful in her efforts, she would before this have fallen a victim to Pan-slavistic intrigues and Russian aggression. Though the Magyars constitute the chief bulk of the nation, yet Hungary is only another Austria, containing four races, each distinct and speaking a different language. The connection of Hungary with Austria is the best safeguard she possesses for the preservation of her existence. Kossuth may stigmatize the constitution which Francis Deak has given to his country as a "crime" and a "surrender;" but the Magyars have now learnt that union with Austria is the wisest policy for them to uphold.

Mr. Scoones' work,<sup>7</sup> like Knight's "Half-Hours with English Authors," is one that fills up a gap which has too long remained a blank in our literature. A selection of English epistolary correspondence from the days of the Paston Letters to the present time extends over a wide range, and offers reading, certainly, of a miscellaneous nature, yet one of deep interest. The specimens given are well chosen and are prefaced by brief remarks which tend to elucidate the nature of the letters selected. It is just the book to while away odd half-hours. Mr. Scoones is to be congratulated upon his idea and upon the efficient manner he has worked it out.

In this last volume of his "History of the English People,"<sup>8</sup> we have the faults and excellences which were conspicuous in Mr. Green's previous works. Great is the charm of style, and it covers numerous inaccuracies; to the historian who is brilliant and picturesque much is forgiven. When Mr. Green's little volume on the "English People" first appeared it took the educational public by storm; it was so different from the ordinary compilations; so interesting, so brilliantly written, so full of vivid pictures of English life in the past. Then after the first enthusiasm had toned down the critics found that the book was in many parts hastily written, was often superficial, and contained numerous mistakes as to dates, facts, and deductions. Encouraged by the success of his little history, Mr. Green began to write a fuller and deeper account of the English people, of which the fourth and last volume has now appeared. It commences with the fall of the Stuarts and ends with the battle of Waterloo. No one can read the interesting pages of Mr. Green on the "House of Hanover," the "Independence of America," and "England and Revolutionary France," without fully admitting his powers of graphic description and the necessary qualities he possesses to become an historian of the first order, if he would only study accu-

<sup>7</sup> "Four Centuries of English Letters—Selections from the Correspondence of an Hundred and Fifty Writers from the Period of the Paston Letters to the Present Day." By W. B. Scoones. Kegan Paul.

<sup>8</sup> "History of the English People." By J. R. Green. Volume IV. Macmillan & Co.

ty. His mind, however, like Lord Beaconsfield's, is not "parochial," and he is above a careful examination of those details which make up the facts of history. He sneers at a man in the reign of George II. styling himself a man of letters because he "grubbed among archives," yet it was not till within the last few years that permission was accorded to examine our records and State papers. Many "men of letters" in the reigns of the Georges would have been only too glad to have had the opportunity now granted to all of "grubbing among archives;" nor does it detract from the dignity of a "man of letters" that he prefers consulting original authorities—like a Froude, a Freeman, or a Gardiner—to accepting blindly second-hand references and indulging in schoolboy blunders. Mr. Green informs us that it was Lord John Sackville that failed to charge at Minden and that Hohenlinden was fought before 1797. We can assure our author that the famous Duke of Newcastle, in spite of his numerous boroughs, did not begin his official career under the first Whig Ministry of Anne, since his grace was then only thirteen years old. We may also object to a history of the English people ending with Waterloo and not with the first Reform Bill, which is a natural termination of the political changes that were introduced by the Revolution of 1688. The power of the sovereign was then transferred from the Crown to an oligarchy till in 1832 the House of Commons became, what it now is, the centre and force of the State—the government of England by the English people. In a future edition of this volume Mr. Green will do well to revise the political maps he offers the reader. If he would carefully go through his history and spend the same time in investigating and correcting his statements as he does in the polishing of his sentences he will have written a work which will undoubtedly take high rank among the historical publications of the century.

Colonel White's "Indian Reminiscences"<sup>9</sup> add little to our knowledge of Indian affairs. They are chiefly occupied with the often-told tale of the Sepoy Revolt, and we fail to see why they should have been given to the world. It is, however, due to the author to state that he writes in a lively style, and perhaps his wish may be gratified that in addition to affording interest to the reader it (his "Reminiscences") may turn out a useful and profitable book in a religious point of view.

Unlike Colonel White's work, the Essays of Mr. Cust,<sup>10</sup> the fruit of much reading and observation whilst in India, are of deep interest. Mr. Cust is evidently one of those civil servants who do not mistake arrogance for command, and brutality for self-respect. He is fond of the much-abused Hindoos. "Be kind to the natives," said his master, Lord Lawrence, to him; "nay more," said Mr. Cust, "take an interest in them, and try to love them." Throughout these essays it is plain to see that our author is fully enamoured of his subject. "The people of India," he says, "are the heirs, perhaps the spendthrift heirs, of an ancient but still surviving civilization." "It seems a special

<sup>9</sup> "Indian Reminiscences." By Colonel White. Allen & Co.

<sup>10</sup> "Linguistic and Oriental Essays." By R. N. Cust. Trübner.



privilege to have lived a quarter of a century amidst such a people as the inhabitants of northern India, who, superior to the Egyptians and Africans; are born of our Arian bond, though they may not yet share our occidental culture; a people with history, arts, sciences, literature, and religion not to be surpassed, if equalled, by the Chinese or Japanese." These Essays, well written, but it must be admitted severe reading; and strictly confined to Oriental subjects—the creeds of India, the language of the East Indies, Oriental scholars and congresses, and the like—will be of the greatest service to those young men who, having passed the first examination of the Indian Civil Service, are studying at home law and Indian matters.

As editor, author, and advocate of every notable reform and philanthropy, Mr. Burritt<sup>11</sup> gained and kept to his dying day the esteem of the distinguished, both in his own country, which was America, and in Europe. Probably no other man of his generation has done so much for the cause of peace as the late Elihu Burritt. By his speeches and writings he reached millions of people, and influenced them for peace. The son of a village shoemaker, young Burritt early showed himself an adept at languages. He studied hard, and made himself acquainted with Hebrew, Greek, Spanish, Danish, and Bohemian. He translated some of the Icelandic sagas, and contributed to numerous magazines and reviews. He became the editor of several journals, lectured throughout Europe and America, endeavouring to form a League of Universal Brotherhood, and essayed his utmost to establish an ocean penny postage. Such is the man whose brief biography lies before us, and time will not be wasted in its perusal.

Mr. Heilprin's work on the "Historical Poetry of the Ancient Hebrews"<sup>12</sup> has now entered upon a second volume. It is carefully edited, and we can accord to the second volume the same praise we passed upon the first. It is a compilation with a little veneer of scholarship.

Mr. James C. Ayer<sup>13</sup> was evidently a local celebrity in the hill-country of Connecticut; when he melted into the "infinite azure of the past," the divine who preached his funeral sermon remarked:—"Ayer was a man of power; whatever his hand found to do he did it with his might. He carried great force into every movement which he made—but now the strong man is laid low. How are the mighty fallen!" We candidly admit we never heard of this Mr. Ayer, and as life is too short to know the lesser lights, we purpose to remain in ignorance. Those who wish to be enlightened may read this biography for themselves.

"Memoirs of Troublous Times"<sup>14</sup> is a work partly imaginary and partly drawn from an old MS. touching the Civil War and the Siege

<sup>11</sup> "Elihu Burritt." By C. Northend. Sampson Low.

<sup>12</sup> "Historical Poetry of the Ancient Hebrews." By Mr. Heilprin. New York. D. Appleton.

<sup>13</sup> "Reminiscences of James C. Ayer." By C. Cowley. Penhallow Printing Company, Eowell, Mass.

<sup>14</sup> "Memoirs of Troublous Times." Seeley.

of Gloucester. We have never been in favour of romance and history when in union; we prefer to treat each separately. Still this little volume is very innocent, both as to its imagination and its historical facts, and will no doubt be appreciated at young ladies' schools of a not very advanced class.

Once an ancient race, entirely distinct from the Indian, possessing a certain degree of civilization, inhabited the central portion of the United States. By what appellation they were known during their existence is past finding out; they have been called Mound Builders<sup>15</sup> on account of the innumerable mounds which they erected, and which remained until the advent of the white man. Mr. Maclean's work is very valuable, not only because it offers sound and novel information concerning a curious and extinct race, but because it fully investigates the archæology of Butler County, Ohio. The geologist, the antiquary, and ethnologist will find in this volume much information not easily to be obtained elsewhere.

Mr. Low has treated an interesting subject with much industry and ability.<sup>16</sup> If we have amongst us no Marlborough or Wellington—no one military star that eclipses all others—still we possess generals whose combined achievements will make the reign of Queen Victoria one of the most remarkable in British annals. In face of the armies of France, Germany, and Russia we cannot boast, yet when we consider what our soldiers have achieved during the past forty years we may congratulate ourselves on possessing such an army as ours, and may reasonably express a doubt whether any other nation in Europe could, with our system of voluntary enlistment and the paucity of our land forces, have effected such a series of conquests. In North India, in China, in Afghanistan, in the Crimea, in New Zealand, in Abyssinia, in South Africa, in Canada—we are not endorsing the policy which gave rise to these wars and expeditions—our arms have been triumphant. Yet in those victories our forces were numerically weak as compared with those of the enemy. At the present moment we hold one-seventh of the world—an extent of territory such as the the Roman Empire at its proudest time never owned—with an army of under 200,000 men. When Russia conquered the Caucasus, when France annexed Algeria, when Austria subjugated Bosnia and Herzegovina, they each made heavy calls upon the military strength of their country, whilst when the army of Lord Chelmsford in Zululand was increased to 20,000 combatants—a fifth of what Russia marches down to Turkestan—there was an outcry at home that the demand for reinforcements was excessive. The record of the deeds of the British army during the present reign is one not to be ashamed of, and Mr. Low has appointed himself the chronicler through the means of biography. His two handsome volumes consist of the lives of those who have added glory to the military annals of our country.

<sup>15</sup> "The Mound Builders." By J. P. Maclean. Trübner.

<sup>16</sup> "Soldiers of the Victorian Age." By C. R. Low. Two volumes. Chapman & Hall.

The list is confined to the names of Sir Thomas Willshire, Sir George Whitlock, Sir Charles Pearson, Sir George Macgregor, Sir Henry Clifford, Viscount Gough, Sir H. Evelyn Wood, Sir Vincent Eyre, Sir Herbert Edwardes, Sir Henry Durand, Lord Chelmsford, Sir James Outram, Lord Strathnairn, Sir Neville Chamberlain, Sir James Hope Grant, Lord Napier of Magdala, and Lord Clyde. We notice two grave omissions, the names of Sir Henry Havelock and Sir Garnet Wolseley. Surely these are as worthy of insertion as a Durand or a Chamberlain? Mr. Low does not pretend to give us any new information as to his heroes, but he puts together in a pleasant and graphic manner the leading incidents in their careers, and furnishes a work which will be read with interest alike by the soldier as by the civilian. It is well, as the author says, that the services of some of England's gallant soldiers who have added provinces to her empire, or saved those she already possessed, should find a record in the pages of the annalist. Mr. Low is the chattiest of chroniclers, and he has done well in extending his labours to the deeds of the living as well as the dead.

For a criticism of Byron there is ample material, and Professor Nichol<sup>17</sup> has fully availed himself of it. What with the cynical confessions of the poet, the praise and abuse of his friends, the flood of literature that his conduct occasioned, we have little difficulty in arriving at a just conclusion as to the character of Byron and the nature of his work. He was the most notorious personality in the world of letters of our century. Nearly every one who crossed his path has left on record various impressions of intimacy or interview. Those whom he avoided or patronized, like Leigh Hunt, maligned him; those to whom he was genial and kindly, like Moore, Shelley, and Harness, loved him. A man whose passions disdained restraint, frank upon matters about which other men keep silent, loving to make himself out worse than he really was, of great genius and biting wit, proud of his birth, at war throughout his life with a world which had been unjust to him, sensitive, unhappy, and slightly tinged with insanity, such was Byron, one of the greatest poets that England or any other country has ever produced.\* "He is a person of the most consummate genius," said Shelley, "and capable, if he would direct his energies to such an end, of becoming the redeemer of his degraded country. But it is his weakness to be proud; he derives from a comparison of his own extraordinary mind with the dwarfish intellects that surround him, an intense apprehension of the nothingness of human life. His passions and his powers are incomparably greater than those of other men; and instead of the latter having been employed in curbing the former, they have mutually lent each other strength. But in social life no human being can be more gentle, patient, and unassuming. He is cheerful, frank, and witty. His more serious conversation is a sort of intoxication; men are held by it as by a spell." So much for the man. As to his work, the poetry of Byron is among the most sublime in the language. He is the grand Napoleon of the realms of rhyme. His works

<sup>17</sup> "English Men of Letters." Byron. By John Nichol. Macmillan & Co.

were the events of the literary world, and were translated into every language in Europe. Lord Macaulay declares that Byron was the most celebrated Englishman in the nineteenth century. Goethe urged Eckermann to study English in order to read "Cain" and "Childe Harold." "The audacity and grandeur of Byron," said the author of *Faust*, "must certainly tend towards culture. We should take care not to be always looking for it in the decidedly pure and moral. Everything that is great promotes cultivation as soon as we are aware of it. . . . Byron issues from the sea-waves ever fresh. I could not make use of any man as the representative of the modern poetic era except him who is undoubtedly to be regarded as the greatest genius of our century." Castelar in Spain, Mazzini in Italy, Sainte Beuve in France, and Elze in Germany, all sing the praise of Byron, classing him with the greatest of English poets. Such concurrent testimony cannot be set aside. Byron was often rapid and slovenly in his verse, he was an improvisatore on the spot where his fancy was kindled; his best inspirations are frequently spoilt by the interruption of incongruous commonplace; he did not pretend to originality—who in a late age can be original?—but he made all he borrowed his own by recasting the rough ore into bell-metal. Still, with all his faults, he stands second to none in the beauty of his descriptions of scenery, in his knowledge of the human heart as evinced by his satires, and in the swing and rhythm of his verse. His work is, as Professor Nichol writes, neither perfect architecture nor fine mosaic, but like that of his intellectual ancestors, the elder Elizabethans, whom he perversely maligned, it is all animated by the spirit of action and enterprise.

#### BELLES LETTRES.

THERE are, we believe, somewhere about two hundred new novels published every year. Yet only the other day, one, who ought to be an authority on the subject, told us that he could not supply new novels fast enough to his subscribers. The fact is, that a woman looks upon a novel as she does upon vegetables or fish—thinks that it is not good unless it is perfectly fresh. She treats a novel as she does one of her guests—as soon as she gets it into the house is anxious to get it out again, and have another. Whether librarians can or cannot supply their customers fast enough with novels, we certainly cannot review them fast enough. Were we to notice all the novels now sent to us in increasing numbers every quarter, we should not have space for any other book. All that we can do is to briefly notice some of the leading works of fiction as they appear. Here, for instance, is Mr. William Black's "Sunrise,"<sup>1</sup> which stands out conspicuously

<sup>1</sup> "Sunrise." A Story of these Times. By William Black, author of "A Daughter of Heth," &c. &c. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, & Rivington. 1880.

from the crowd. It is too soon to pass any criticism in detail, but each number most certainly grows in strength, and reveals Mr. Black's power for description, and, what is far more difficult, for character. His descriptions, for instance, of Venice are as good as anything which he has ever done when describing his own favourite north-coast scenery. It is not every man can use both his right hand and his left. Authors, like painters, generally sketch only one kind of scenery, and can do no other. Lord Evelyn's character is gradually developing, and he promises to be one of the most interesting studies which Mr. Black has ever done.

Those who fancied that Mr. Trollope had been falling off will be delighted to read "The Duke's Children,"<sup>2</sup> and to meet again their old friend the Duke of Omnium, the only duke whom all of us know. Mr. Trollope is upon old ground, and describes it with all the ease of his best days. The death of the Duchess so early in the tale will be a great shock to many worthy people, but even duchesses must die that novels may be written.

"Reata"<sup>3</sup> is by a writer whose name is unknown to us, but which will not long be so to all novel readers, if he continues to produce such good work as the present. He has evidently seen much of the world, and, what is more, is able to describe what he has seen. There is a brightness and picturesqueness about his style which are particularly attractive. Once or twice he allows his fancy to run riot. There are also some other extravagances which time and self-criticism will cure. Altogether "Reata" is full of promise of a by no means common order.

"In Pastures Green"<sup>4</sup> is a collection of stories worthy of the reputation of the author of "Queen of the Meadow." We think the first story, from which the volume takes its name, decidedly the best. Let us again call attention to the way in which Mr. Gibbon's books are always got up. The outside of the present volume is nearly worthy of the inside.

Two or three one-volume novels may all be classed together. The best of them is perhaps "Strangers Yet,"<sup>5</sup> though we cannot say very much for the illustrations. Close to it in point of merit comes "Signor Monaldini's Niece."<sup>6</sup> The authoress, however, is far too much given to fine writing. Here, for instance, is a passage: "All the bells broke out in the aurora *Angelus* with a pure fresh music, as if the great silver bell of the sky had been struck by some swinging

<sup>2</sup> "The Duke's Children." A Novel. By Anthony Trollope. London: Chapman & Hall (Limited). 1880.

<sup>3</sup> "Reata. What's in a Name?" By E. D. Gerard. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons. 1880.

<sup>4</sup> "In Pastures Green," and other Stories. By Charles Gibbon, author of "Queen of the Meadow," "In Honour Bound," &c. &c. London: Chatto & Windus. 1880.

<sup>5</sup> "Strangers Yet." A Story. By Sarah Doudney, author of "Stepping Stones," &c. London: William Isbister & Co. (Limited). 1880.

<sup>6</sup> "Signor Monaldini's Niece." A Novel of Italian Life. London: W. H. Allen & Co. 1880.

star" (p. 98). We can only match this piece of eloquence by the American description: "Night wrapped her mantle of darkness around her, and pinned it with a star." There are several other similar passages which might be easily pointed out. "The Story of Heritage"<sup>7</sup> is a thorough-going love-story, written, we should imagine, notwithstanding the title-page, by a woman. "Wandering Will"<sup>8</sup> has very little to do with love, and is chiefly taken up with travelling and adventures. It is, however, quite as interesting as most love stories.

Amongst the regular three-volume novels "My Only Love"<sup>9</sup> will hold its own for what, in lack of a better word, we must call "go." The best scene is perhaps that in which the production of the opera "Cupid and Psyche" is described. Equally good is the account of the private theatricals in the first volume.

"A Son of Mars"<sup>10</sup> has all Major Griffiths's old defects. It is, however, vigorous, and the story never flags. The men are better done than the women. Just as "A Son of Mars" may be recommended to men, so may "Lady Laura"<sup>11</sup> be recommended to women. It is not only well written, but at times is marked by grace and fancy. Another story which may also be recommended for drawing-room reading is "Hartleigh Towers."<sup>12</sup> In the same class we may put "Beauty's Daughters"<sup>13</sup> and "The Shadow of Life."<sup>14</sup>

Far better, however, than the whole of these put together is the Japanese romance of "The Loyal League."<sup>15</sup> It is a book not merely to be read once, but to be bought and treasured as a work of art. From it we may learn a lesson how our novels may be illustrated. Nothing can exceed the force and precision of the woodcuts, which will be the delight of all lovers of Japanese art. The design on the cover, we may add, is taken from a Japanese album, and puts to shame all the tawdry embellishments which appear on the outside of our Christmas and New Year books.

At last, in "Riquet of the Tuft"<sup>16</sup> we have a play which is

<sup>7</sup> "The Story of Heritage." By Herbert Gough. London: Remington & Co. 1880.

<sup>8</sup> "Wandering Will." A Story of Adventure, founded on Facts. London: Remington & Co. 1880.

<sup>9</sup> "My Only Love." A Novel. By Emilia A. Blake. London: Remington & Co. 1880.

<sup>10</sup> "A Son of Mars." By Major Arthur Griffiths. London: Remington & Co. 1880.

<sup>11</sup> "Lady Laura." By Mary E. Christie. London: Strahan & Co. (Limited). 1880.

<sup>12</sup> "Hartleigh Towers." By Mrs. Milner Rae. London: William Isbister & Co. (Limited). 1880.

<sup>13</sup> "Beauty's Daughters." By the Author of "Phyllis." London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1880.

<sup>14</sup> "The Shadow of Life." By Beryl Hope. London: W. H. Allen & Co. 1880.

<sup>15</sup> "Chiushingura, or the Loyal League." A Japanese Romance. Translated by F. V. Dickins, Barrister-at-Law. Illustrated by numerous engravings on wood, drawn and executed by Japanese artists on Japanese paper. London: W. H. Allen & Co. 1880.

<sup>16</sup> "Riquet of the Tuft." A Love Drama. London: Macmillan & Co. 1880.

thoroughly readable. We do not say that the author is complete master of his craft, for this can only come after a long apprenticeship. Probably the author, now that his play is published, would be the first to confess his own shortcomings; for it is only after a poem has been written some time that we see its true perspective. Publication brings to light many defects which somehow or another are hidden in the manuscript. We should, however, fancy that, with a few curtailments, "Riquet of the Tuft" was pre-eminently suited for the stage. Perhaps what the play lacks most is want of action; but the compression, and consequently the quicker movement which would thus be obtained, would to a great extent remedy this defect. Nobody can possibly read it through without a desire to see it acted. The story is the old French fairy-tale, which has, we believe, been more than once dramatized, and was certainly the delight of Paris some fifty years ago. The author's workmanship is excellent. His touch is both light and effective. His management of the fairies, most difficult of all creatures to manage, is delightful. He uses them as the Japanese use moths and butterflies and flowers—for ornaments. He always introduces them in the right place. Their wings rustle at the right moment. They sing just when we want music. Few scenes could be more effective on the stage than that in which the three bands of fairies appear, each alternately singing and predicting Prince Riquet's fate. The scene contains every element of stage effect. With modern appliances, good voices, and good dancing, success must, in this scene as well as in several others, be inevitable. The whole play, however, is from beginning to end full of warmth and colour. It opens on a May-day morning, such a May-day as Shakespeare and his contemporaries knew, and the freshness of the May is felt in every scene. The songs, too, are as fresh as the birds, on such a May morning. Lanval, the painter, comes on singing a May song not unworthy of Beaumont and Fletcher:—

"Winter cold is dead and laid  
In his grave beneath the yew;  
March and April, boy and maid,  
Sleep beneath the mournful dew;  
Oh! Farewell—for May is here,  
May, the darling of the year.

"Children, fly to field and grove,  
All the flowers are wild with mirth;  
Youths, it is the time when love  
Makes a garden of the earth:  
Maids, be kind—for May is here,  
May, the darling of the year."

Scarcely inferior to this is the song, composed by the Court poet and sung by the gardener to please Prince Riquet:—

"Roses in whose scented bed  
Oberon lays his curly head;  
Myrtles whence the plaintive dove  
Wooes carnations red with love;

Pansies full of thoughts they tell  
 To the lilies near the well ;  
 Tulips in whose royal cup  
 Starry dews are gathered up ;—  
 All the flowers in garden born,  
 Bid my lady-love good morn.

“ Snowdrops drooping with the stress  
 Of the winter’s barrenness ;  
 Violets, dark as Love’s wild eyes,  
 Dreaming through his memories ;  
 Daffodils by rivers old,  
 Broom that burns from wold to wold ;  
 Primrose, virgin of the spring,  
 Dim bluebells and daisy-ring ;—  
 All the flowers the fields adorn  
 Bid my maiden-love good morn.”

It is a happy sign when poets can write such healthy songs. A little time ago we ventured to recommend a revival of the masque in a modified form. Now, “ Riquet of the Tuft ” is such a revival. True, it is in scenes and acts ; but this in no way affects the essence of the matter. In it we get two essentials for success on the modern stage—spectacle of a poetical character, and all the elements of music. Songs such as those we have quoted, set to music say by Sullivan, fairy scenes such as abound in the play, together with well-written dialogue, could not fail to oust the modern burlesque. The dialogue in “ Riquet of the Tuft ” is as remarkable for its point and terseness as the songs are for their rhythmical sweetness. Here, for instance, is an old theme treated with freshness and vigour of thought :—

“ What a wild wonder is a woman’s will !  
 Impulse commands it, hope and faith and love ;  
 But conscience never, truth and justice never.  
 Who could enchain it, could bind fast the sun,  
 And whirling earth, and make the flying wind  
 A prisoner, and lay a sudden hand  
 Upon the lightning’s arrow.”

Altogether, “ Riquet of the Tuft ” gives us some hopes of the revival of the stage ; not, indeed, in the old form of the five-act drama, but in short pieces, half partaking of the masque, and suited both by music and by what, for want of a better name, we must call spectacle, to the æsthetic needs of the day.

It is useless now to make any protest against Mr. Browning’s<sup>17</sup> style, or his choice of subjects. We can only regret that a writer of so dramatic, so full of imagination, fancy, musical expression, and all the qualities which go to make a great poet, should have sunk into mere violence, spasm, and affectation. Mr. Browning is, however, not only popular, but rising in popularity. His books enjoy a wide circulation. He has even a school of admirers and followers. We

---

<sup>17</sup> “ Dramatic Idyls.” Second Series. By Robert Browning. London : Smith, Elder & Co. 1880.



can only explain this by a saying of one of the Fathers, that there is no book so bad that it will not have admirers. Certainly, in this day of artistic crazes and æsthetic crotchets, we need not be surprised that Mr. Browning's later poetry should have its worshippers. There are plenty of people who mistake mere ruggedness for power, uncouthness for originality, and downright nonsense for profundity. It is, however, now of no use to say a word on the subject. Mr. Browning's mannerisms have become stereotyped. The idyls in the present volume which we like most, or rather dislike least, are 'Clive,' and 'Pan and Luna.' Some of the others are simply detestable. They seem to be written for no other purpose than to torture the reader's ears. Here, for instance, is a passage :—

“Good—you muster up a smile; that's better! still so brisk?  
All at once grown youthful? But the case is plain? Ass—  
How I dally with the fiend, yet know the Word—compels all creatures,  
Earthly, heavenly, hellish. 'Apaga, Sathanas!  
*Dicam verbus Salamonis*'—'Dicite'—when—whisk!—”

Most certainly the great poets—Homer, Dante, Shakespeare, and Milton—did not win the world's ear by “dicite, when, whisk!” It would, however, be the height of infatuation to deny Mr. Browning's powers. Luckily for us, the two volumes of selections from his works prove how great a poet he once was, and we should advise our readers to turn from the present volume to their happy pages.

Mr. Symonds' “New and Old”<sup>18</sup> is a most difficult book to review. Two criticisms might be, however, passed off-hand by a flippant reviewer—first, that there is about four times the quantity of verse that there should be; secondly, that the man who wrote this book could write equally well on any subject. Perhaps Mr. Symonds' poetry may be best understood by comparing him with Mr. Swinburne. When we read Mr. Swinburne's criticisms we feel that he is a poet; when we read Mr. Symonds' poetry we feel that he is a critic. But let us hasten to add that many who read Mr. Symonds would despise Swinburne, whilst none who read Swinburne would despise Mr. Symonds. The poet whom Mr. Symonds most resembles is Clough. But Clough was never popular, nor can Mr. Symonds expect to be. Mr. Symonds, however, is sure to have that select audience which is one of the highest tributes of praise. His culture, his sympathy for all that is noble, his liberality of spirit, must always secure him a place amongst modern thinkers. Come what may, lines such as these are sure to hold their own :—

“Blame not the times in which we live,  
Nor Fortune frail and fugitive;  
Blame not thy parents, nor the rule  
Of vice or wrong once learnt at school;  
But blame thyself, O man!”

---

<sup>18</sup> “New and Old.” A Volume of Verse. By John Addington Symonds, author of “Many Moods,” “Studies of Greek Poets,” &c. &c. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1880.

“ Although both heaven and earth combined  
To mould thy flesh and form thy mind,  
Though every thought, word, action, will,  
Was framed by powers beyond thee, still  
Thou art thyself, O man !

“ And self to take or leave is free,  
Feeling its own sufficiency ;  
In spite of science, spite of fate,  
The judge within thee soon or late  
Will blame but thee, O man !

“ Say not, ‘ I would, but could not—He  
Should bear the blame who fashioned me—  
Call you mere change of motive choice ?’—  
Scorning such pleas, the inner voice  
Cries, ‘ Thine the deed, O man ! ’ ”

The great value, however, of Mr. Symonds' volume is the way in which he reflects the thought of the age upon the great problems of life. He is constantly reminding us how

“ The old faiths die and dwindle  
With each twirl of Clotho's spindle,  
And she spins eternally.”

He is constantly singing to us

“ Part of the whole that never can be known,  
Is this poor atom that we call our world ;  
Part of this part amid confusion hurled  
Is man, an idiot on a crumbling throne.

“ You, and each separate soul that works alone,  
Striving to pierce the clouds around him curled,  
Gasp but one moment in the tempest whirled,  
And what he builds strong Death hath overthrown.”

It is these reflections which give the real note to Mr. Symonds' poems. His work is characteristic of the day, and for this reason alone no one can afford to pass it by. Of course the poems are affected by the writer's own peculiar temperament. Other singers will arise, who, though holding Mr. Symonds' views—who, though believing that life is the end of life—will strike far more joyous notes. Still, Mr. Symonds doubtless expresses only too truly the despair which fills so many of the best minds of the day. In his book they will find reflected their own thoughts and their own musings. It is a work rather for the thinker and student than for the mere poet, a work which is to be approached in the same spirit with which we take up a volume of meditations.

\* Mr. Myers' "Defence of Rome"<sup>19</sup> is another difficult volume of poems to criticize without seeming to do injustice to the author. There is so much in it in which we sympathize, so much that is noble, so much artistic power, that it seems ungracious to say a harsh

---

<sup>19</sup> "The Defence of Rome," and other Poems. By Ernest Myers, author of "The Puritans," "Poems," &c. &c. London: Macmillan & Co. 1880.

word. But if the truth must be spoken, Mr. Myers' verse is poetical rather than poetry. We read it, and coldly admire. We are never carried away in any fit of enthusiasm. On the whole, we prefer the shorter pieces. It is here that we see Mr. Myers' delicacy and grace of sentiment at its best. One or two of them ought to find their way into all collections of modern English poetry.

"Beethoven"<sup>20</sup> is a drama in one act, taken from the German. If the original ever possessed any merit, it has all evaporated in this translation.

"Nero"<sup>21</sup> is a tastefully got up little volume, with a photograph by no means badly executed. If the author had only been half as successful as his publisher, the book would have been a decided success.

Mr. Weatherly's<sup>22</sup> poems possess a decided character of their own. He is no imitator. There is just a family likeness between some of his pieces and those of Elliott the Corn-law Rhymer, Clare, and the Dorsetshire poet Barnes. They for the most part deal with homely subjects, and may be best described as simple and thoroughly healthy. This is no slight praise at any time, but especially in these days. Here and there, however, Mr. Weatherly leaves his homely subjects and ventures on a higher strain, but his verse still preserves that definite note which is certainly one of the best tests of poetry. Here, for instance, is a piece beginning—

"Once in the days of old,  
 In the years of youth and mirth,  
 The sea was a lover bright and bold,  
 And he loved the golden earth.  
 The sun in his royal rayment clad,  
 Loved her and found her sweet,  
 But the sea was content, and glad  
 Only to lie at her feet."

"Ah, that the bards should sing,  
 And wail for the golden years;  
 Love was and is but an idle thing,  
 'Tis but a wind that veers.

The poem goes on to tell how the earth spurns the love of the sea, and accepts that of the sun:—

"And earth in her beauty and pride,  
 Held her lips to the wooing sun,  
 He said 'Thou art fair, oh, my bride,'  
 And she sang 'I am thine alone.'  
 The faithful sea at her faithless feet  
 Rolled with a broken moan;  
 'Oh, sun!' he cried, 'but thy bride is sweet,  
 And I am alone, alone!'

<sup>20</sup> "Beethoven." A Dramatized Episode from his Life. From the German of Dr. Hugo Müller. By Gustav Hein. Aberdeen: A. & R. Milner. 1880.

<sup>21</sup> "Nero." A Tragedy. By Richard Comfort. London: Trübner & Co. 1880.

<sup>22</sup> "Dresden China. And other Songs." By F. E. Weatherly, author of Nancy Lee." London: Diprose & Bateman. 1880.

“ Ah! that the bards should sing,  
 And wail for the golden years;  
 Love was and is but an idle thing,  
 ’Tis but a wind that veers.”

The sun, however, in its turn spurns the earth, but the sea remains faithful to his love—

“ Oft would the sun depart,  
 And his bride in her gloom made moan;  
 And the sea would cry that her loving heart  
 Should be left to pine alone.  
 And his voice is strange and sad and sweet,  
 ‘ Oh! love, not mine! not mine!  
 I am content to lie at thy feet,  
 And to love thee in storm and shine.’

“ Ah! that the bards should sing,  
 And wail for the golden years;  
 Love was and is but an idle thing,  
 ’Tis but a wind that veers.”

This appears to us full of freshness, fancy and music. The last stanza in the original is unfortunately marred by a blunder in the punctuation, which makes the author say precisely the reverse of what he intended. ‘The Ferry Maiden’ is another piece full of pathetic beauty, where the catastrophe is hinted at rather than described. The ‘Two Pathways’ has a manly earnest ring about it, which is so much wanted in modern poetry, and which we find repeated again in a different way in the ‘Maiden and the River.’ We have not for a long time seen work which contains so much promise. Lastly, the volume is brought out in an attractive and wonderfully cheap form, and most certainly deserves to be popular with all classes.

We have pleasant recollections of Mr. J. Brunton Stephens,<sup>23</sup> rather, however, as a poet than as a humorist. His humour, however, is excellent. There is nothing vulgar nor personal about it. Here, for instance, is a parody on Coleridge’s well-known poem:—

“ All thoughts, all passions, all delights,  
 Whatever stirs this mortal frame,  
 Are but the legacies of apes  
 With interest on the same.”

The parody goes on to tell how the poet won Gwendoline, “the mammal of his heart”:—

“ Few virtues had she of her own,—  
 She borrowed them from time and space;  
 Her age was eocene, although  
 Post-tertiary her place.”

---

<sup>23</sup> “Miscellaneous Poems.” By J. Brunton Stephens, author of “Convict Once,” “The Godolphin Arabian,” &c. London: Macmillan & Co. Brisbane: Watson, Ferguson & Co. 1880.

All this is amusing enough. There are plenty, too, of equally amusing things in the volume, such as 'The Southern Cross,' 'My Chinese Cook,' 'My Other Chinese Cook.' All who wish to enjoy, not what is vulgarly called a good laugh, but what is infinitely better, the quiet smile which true humour always raises, should buy Mr. Stephens' book.

All who know Mr. Graves' "Irish Songs and Ballads"<sup>24</sup> will be glad to learn that it has reached a second edition.

We are always glad to see "The Papers of the Manchester Literary Club."<sup>25</sup> Some of them are quite equal to the best articles in our best reviews. The present volume is full of interest. It deals with a variety of subjects. The Paper which rightly takes the first place is Mr. Howorth's 'Primary Data of Knowledge.' He here takes up the challenge elately laid down by another Lancashire man, the Rev. T. P. Kirkman. Those who are interested in this controversy should certainly read Mr. Howorth's most lucid statements and explanations, and then turn to Mr. Grant Allen's 'Ways of Orthodox Critics,' recently published in *The Fortnightly Review*, for another side of Mr. Kirkman's book. Another excellent article is Mr. Milner's 'The Relation of Literature to Painting.' He rightly lays down the canon, so often misunderstood, that the first motive both of the poet and the painter is to give pleasure; that is, pleasure of the highest kind, or, to use Mr. Milner's own words, "to aim at increasing the total sense of enjoyment, and of heightening the mental and spiritual pulse." Mr. Milner, in language which will seem mere darkness to many, points out how, in the school of art, "men learn, but are not taught," and how, though an artist has nothing to do with morals *per se*, yet he may make for those "who come under his influence an atmosphere pure as the heavens above, or an immoral atmosphere debasing as the pit of hell." Mr. Milner then proceeds to expose the errors of two modern contemporary schools, one in France and the other in England, one in painting and one in poetry. Both, as he shows, have chosen subjects outside the proper domain of art. Excellent, too, are Mr. Milner's remarks on mere realism. He has thoroughly grasped Schiller's saying, that it is the artist's aim "to blend the ideal with the real, and the real with the ideal," and illustrates the doctrine with great happiness of expression. Excellent, too, are Mr. Milner's remarks on criticism, or what he very rightly calls "the uncertainty, the wilfulness, the uninformed audacity" of modern critics. "Here," as Mr. Milner says, "is universal Nature, a region where all things are protean and subtle; where the improbable is that which is for ever happening; where no two shapes are alike; where effects are legion, and development infinite." Yet it is here that the critic presumes to dogmatize, and to lay down his one-sided opinions, without ever having given the matter an hour's considera-

<sup>24</sup> "Irish Songs and Ballads." By Alfred Percival Graves, author of "Songs of Killarney." Second edition. Manchester: Alexander Ireland & Co. 1880.

<sup>25</sup> "Papers of the Manchester Literary Club." Volume VI. With Illustrations by William Hull, William Walker, W. H. J. Boot, and George Evans. Manchester: published for the Club by Abel Heywood. 1880.

tion. We must, however, stop, although we have much more to say, especially upon Mr. Milner's remarks on imagination and fancy, both as regards the poet and the painter. Amongst the other papers we may call attention to Mr. Rouley's 'Fancies and Fashions in Art.' He begins by reminding us that, with all our boasting about art, we possess the most feebly designed coinage and the ugliest postage stamps in the world. His criticisms are in the main just. His paper would, however, be far more telling if it were better arranged. He rambles about too much, and his remarks thus lose their point. His article, however, is well worth reading. Besides these two papers we have two shorter contributions on art, one on 'Etching,' and the other on 'The Manchester Academy of Fine Arts.' Books, too, as books, have due attention paid to them. We have two articles, one on 'The Libraries of Lancashire and Cheshire,' by Mr. Axon, and another on 'Special Collections of Books in Lancashire and Cheshire,' by Mr. Nodal. These, we need not say, are excellently done. They possess a permanent value for book collectors and librarians. Mr. Madeley adds an interesting notice on the 'Limits of Local Collections in the Town Libraries of Lancashire and Cheshire.' Colonel Fishwick has, too, contributed an elaborate and apparently exhaustive account of 'The Bibliography of Rochdale;' and, to show index-makers how their work should really be done, Mr. Axon has compiled the Index for the present volume. Amongst the remaining miscellaneous contributions we may call especial attention to Mr. Heywood's learned article on 'Almanacs.' Mr. Mortimer gives us an account of Sherwood under the title of 'Robin Hood's Country,' but Sir Walter Scott still remains master of the field by his description in "Ivanhoe" of the Birkland oaks. Mr. O'Connor writes upon 'Proverbs,' and comes to the conclusion that the man of proverbs is not always the wise man—in fact, "non dicere sed facere beatum est." Quite true is this in its way. Still proverbs are of the highest service. "He is never alone," said Sidney, "who has noble thoughts for his companions;" and many proverbs do contain the noblest thoughts. But this side of the question Mr. O'Connor has not sufficiently considered. Much, very much, may be said for the study of proverbs. They are often the incentives to action. Often, too, when the mind is wavering, do they incline the balance the right way. Lastly, we have what is so rare, a humorous article by the same writer on 'Humour.' Mr. O'Connor looks upon humour as the salvation of life. We shall not contradict him. Your merry heart goes all the day. According to our humorist, the world is a huge jest. Πάντα γέλωσ. Never, says Mr. O'Connor, do we in a thousand years see the right man in the right place, and "what is a man in the wrong place but a thing to laugh at?" All evils may be overcome by a little well-timed humour. As Mr. O'Connor remarks, the proud man's contumely, the insolence of office, and all the other daily annoyances of life, may be turned aside by a better weapon than a bodkin. What if people do take us for idiots? The mistake is theirs. A clergyman was once made the butt of the dinner-table. He took no notice of the insults. At last

some one remarked on his quietness. "Oh!" said he, "I am used to this sort of thing: I am the chaplain of a lunatic asylum." Equally amusing is Mr. O'Connor's explanation why women are destitute of humour. The truth is, men have no real occupations. Politics are all frivolous nonsense; law is much the same; the art of medicine still worse; and as to theology, we hardly dare, even in this review, quote Mr. O'Connor's words. But woman, she has real duties to perform. This world to her is sadly truly real, and not a thing to be joked about. How, then, can she have humour? Long ago, says Mr. O'Connor, a Scotch laird condemned one of his vassals to death. When Donald came to the gallows, accompanied by his faithful wife Janet, he stood at the foot of the ladder, shrugging his shoulders, unwilling to mount. "Hoot awa, Donald," said Janet, "gang up like a man, and please the laird."

Perhaps nothing is so remarkable as the recent growth of literature in our larger towns. Mr. Gladstone has called attention to the excellence of the provincial newspaper press. He might, however, with equal justice, have called attention to the excellence of our local literature. Whether we look at the printing, binding, illustrations, paper, and general finish and get-up of the book, we find works issued from the local press quite equal to any brought out by the most eminent firms in London. Such a book is Mr. Hine's "Nottingham Castle."<sup>26</sup> It would be a credit to any press. The book is evidently a labour of love. Mr. Hine is not merely an antiquarian, but an artist. No one need be afraid of being overwhelmed by mere dry-as-dust details. Its pages are richly illustrated by drawings and photographs. Mr. Hine has of course made use of all the local records. In fact, his book is a record in itself of all the principal events connected with the castle, and consequently with Nottingham, and so with the history of England. We should never forget that the history of England, more particularly the history of the last civil war, is really written in our local records, especially in the corporation books of our large towns. It would be of the greatest benefit to the historian if these books, more particularly the chamberlain's accounts, could be published. They would show very accurately the feeling of the nation on the most important events of the day, and how it varied in different parts of England. As it is, however, we must have recourse to such books as Mr. Hine's. Nor is it easy to over-estimate the value of such books. The local historian must always be able to glean facts which are inaccessible to others. Macaulay was himself, as he admits, largely indebted to the local historian for minute details which must otherwise have escaped him. In this way Mr. Hine's book has a special interest for

<sup>26</sup> I. "Nottingham. Its Castle: a Military Fortress; a Royal Palace; a Ducal Mansion; a Blackened Ruin; a Museum and Gallery of Art." With Notes relating to the Borough of Nottingham. By Thomas Chambers Hine, F.S.A. Nottingham: J. Derry. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co. II. "A Supplement to Nottingham. Its Castle: A Military Fortress; a Royal Palace; a Blackened Ruin; a Museum and Gallery of Art," &c. &c. By Thomas Chambers Hine, F.S.A. Nottingham: J. Derry. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co. 1879.

the historian. Thus Mr. Hine, from his local knowledge, is enabled to show, by a quotation from the first Duke of Newcastle's will, that it was the Duke himself who was the architect of the present castle, and not March, who till now has always had the credit of the design. The discovery, slight as it may seem, throws considerable light on the architecture, and clears up a point which has always been a difficulty. This Duke, "the Loyell Duke," as he is called on his monument in Westminster Abbey, was a man of high and varied accomplishments, and his book on Horsemanship is still prized by collectors. Several other vexed questions Mr. Hine is also able to clear up. Thus he indubitably proves that there is not the slightest truth in the charge always brought against Sir William Kingston of cruelty towards the fallen Wolsey. Further, Mr. Hine brings a very curious piece of evidence to light, showing how the blunder arose which attributed the Life of Wolsey to Sir William Cavendish, instead of to George Cavendish. Further, too, Mr. Hine gives good reasons for showing that the imprisonment of King David II. of Scotland in Nottingham Castle for eleven years is a mere fiction. This is doing yeoman's work. But if Mr. Hine has bestowed so much labour on the early history of Nottingham, he has paid no less attention to its later days. In the supplementary volume Mr. Hine gives us a most interesting account of Nottingham worthies, more especially its artists. His criticisms on Dawson and Bonnington—for it is often forgotten that Bonnington was ever an Englishman—are marked by good taste and feeling. He does not, however, notice that the new Dawson photo-etching process, which seems destined sooner or later to produce a revolution in art, is the invention of the painter's son. Altogether, we may say that Mr. Hine's book, looking at it both from an artistic and a literary point of view, is worthy of its subject. We are probably a long way off yet from beating the sword into the ploughshare, but we have, at all events, turned a castle into a museum, and Mr. Hine has proved himself no unworthy chronicler of the transformation.

We can, of course, do little more than notice Professor Skeat's great Dictionary.<sup>27</sup> It would require not merely one but several specialists to do such a work thorough justice. We may, however, venture to say that where we have tested it in Shakespearian matters, we have always found either a full explanation or the difficulty fairly stated. We do not, however, quite understand why neither under "pioneer" or "peony" there is no reference to the well-known passage in "The Tempest" about which so strong a controversy is still being carried on. By the way, is "pink" in Shakespeare's "Bacchus with pink cyne" obsolete as a provincialism? We fancy that we have heard it in Nottinghamshire.

We gladly welcome one of those little books without which Professor Skeat's work could not be written. Mr. Poole's "Glossary

<sup>27</sup> "An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language." Arranged on an Historical Basis. By the Rev. Walter Skeat, M.A., Ebrington and Bosworth Professor of Anglo-Saxon in the University of Cambridge. Part III. Lit—Red. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1880.



of Staffordshire Provincialisms<sup>28</sup> is welcome, too, on many grounds. If our memory does not deceive us, Staffordshire is sadly deficient in glossarists. Mr. Poole's work helps to fill up a very serious gap. Mr. Poole's modest preface ought, too, to bring many recruits into this field. He appeals for aid, in the shape of lists of Staffordshire words, to the members of the English Dialect Society. There must be many members, we are sure, who are able to give that aid, and we trust that it will not be withheld from so worthy and zealous a labourer as Mr. Poole. His book, though small, is rich in many classes of words. He has set to work on the principle—the only true principle we may add—recommended by Professor Skeat, of registering every word which he might pick up, which is not now used in literary English. There are, in fact, three distinct classes of words in Mr. Poole's glossary; first, those used in the coal-pits, the second those used in the iron and smelting works, and the third those used in the potteries. Now these make real additions to our knowledge of provincialisms. The coal terms should of course be compared with those in the North of England and in South Wales, whilst the iron terms might be collated with those used in Cleveland. Besides giving us these three classes of provincialisms, Mr. Poole's Glossary is especially rich in Shakespearian words and in picturesque archaisms, such as "edge of light" for twilight; "nookshotten" (by the way a Shakespearian word), now used for from corner to corner; "narrow-dale-noon," for anything done late in the day; "bakelet," one of that large number of provincial diminutives in "let," for a little shovel used in turning out cakes; "can-bottle," the long-tailed titmouse, evidently so called from the shape of its nest. Words like these would alone give the Glossary a value of its own. Mr. Poole's work, too, possesses another great merit, he rightly abstains from all derivations. Lastly, he evidently possesses a large fund of humour, as is shown in his tale of 'Going to be Bishopped.' In short, Mr. Poole's Glossary is one of the best which we have lately seen, and we heartily trust that some of the members of the English Dialect Society will respond to his appeal, and co-operate with him in his work. Only in this way can a complete glossary of Staffordshire provincialisms be attained, which Mr. Poole has now so worthily begun.

Miss Stokes' collection of Indian Fairy Tales<sup>29</sup> will be welcomed by everybody. Perhaps they at times make somewhat too great a demand on our cold Western imaginations. The collection is considerably enhanced in value by Mr. Ralston's introduction, who points out to what groups various tales belong, and what are their European equivalents and counterparts.

Although we cannot consider Mr. Matthew Arnold's prose writings<sup>30</sup>

<sup>28</sup> "An Attempt towards a Glossary of the Archaic and Provincial Words of the County of Stafford." First brought together by Charles Henry Poole. Saint Gregory's Press, Stratford-upon-Avon. 1880.

<sup>29</sup> "Indian Fairy Tales." Collected and Translated by Maine Stokes. With Notes by Mary Stokes. London: Ellis & White. 1880.

<sup>30</sup> "Passages from the Prose Writings of Matthew Arnold." London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1880.

as valuable as his poetry, yet they undoubtedly have had more effect upon the world at large. No proper estimate has, in fact, ever been made of Mr. Arnold's poetry, which future generations will, we believe, put on a higher pedestal than that of any contemporary poet, not excepting Tennyson himself. The present volume of extracts will certainly do good. It is a pity that Mr. Arnold should have reprinted any of his controversies with third and fourth-rate literary men. He should have remembered the advice of his master, Epictetus—"As well argue with a drunken man as with an illiterate one." The book is full of wise things, especially in the way of literary criticism. Here, for instance, is something well worth remembering: "A man's power to detect the ring of the false metal in Lord Macaulay's 'Lays of Ancient Rome,' is a good measure of his fitness to give an opinion about poetical matters at all." Here, again, is a criticism which should never be forgotten: "When we call a man emphatically artist, a great artist, we mean something more than the temper in which he works; we mean by art, not merely an aim to please, but also and more, a law of pure and flawless workmanship." What, too, immediately follows this upon Shakespeare is most undoubtedly true, though Mr. Arnold will never persuade the Shakspearian Philistines and Jingoos to believe in it.

There is quite a Shelleyan literature springing up. Within the last year we have had two volumes of selections from Shelley's works, with elaborate prefaces and introductions. We cannot now do Mr. Todhunter's<sup>31</sup> work justice, but shall hope to notice him, with the volumes to which we have referred, at some other time. In the meanwhile, however, let us call our readers' attention to a work which throws considerable light upon Shelley's views, and increases our knowledge of him both as a man and a poet. Mr. Todhunter's style would, however, be greatly improved if he would prune down some of his metaphors.

The choice of "Theocritus, Bion and Moschus" for translation by Mr. Lang<sup>32</sup> may be looked upon as a sign of the times. No writer, as Mr. Matthew Arnold observes, has the note of paganism more strongly than Theocritus. Further, the translation is welcomed by two of our most promising poets, Mr. Austin Dobson and Mr. Gosse, one of whom, rightly or wrongly, sings—

"To-day our songs are faint and cold,  
Our northern suns too sadly shine;  
Oh! singer of the field and fold,  
Thine was the happier age of gold!"

And the other in much the same strain exclaims—

"We are in Sicily to-day;  
Oh! foolish world, too sadly wise,

<sup>31</sup> "A Story of Shelley." By John Todhunter, author of "Laurella." London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1880.

<sup>32</sup> "Theocritus, Bion and Moschus." Rendered into English Prose by A. Lang, M.A., lately Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. Macmillan & Co. 1880.

Why didst thou e'er let fade away  
 Those ancient, innocent ecstasies?  
 Along the glens in chequered flight  
 Hither to-day the nymphs shall flee,  
 And Pan forsake for our delight  
 The tomb of Helice."

Of course Mr. Lang's translation, it is needless to say, is everything which could be desired. As, too, we have so constantly advocated the use of prose as a means of translating verse, more especially of a certain kind, we have double reasons to be pleased with Mr. Lang's success. The reader's first impulse, we suppose, will be to compare Mr. Lang's version of the famous fifteenth idyll with Mr. Matthew Arnold's. It might, perhaps, be supposed that Mr. Lang would have the advantage in the more humorous and Mr. Arnold in the more purely poetical parts. This, however, we do not find to be the case. We can only say, that if one translator seems to be a little more happy in one passage than the other, the balance is very quickly restored. The value of the book, we may add, is much increased by the introduction.

Among reprints we may especially notice two nicely got up and handy volumes of Bret Harte's works,<sup>33</sup> and a large and gorgeous edition of *Don Quixote*,<sup>34</sup> illustrated by Doré. To these we may add three new editions of novels.<sup>35</sup>

#### MISCELLANEA.

**M**R. NEWTON deserves the gratitude of all students of archæology for the masterly essays—the labour of thirty years—which he has collected together into a volume.<sup>1</sup> These essays may be said to present the fruit of a lifetime of exhaustive scholarship, and of such individual research as it seldom falls to the lot of any archæologist to accomplish. Mr. Newton has been found fault with by some of his admirers for not having written as much as he might have done in the course of his career. To us this seems, on the whole, an exceptional commendation. The observation of the son of David in respect to the multiplication of books holds good as truly now as when it first fell from the lips of the Preacher. Mr. Newton has not thought it

<sup>33</sup> "The Complete Works of Bret Harte." Collected by the Author. London: Chatto & Windus. 1880.

<sup>34</sup> "The History of Don Quixote." By Cervantes. The text edited by J. W. Clarke, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. With a Biography by T. Teignmouth Shore, M.A. Illustrated by Doré. London: Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co. 1880.

<sup>35</sup> I. "Sealed by a Kiss." London: Moxon, Saunders & Co. 1880. II. "Love in Cyprus." Same Firm. III. "The Sisters." A Romance. By George Ebers. Translated by Clara Bell. (Tauchnitz Edition.) London: Sampson, Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington. 1880.

<sup>1</sup> "Essays on Art and Archæology." By Charles Thomas Newton. London: Macmillan. 1880.

necessary to expend his strength in the production of frequent volumes, in the writing of innumerable essays, in the creation of all sorts of monographs on all sorts of subjects which might come into his particular line of study. He has been content to labour, and labour hard, at the science to which he has devoted himself, and only to contribute to literature when he had something very special to say, which perhaps he, and he alone, could say properly. There is for this reason a certain completeness about this volume of essays which is not often to be met with in works of the kind, and which will make it all the more indispensable to earnest students of the history of antiquity. Since this volume appeared the toils of Mr. Newton have been rewarded in a manner which will perhaps seem to him to be especially agreeable. He has been appointed to a chair in the London University for the teaching of archæology. This timely honour was bestowed on him after he had delivered a series of most admirable lectures on Greek antiquities at University College, lectures which we should be certainly very glad to see reproduced in book form. Among the some dozen essays which this volume contains, that which will perhaps be most interesting to the advanced student will be the deep and exhaustive article on Greek Inscriptions. A knowledge of inscriptions, whether Greek or Latin, Etruscan or early Christian, demands for itself a special and separate education, quite distinct from the ordinary knowledge either of philology or of antiquities. A man might be an admirable Greek scholar, to whom even Lycophron presented little difficulties, and yet be as hopelessly puzzled by a Greek inscription as a schoolboy who is commencing his first page of Xenophon. Those students, therefore, who would wish to extend their archæological knowledge by some acquaintance with Greek inscriptions will find it in the pages which Mr. Newton has devoted to this subject, the best possible introduction that they could obtain; and they will find that when they have mastered what Mr. Newton has to say, they will have made an exceedingly good beginning in this difficult study. To the ordinary reader, perhaps, the article on the discoveries at Olympia will present most attractions. Those researches, which have been carried on so successfully in consequence of the generosity of the German Government, have resulted in endowing the world with some of the greatest treasures of Greek art—treasures that in many cases were supposed to be wholly lost to us. The Hermes of Praxiteles, which some enthusiasts not unnaturally consider to be the finest specimen of classic sculpture in existence, has only been brought to the light of upper air since these discoveries began, and many other objects which were hitherto known to us solely by some chance reference or description in Pausanias have now once again become the property of the world. The essay on the bronze head in the Castellani collection will be read with great interest by those who are anxious to have Mr. Newton's opinion on the divine face which has been taken most naturally to represent the loveliness of the Cyprian goddess as created by the cunning hand of some Grecian master. That class of readers whose aim is only general culture, and

not any deep research into the particular branch of knowledge which Mr. Newton has made his own, will also find in Mr. Newton's volume the means of passing some very delightful hours of study. Goethe has laid it down as an axiom, that to the creations of Greek thought and Greek handicraft humanity is to look for its artistic models. It may be considered fortunate, therefore, that the tastes of the age have shown such marked signs of a return for artistic inspiration, to the Hellenic world, where all that is loveliest in form, and fairest in song or speech, and mightiest in mirth, in praise and passion, is to be found.

If Mr. Newton's volume is an admirable example of a book written because the author had something to say which he was especially qualified to utter, "Curiosities of the Search Room"<sup>2</sup> is a conspicuous specimen of that vast department of literature where books are made for the sake of book-making, and where the effort is rather to fill out a certain number of pages than to benefit the world by the results of special experience, and the lessons of special culture. The reader of a desultory kind will find in this volume a good deal that may amuse him, and may collect from it some scraps of eccentric information. In the making of wills, as in all other things, room is occasionally found for the play of fancy, and the whims of eccentric individuals have left their mark on Doctors' Commons, as well as elsewhere. Some of the wills which are quoted in this volume are odd enough, and one or two are not a little amusing. On the whole, however, it is impossible to avoid the impression that considerable time has been wasted in getting up the book, and a great deal of paper wasted in printing it.

This volume of Mr. Bardsley's on the "Curiosities of Puritan Nomenclature"<sup>3</sup> is rather an example of book-making too, but it is book-making of a very attractive, and, on the whole, a valuable order. A great deal of the history of any country finds its reflexion in the names of the period, and much of the spirit of that strange Puritan epoch is to be found in the fantastic names which the devotees of Cromwell chose to assume. It may be that the famous list of Sussex Jurors, with its Faint Not Hewitt, its Search the Scriptures Morton, its Kill Sin Pemble, its Safety on High Snat, its Right the Good Fight of Faith White, its Small Hope Biggs, and its Repentance Avis, is not genuine in the sense that all these names were brought together in one panel; but every one of the names that occurs in the list was used by an actual man, and in that sense anyhow the list is a perfectly authentic and correct one, giving a by no means exaggerated idea of the eccentricities of the sternly religious men of the Puritan period. Some of the women's names mentioned in this volume, which have passed out of use almost entirely—names like Lettice, Anice, Dowse (with its fuller Dow-sabel), and Phyllis, and Grizel, and Joan, and Gillian—are exceedingly pretty, and might very well be revived in this age of revivals.

The Committee of Council on Education have done good work for the

<sup>2</sup> "Curiosities of the Search Room." By the Author of "Flemish Interiors." Chapman & Hall.

<sup>3</sup> "Curiosities of Puritan Nomenclature." By Charles W. Bardsley. Chatto & Windus, 1880.

spread of artistic knowledge by their publication of the South Kensington Museum Art Handbooks,<sup>4</sup> and no one of these handbooks deserves higher praise than that which Mr. Birdwood has compiled on the Industrial Arts of India. In the present time, when there really seems to be a distinct attempt to return to the art workmanship of earlier and more highly artistic periods, a knowledge of the masterpieces of Oriental handicraft is of exceptional importance to our own art workman. For such a purpose this volume will be found invaluable. All that the skill of Indian artificers has produced in silver, in gold, in brass, in ivory, in jewellery, in ware, in weapons, in furniture, and in woven stuffs, is treated of here with great fulness and completeness. There are very many illustrations, which have been very carefully executed, and which would convey, even to those who have not seen the originals, a very good idea of the skill and beauty of Hindoo workmanship. A large portion of the book is wisely devoted to a careful study of the Hindoo Pantheon, where all the weird mythology of sacred India is described in a very intelligible manner, and where almost every individual member of the strange assemblage of gods is represented pictorially. To others besides students of art and art workmen, this volume will prove interesting. Even the political reader, in whom now a knowledge of India and Indian affairs is essential, will find much that reflects the national character, that throws light upon the national temperament, from a study of the arts of India.

Dr. Vollgraff has written an interesting pamphlet<sup>5</sup> on the question which has often puzzled philologists as to the authorities consulted by Plutarch in composing his famous Parallel Lives. Dr. Vollgraff has gone into the whole question with that minute care and study which is peculiar to certain foreign schools of criticism, and he has come to some very interesting conclusions. He considers that the great resemblance in any instance between Plutarch and Fabius Maximus and Livy, is only to be explained on the ground that both followed the same author, sometimes almost literally, sometimes more or less freely, and from a series of very plausible arguments he considers himself to have proved that this author is L. Cælius Antipater. With regard to the common Greek sources of Plutarch and Appianus for Roman history he finds it more difficult to arrive at any certainty, but he suggests the plausible hypothesis, that in the History of Nicolaus of Damascus and the *Historia Romana* of Juba, it is very likely that the chief sources may be found. He also considers that the chief authority for Plutarch's Life of Antony was King Juba. The pamphlet is an interesting one, if only as a proof of the care and thoroughness with which Dr. Vollgraff has accomplished his task.

• Messrs. Field and Tuer, the well-known printers, seem anxious to show their skill in the production of pretty books.<sup>6</sup> "Luxurious Bath-

<sup>4</sup> "Indian Art." By George C. M. Birdwood. Chapman & Hall. 1880.

<sup>5</sup> "Greek Writers of Roman History." By J. C. Vollgraff. Leyden: Van de Hoek Brothers. 1880.

<sup>6</sup> "Luxurious Bathing." By A. W. Tuer. "Journals and Journalism." By John Oldcastle. London: Field & Tuer. 1880.

ing" and "Journals and Journalism" are singularly happy specimens of all that the printer and the bookbinder can do to make books handsome. Vellum binding, parchment sides, rough-edged paper with the large margin dear to book collectors, quaint head and tail pieces, and beautiful old-fashioned topography, have been lavishly bestowed upon both these books. In both cases the letterpress is distinctly subservient to the outer garb of the volumes. "Luxurious Bathing," as we have observed before in reviewing the larger edition of the work, is simply a little pamphlet treating of the advantages of washing; and the chief importance of the new edition is the series of eight etchings by Mr. Tristram Ellis which accompany it. In "Journals and Journalism" Mr. John Oldcastle, whose name we do not know of in literature—"Oldcastle died a martyr, but this is not the man"—treats in an easy and pleasant fashion of the various vicissitudes of a journalist's life, and gives some sensible advice to beginners in the art. The observations with regard to corrections of proofs are especially useful.

Professor Jebb has issued a most useful companion volume to his work on the Attic Orators in the form of an anthology of passages from the five great orators of whom he treated.<sup>7</sup> As it is a volume of selections, it is needless to say that it will not satisfy all persons, and there are sure to be critics ready to complain that some of the most characteristic examples of Attic oratory have been culpably omitted. But it is impossible for a volume of selections to please everybody, and the majority of students of Greek literature will be quite willing to accept the guidance of Professor Jebb and to rely implicitly upon his taste in the choice of excerpts. Professor Jebb occupies justly a foremost place among English classical scholars, and his writings are especially attractive to the general reader, because of the beautiful prose in which he expresses himself. Of course, with the exception of a short preface, there is nothing of Professor Jebb in this volume except the scholarly care and cultivated judgment which are everywhere evident in the selections. The notes are very full and learned, but at the same time quite within the comprehension even of not very advanced scholars in the oratory of Greece, and Professor Jebb has kindly refrained from making those frequent emendations which it is the peculiar delight of some scholastic critics to indulge in, at the expense of even the very best texts.

The publication of the studies of Henry Fothergill Chorley upon the national music of the world will be gladly welcomed by most students of music and readers of musical literature.<sup>8</sup> In spite of the strong antagonism which Chorley roused in many quarters his reputation as an eminent musical critic has not diminished, and will be generally acknowledged by most persons who have studied much of the history of music and musical criticism within recent years. There is something about Chorley's style which is very curious, and which is at once attractive and repellant. There is an odd assumption of infalli-

<sup>7</sup> "Selections from the Attic Orators." Edited by R. C. Jebb. Macmillan.

<sup>8</sup> "The National Music of the World." By the late H. F. Chorley. Edited by Henry G. Hewlett. Sampson Low & Co. 1880.

bility, a decisive dogmatism, about the manner in which he gives his opinion on any topic, which is at once encouraging to the reader and at the same time rather irritating. The reader will, however, soon forget any irritation of the kind in the pleasure which the national music of the world will give him. It will be exceedingly interesting even to those who may not be prepared to endorse all its opinions, and its publication must certainly be considered as very fortunate. Also upon music, but of a very different nature, is a thin little pamphlet by Dr. Lilley<sup>9</sup> in which the value of the art for curative purposes in certain mental disorders is discussed with great appearance of reason.

"Sermonic Fancy Work" is the title of a rather silly volume,<sup>10</sup> in which the author, taking as his text several of the familiar nursery rhymes of childhood, deduces from them several sermons, which are meant, no doubt, to be highly moral and instructive, but which succeed chiefly in being very tiresome. From "Little Jack Horner," "Humpty Dumpty," "Little Miss Muffat," "Jack Sprat and his Wife," "Jack and Jill," and other heroes and heroines of infancy, the author spins out a good deal of writing, which is meant to be very profound and witty, and which he perhaps fondly fancies resembles the style of Mr. Ruskin, of Mr. Carlyle, and other of our great modern thinkers who preach to the world. If he has any such impression, he should undeceive himself at once, and he may do better next time.

The second division of Spon's important "Encyclopædia of the Industrial Arts"<sup>11</sup> contains some very valuable articles, illustrated when necessary by practical diagrams. Under the head "Beverages" a great deal of very interesting information is given with respect to the process gone through in the manufacture of beer, cider, cocoa, coffee, tea, and wine. An article on Buttons will be read with interest by the philosophic student who remembers the narrative of the man who attempted to commit suicide because he said he was tired of buttoning and unbuttoning his garments.

Amongst minor works we may mention a small Geography of India,<sup>12</sup> which ought to prove exceedingly servicable at a time when a knowledge of our Indian Empire is so indispensable to all who wish to understand the political questions of the day; a new edition of M. De Fivas' admirable "Grammaire des Grammaires,"<sup>13</sup> a small Primer of Greek Syntax, by E. D. D. Mansfield,<sup>14</sup> a good edition of "Demosthenes de Corona,"<sup>15</sup> in Macmillan's admirable series of School Classics; an "International Dictionary for Naturalists and Sportsmen,"<sup>16</sup>

<sup>9</sup> "The Therapeutics of Music." By G. Herbert Lilley. H. K. Lewis. 1880.

<sup>10</sup> "Sermonic Fancy Work." By John Paul Ritchie. W. B. Whittingham & Co. 1880.

<sup>11</sup> "Spon's Encyclopædia of the Industrial Arts." Division II. E. & F. N. Spon.

<sup>12</sup> "Geography of India." By George Duncan. London: Trübner.

<sup>13</sup> "Grammaire des Grammaires." By Dr. V. De Fivas. Crosby Lockwood & Co. Forty-fourth Edition. 1880.

<sup>14</sup> "Primer of Greek Syntax." By E. D. D. Mansfield. Rivingtons. 1880.

<sup>15</sup> "Demosthenes de Corona." Edited by B. Drake. Macmillan. 1880.

<sup>16</sup> "International Dictionary for Naturalists and Sportsmen." By Edwin Simpson-Baikie. London: Trübner.



which gives the German and French equivalents for many words and terms which are not to be found in ordinary dictionaries, and which should be indispensable to travellers of a sporting or natural history turn in France or Germany; a useful volume on Spelling;<sup>17</sup> a new part of the valuable series of examples of their treasures published by the authorities of the South Kensington Museum;<sup>18</sup> and a volume of Sunday-school Songs for children.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> "Spelling and Punctuation." By Henry Beadnell. Wyman & Son. 1880.

<sup>18</sup> "The South Kensington Museum." Part VI. Sampson Low. 1880.

<sup>19</sup> "Songs for Little Singers." Composed by Henry King Lewis. Hodder & Stoughton. 1880.

## INDEX.

---

\*\* *All Books must be looked for under the Author's name.*

- ABLETT, W. H., "English Trees and Tree Planting," 556  
 Afghanistan, 201, 489  
 Africa, South, 215, 511  
 "Allaooddeen: a Tragedy; and other Poems," 298  
 Allies, T. W., "A Life's Decision," 521  
 Althaus, J., "The Functions of the Brain," 272  
 Andrew, W. P., "Our Scientific Frontier," 239  
 "Annual Register, 1879," 287  
 "Annual Report for 1879 of the Trustees of the Astor Library," 259  
 Anthony, C., jun., "Popular Sovereignty," 240  
 "Arnold—Passages from the Prose Writings of Matthew," 586
- BAGENAL, P. H., "Parnellism Unveiled," 258  
 Baidon, H. B., "The Spirit of Nature," 233  
 Baird, H. M., "History of the Rise of the Huguenots," 285  
 Ball, R. S., LL.D., "Elements of Astronomy," 553  
 Bardsley, C. W., "Curiosities of Puritan Nomenclature," 590  
 Barlow, G., "Time's Whisperings: Sonnets and Songs," 296  
 Barrister, A., "A Guide to the Law," 23rd edition, 545  
 Bastian, H. C., M.A., M.D., "The Brain as an Organ of Mind," 266  
 "Beauty's Daughters," 575  
 Bickersteth, E., D.D., "The Mercian Church and St. Chad," 229  
 Bigg, R. H., "The Orthopagnms of the Spine," 563  
 Birdwood, G. C. M., "Indian Art," 591  
 Black, W., "Sunrise: a Story of these Times," parts i. and ii., 289; parts iii. iv. v., 573  
 Blanqui, J. A., "History of Political Economy in Europe," 244  
 Blake, E. A., "My Only Love," 575
- Mr. Bradlaugh's Case: The Parliamentary Oath Question, 333-355; historical position of the question as to a professed Atheist's right to sit in Parliament stated by Cardinal Newman, 334, 335; Lord Lyndhurst's argument for admitting Jews to Parliament, 335; Lord Macaulay on the same, 336; Mr. W. C. Borlase quoted, 337; Bentham's ground of objection to oaths, 340; Helvetius on the oath, 311; Parliamentary oaths of other countries, 342; the sanctions of an oath, 343; what is the religious formula contained in the oath? Cardinal Newman quoted, 345; Dean Stanley, 346; Mr. Bradlaugh and the Committee, 348; Mr. Walpole's statement of the effect of the Acts relating to evidence, 351; Resolution of 2nd July: its effect, 352; and consequences shown by Mr. Walpole, 353, 354  
 Brandt, G. H., M.D., "Royort: its Mineral Waters and Climate," 563  
 "Bret Harle—The Complete Works of," 588  
 British Guiana, 208  
 Britten, J., "English Dialect Society;" "A Dictionary of English Plant Names," part ii., 555  
 "Brook's Popular Botany," 555  
 Browne, J. H. Balfour, "Water Supply," 245  
 Browning, F. C., "Fighting and Farming in South Africa," 255  
 "Browning—A Selection from the Poetry of E. Barrett," 300  
 "Browning—Selection from the Poetical Works of Robert," 300  
 Browning, R., "Dramatic Idylls," second series, 577  
 Brunton, T. Lauder, M.D., "Pharmacology and Therapeutics of Medicine, Past and Present," 561  
 Burke, U. R., "Loyal and Lawless," 290  
 Burnmah, 194  
 Buxton, S. C., "A Handbook to Political Questions of the Day," 533

- "Byron: English Men of Letters Series,"  
edited by John Nichol, 572
- CAINE, T. H. Hall, "Politics and Art,"  
244
- Caird, J., D.D., "An Introduction to  
the Philosophy of Religion," 217
- Calderswood, H., LL.D., "The Parables  
of our Lord," 520
- Canada, 206, 511
- Cape Colony, 215
- Carlos, E. S., "The Sidereal Messenger  
of Galileo Galilei; and part of the  
Preface to Kepler's Dioptrics," 264
- Caroline Von Linsingen and King Wil-  
liam IV., 356-388; the translator and  
the German editor personally unable  
to guarantee genuineness of the tale,  
356-358; which alleges the clan-  
destine marriage of William IV.; an  
inquiry as to the witnesses: first, the  
editor, 359; second, Von Reichenbach,  
360; manner in which Von Reichenbach  
obtained the letters, 361, 362; of the nine  
letters one only is from the lady to the  
Duke, 363; the letters are not love-  
letters, but letters about a love-story,  
364; Von Linsingen family, 365, 366;  
Caroline's introduction to the Duke,  
366; extract from Madame D'Arblay's  
diary for 1789, 367, 368; editor's  
description of Caroline, 369; progress  
of the love-affair, 370, 371; Madame  
D'Arblay's diary again, 372-374;  
Caroline's own account of the evening  
before her wedding and of the ceremony  
itself, 375-377; validity of the mar-  
riage discussed, 378-380; separation,  
381; Caroline's illness, and subsequent  
marriage with Dr. Meincke, 382; ac-  
count of the life led by the Duke, 383,  
384; hypothesis that the story is the  
result of a hallucination in the mind  
of the lady, 386; quotations from her  
letters, 387; two like cases quoted, 388
- Caro, Von J., "Das Bundniss von Can-  
terbury," 277
- Carter, R. B., "Eyesight, Good and  
Bad," 267
- Cashmere, 193
- Cervantes, "The History of Don  
Quixote:" the text edited by J. W.  
Clarke, M.A., 588
- Ceylon, 209
- Chastity: its Development and Main-  
tenance, 419-436
- Chaucer, *see* Ward
- Chayne, Rev. T. K., "The Prophecies  
of Isaiah," vol. i., 224
- China, 200
- "Chinshingura, or the Loyal League"  
575
- Chorley, H. F., the late, "The National  
Music of the World," 592
- Christie, Mary E., "Lady Laura," 575
- Church, F. J., "The Trial and Death of  
Socrates: being the Euthyphron,  
Apology, Crito, and Phaedo of Plato,"  
527
- Church, R. W., "The Gifts of Civiliza-  
tion," 516
- Clayden, P. W., "England under Lord  
Beaconsfield, 1873-1880," 285
- Colenso, Frances E., "History of the  
Zulu War," 565
- Collins, W. C., "Saint Simon," 282
- Colonies, The, 204, 502
- Colville, Captain H. E., "A Ride in  
Petticoat and Slippers," 548
- Comfort, R., "Nero: a Tragedy," 580
- Cowley, C., "Leaves from a Lawyer's  
Life, Afloat and Ashore," 551
- , "Reminiscences of J. C.  
Ayer," 570
- Cox, S., "The Genesis of Evil, and other  
Sermons," 225
- Crawford, J. C., "Recollections of Travel  
in New Zealand and Australia," 246
- Crawford, O., "Portugal, Old and New,"  
250
- "Crosby Records: a Cavalier's Note-  
Book," edited by the Rev. T. E. Gib-  
son, 288
- Crozier, J. B., "The Religion of the  
Future," 218
- Cunningham, W., M.A., "Christian  
Civilization with Special Reference to  
India," 517
- "Curiosities of the Search Room," 590
- Cust, R. M., "Linguistic and Oriental  
Essays," 569
- DAWKINS, W. Boyd, "Early Man in  
Britain," 278
- Dawson, J. W., LL.D., "Fossil Men and  
their Modern Representatives," 284
- "Deak, Francis, Hungarian Statesman,"  
279
- De Amicis, E., "Morocco: its People  
and Places," 549
- Dickson, *see* Vincent
- D. M., "Scientific Transcendentalism,"  
530
- Dobell, H., M.D., "On Loss of Weight,  
Blood Spitting, and Lung Disease,"  
562
- Doudney, Sarah, "Strangers Yet," 574
- Drysdale, C. R., M.D., "The Nature and  
Treatment of Syphilis," 559
- Duncan, G., "Geography of India," 593

- Dymond, J., "Essays on the Principles of Morality," seventh edition, 546
- EAST Indian Currency and Exchange, 459
- "Egypt for the Egyptians: a Retrospect and a Prospect," 239
- "English Poets (The), Selections, with Critical Introductions," edited by T. H. Ward, M.A., 299
- "English Dialect Society," *see* Britten
- Eugenio, "The Tale of the Three Tinkers," 296
- "Enropäische Staatenkunde," Erster Band, 243
- Ewald, Von, the late G. H. A., "Commentary on the Prophets of the Old Testament," vol. iv., 523
- FARRAR, M., "Five Years in Minnesota," 254
- Frankland, F. W., "On the Doctrine of Mind-stuff," 532
- Froude, J. A., "English Men of Letters—John Bunyan," 280
- GAME Laws and Game Preserving, 131–156; no property in game or other wild animals recognized by common law of England, 132; the Game Law "a bastard slip" from the same root as the Forest Law, 133; present system of Game Laws built up in the eighteenth century, 134; terms of the Act of 1829, 134; Poaching Prevention Act, 1862, 135; principal features of the Game Laws summarized, 136; indictment of the Game Laws, 137; argument of the Game Laws' advocates, 138; universal denunciation of the Game Law system, 139; Blackstone, Sheriff Barclay, Lord Hatherley, Mr. Bright quoted, 139; Austin, Marquis of Ailesbury, 140; injurious effects of over-preservation, 141; Bishop Fraser on the Game Laws, 141; Rev. F. D. Maurice, 142; Mr. Clare Read on the destructiveness of game, 143; illustration of game preserving, 144; evidence taken by Select Committee of 1873, 145; affirms damage done by winged game, 146; the *Saturday Review* on magistrates and poachers, 147; game-preserving, its influence on leases, 148, 149; Mr. Bright's committee of 1845, 150; Mr. P. A. Taylor and the Game Law question, 151; Anti-Game Law League founded in 1872, 152; recommendations of Select Committee of 1872, 153.
- Gerard, E. D., "Reata: What's in a Name?" 574
- Gibbon, C., "In Pastures Green," 574
- Goldsmid, Major-Gen. Sir F., "James Outram: a Biography," 564
- Gough, H., "The Story of Heritage," 575
- Grant, Miss, "Prince Hugo," 291
- Graves, A. P., "Irish Songs and Ballads," 582
- Green, J. R., "History of the English People," vol. iv., 568.
- Griffith, T., "The A B C of Philosophy," 232
- Griffiths, Major A., "A Son of Mars," 575
- Gutmann, E., M.D., "The Watering-Places and Mineral Springs of Germany, Austria, and Switzerland," 562
- "HAGENBACH'S History of Christian Doctrines," vol. i., 223
- Hake, T. G., M.D., "Maiden Ecstasy," 295
- Hall, W. E., "International Law," 540
- Hardwicke, H. J., M.D., "Medical Education and Practice in all Parts of the World," 562
- Haughton, Rev. S., F.R.S., "Dublin University Press Series: Six Lectures on Physical Geography," 259
- H. C., "Her Dignity and Grace," a Tale, 291
- Heath, F. G., "Sylvan Spring," 265
- Heidenhain, R., M.D., "Animal Magnetism: Physiological Observations," 561
- Heilprin, Mr., "Historical Poetry of the Ancient Hebrews," 570
- Hewitt, Graily, "The Mechanical System of Uterine Pathology," 273
- Hillebrand, Karl, "Six Lectures on the History of German Thought from the Seven Years' War to Goethe's Death," 230
- Hine, T. C., "Nottingham: its Castle," 584
- "A Supplement to Nottingham: its Castle," 584
- Hodgkin, T., "Italy and her Invaders, 376–476," 276
- Holland, *see* Britten
- Hope, A. R., "Seven Stories: about Old Folks and Young Ones," 290
- Hope, Beryl, "The Shadow of Life," 575
- Hopkinson, A., "Definite Reform in English Land Law," 257
- Horne, W., M.A., "Religious Life and Thought," 226
- Hueffer, F., "Musical Studies," 303

- Hulme, F. E., "Familiar Wild Flowers," 555
- Hume, David, "History of England," 566
- Hylton, J. D., "Betrayed: a Northern Tale," 297
- INDIA: Change of Government, 195; Finance and War, 196
- "India—Report on the Administration of the Meteorological Department of the Government of, in 1878-79," 264
- Indian Exchange Difficulty—A New View of the, 173
- "Indian Meteorological Memoirs," 265, 556
- Ingram, J. H., "Edgar Allan Poe," 567
- Irwin, H. C., "The Garden of India," 286
- Italian Blue Books, 247, 248, 552
- JAMES, A. G. F. Eliot, "Indian Industries," 538
- Jay, Rev. J., "The Roman Catholic Question in the United States," 229
- Jebb, R. C., "Modern Greece," 534.
- , edited by, "Selections from the Attic Orators," 592
- Jefferies, R., "Hodge and his Masters," 289
- KENNY, C. S., "Endowed Charities," 544
- Kent, C., "Corona Catholica," 229
- Kingzett, C. T., "Nature's Hygiene: a Series of Essays on Popular Scientific Subjects," 554
- Kinnear, J. Boyd, "Principles of Property in Land," 545
- Kossuth, Louis, "Memories of My Exile," 567
- Kynaston, H., M.A., "Exemplaria Cheltoniensia," 300
- LACRETELLE, H., "Lamartine and his Friends," 284
- Lanz, A., rendered into English by, "Theocritus, Bion, and Moschus," 587
- Lawson, J. A., "The Wandering Naturalists," 256
- Lee, H., "Illustrations of the Physiology of Religion," 226
- Lee, Vernon, "Studies of the Eighteenth Century in Italy," 304
- Legge, J., "The Religions of China," 220
- Legrelle, A., "La Prusse et la France devant l'Histoire," 236
- Leigh, A., "El Dorado," 291
- Lilley, G. H., "The Therapeutics of Music," 593
- Lloyd, F., and C. Tebbitt, "Extension of Empire, Weakness? Deficits, Ruin?" 536
- Lomax, J., "A Manual of the Alkali Trade," 265
- Lombard, J. S., M.D., "Experimental Researches on the Regional Temperature of the Head," 268
- Low, C. R., "Soldiers of the Victorian Age," 571.
- Luckock, H. M., D.D., "After Death," 226
- MACCORMAC, W., M.A., F.R.C.S.E. and I. "Antiseptic Surgery," 558
- MacGeorge, A., "Old Glasgow: the Place and the People," 286
- Maclean, J. P., "The Mound Builders," 570
- MacMunn, C., "The Spectroscope in Medicine," 269
- Mahaffy, Rev. J. P., "A History of Classical Greek Literature," 306
- Manuing, Cardinal, "The Catholic Church and Modern Society," 228
- , "The Temporal Power of the Pope," 242
- Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, 93-109; Archbishop Parker's Table of Degrees to support Elizabeth's legitimacy declared unlawful, marriage with a brother's widow, or with a deceased wife's sister, 94; in 1835 Lord Lyndhurst's Bill, perverted by the Bishops, was provisionally accepted by the Commons, 95; twenty-two divisions from 1842 to 1875; Bill passed seven times by the Commons, 96; progress among the Peers very great, 98; the marriage valid in Australian Colonies, Canada, and Natal, 99; Objections to the Bill for legalizing such marriage answered, 101-106; everywhere in Christendom, except in Great Britain, the forbidden marriage is allowed, 107; the Act of 1835 declared by Dr. Vaughan to have "created sin," 107; the Lower House in favour of the Bill in the proportion of 4 to 1, 108; High Church members and Bishops alone oppose it, 109
- Marshall, J. J., "Half an hour with the English Land Laws," 258
- "Martha and Mary," 291
- Max Muller, F., "The Sacred Books of the East: The Institutes of Vishnu; Pahlavi Texts, part 1.; and The Zend Avesta, part 1.," 523, 524
- "Mechanist, A.," "A Letter on the 'Exact God,'" 532

- "Memoirs of Troublous Times," 570  
 Mickle, W. J., M.D., "General Paralysis of the Insane," 560  
 Miller, E., "The Church in Relation to the State," 534  
 Milne, B., "Thoughts in Rhyme and Prose," 296  
 Milnes, A., "Elementary Notions of Logic," 527  
 Mitchell, A., "The Past in the Present: What is Civilization?" 529  
 Mises, Von H., "Ueber die reactionäre Strömungenscr Zeit," 243  
 Monck, W. H. S., M.A., "An Introduction to Logic," 525  
 Moncrieff, J. A., C.E., "The Scientific Structure of the Universe," 262  
 Montague, Captain W. E., "Campaigning in South Africa," 550  
 Morris, Rev. F. O., "Letters to the *Times* about Bids, &c.," 557  
 ——— "The Darwin Craze," 557  
 ——— "On the Plumage of Birds and Butterflies," 557  
 Morris, M., "Skin Diseases; including their Definition, Symptoms, &c.," 272  
 Myers, E., "The Defence of Rome," 579  
  
 NAGA War, The, 193  
 Nasmith, D., "The Institutes of English Law," 248  
 New South Wales, 210, 503  
 Newton, C. T., "Essays on Art and Archaeology," 588  
 "New Zealand for 1878—Statistics of the Colony of," 245  
 New Zealand, 214, 510  
 Nichol, J., "English Men of Letters—Byron," 572  
 Nohl, Von L., "Mozart nach den Schilderungen seiner Zeitgenossen," 284  
 Northend, C., "Elihu Burritt," 570  
  
 OBER, F. A., "Camps in the Canibbees," 254  
 "Ode of Life, The," 299  
 O'Donnell, C. J., "The Ruin of an Indian Province," 538  
 O'Reilly, Mrs. R., "Sussex Stories," 290  
 Ormerod, E. A., "Report upon Injurious Insects," 263  
 Orpen, J. M., "Some Principles of Native Government, and the Petition of the Basuto Tribe," 551  
 Orred, Meta, "Ave," 298  
 Oxenham, H. N., "Recollections of Ober-Ammergau in 1871," 228  
 "Oxford, 1509-1583—Records of the City of," edited by W. H. Turner, 288  
  
 PACIFIC, The, 209, 505]  
 Painter, R. B., M.D., "Science a Stronghold of Belief," 527  
 "Papers of the Manchester Literary Club," vol. vi, 582  
 Paterson, J., "The Liberty of the Press, Speech, and Public Worship," 512  
 Paul and Seneca, 309-332; inquiry into genuineness of correspondence between Paul and Seneca, 310, 311; twelfth letter of the "Collection" quoted, 312; Seneca's "ideal man," 314; resemblance of the theology of Seneca to that of Paul explained without the aid of the hypothesis of a personal acquaintance, 315, 316; conversion of Saul, 317; his subsequent conduct, 318; opposed by the old Hebraic party, 319; because of its originality and independence, 320; difference in the characters of Paul and Seneca, resemblance between the religion of Christ and the stoicism of Seneca, 321-326; verbal resemblances, 327; cardinal divergences show that Seneca was never a convert to the religion of Jesus, 328; Paul, a Jew, a citizen of Rome, a pupil of Greece, unconsciously prepared the way for the separation of the temporal and spiritual powers, 330; Paul and Seneca contrasted, 332  
 Paul, W., "The Future of Epping Forest," 258  
 Payne, the late Joseph, "Lectures on the Science and Art of Education," 545  
 Peasant-Poets of Russia, The, 63-93 :  
 Lomonosov, born in 1711, at Archangel, travels to Moscow, 64; sent in 1731 to St. Petersburg to study, thence to Marburg in Germany, 65; marries; returns to St. Petersburg; his career "a long success," 66; "one of the most learned men of his day," 67.—Slepoushkin, born in 1783, starts as a small shopkeeper, 69; combines portrait painting with writing poetry, 71; receives a gold medal from the Imperial Academy, 72.—Koltzov, born at Voronezh in 1809, 74; his unhappy life, 76, 77; an interview with Koltzov in 1842, 79, 80; extracts from Koltzov's Poems, 82, 83, 84.—The Cossack, Shevchenko, born in 1814, in province of Kiev, 85; his passion for painting, 86; becomes a member of the Academy of Arts in 1858, 87; exiled to Orenburg, 88; his memory regarded with idolatry by the Southern Russians, 91; Nikitin,

- an innkeeper, then a bookseller; his poem "Grandfather," quoted, 92; Ivan Sourikov, 92
- Perring, Sir P., Bart., "The Spirit and the Muse," 297
- Plato and his Times, 389-419; Plato looked up to by the best and wisest men of all ages, 391; the creator of speculative literature, 392; although the greatest master of prose composition cherished a strong dislike for books, 393; maintained that human nescience is universal and necessary, 395; and exalted the Creator by enlarging on the nothingness of the creature, 396; ratiocination, the highest function of mind, 397; themes pursued in the *Apologia*, 397; the *Crito*, 398; the *Euthyphro*, 399; Plato and the Sophists, 400, 401; Plato's birth and education, 402; his style, 403; Plato and Dionysius the elder, 406; Plato's dissatisfaction with existing systems of government, 407, 408, 409; his scorn for the multitudes, 410; Plato fought for the principle that truth itself exists, 411; his visits to Sicily and Southern Italy, 412; theme of the *Theætetus*, 413, 414; readmits into philosophy the earlier speculations excluded by Socrates, 414, 415; the *Cratylus*, 416; Plato discovers true speculative significance of the exact sciences, 417
- Poole, C. H., "An Attempt towards a Glossary of the Archaic and Provincial Words of the County of Stafford," 586
- Poole, R. L., "A History of the Huguenots of the Dispersion," 280
- Pope, *see* Stephen
- Porter, J. H., "The Surgeon's Pocket-Book," 562
- Prantl, Dr. K., "An Elementary Text-Book of Botany," 266
- "Precis of Official Papers, Session 1880," 538
- Prince Consort, The Life of the, 109-131; the Prince habitually morbid and melancholy, 110; his diary and letters to the Queen, written in German, 111; movement for Italian unity too democratic in its spirit to please the Prince, 112; his contemptuous feelings towards Lord Russell, 112; censure of the arbitrary monarchs on the Italian policy of England, 113; passages from Lord Russell's despatch to Sir James Hudson, 114, 115, 116; letter from the Prince to the Princess Royal on "ministerial responsibility," 118, 119; criticized, 120; instances of the Prince's perpetual interference, 121, 122; letter from Lord Palmerston to Sir Charles Phipps, 123; the Prince scarcely concealed his dislike to Parliamentary government, 124; averse to the Cobden Commercial Treaty, 125; inaugural address at the International Statistical Congress, 126, 127; mode of keeping Sunday, 128; the results of overwork apparent, 129, 130; caused chiefly by his unceasing interference with Ministers, 131
- "Pulpit Commentary," The, *see* Spencer.
- QUEENSLAND, 213, 509,
- RAE, MRS. MILNER, "Hartleigh Towers," 575
- Reid, T. Wemyss, "Politicians of Today," 238
- "Religious Instinct, The, of the House of Commons," 437-458
- Renan, E., "The Hibbert Lectures, 1880," 514
- Renouf, P. Le Page, "The Hibbert Lectures, 1879," 219
- "Rigby's (Dr.) Letters from France in 1789," edited by Lady Eastlake, 285
- "Riquet of the Tuft: a Love Drama," 575
- Ritchie, J. P., "Sermonic Fancy Work," 593
- Rumsey, A., "Moohummudan Law of Inheritance," 249
- Russia and China, 200
- "Sacred Books of the East," *see* Max Muller
- Savage, M. J., "The Morals of Evolution," 524
- Scoones, W. B., "Four Centuries of English Letters," 568
- Scotch Peerage, 1-18; position and *status* of a Scotch peer, 3; due to no injustice, 4; Scotch representative peerage conceded in order to facilitate the Union, 5; and it exists as the result of a bargain, 6; gloomy condition of Scotland at the time of the Union, 7; political privileges enjoyed by the Scotch peers in Scotland before the Union, 8-9; willingly bartered for privileges accruing from the Union, 10; reasons for such decision, 11; grounds of the claim set up by the Scotch peers, 11; proportion of peers to commoners, 12; present condition

- of the Scotch peer much improved, 13; system of election, 14; how would a change in the Scotch peerage affect the public interest? 16; persistent hostility shown by Scotch peers to advancement of political liberty, 17; need of strength in a second chamber, 18
- "Scotch Sermons," 227
- Ségnin, L. G., "The Country of the Passion Play," 253
- Shadwell, J. L., "Political Economy for the People," 545
- "Signor Monaldini's Niece," 574
- Skeat, Rev. W., "An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language," 585
- Smith, Goldwin, "English Men of Letters—Cowper," 281
- Smith, H. H., "Brazil, the Amazons and the Coast," 547
- "Social Rights and Principles," 547
- Socrates, The Place of, in Greek Philosophy, 19-62; his world-wide fame, 19; various conceptions of his personality, 20; and philosophy; the *Apologia* contrasted with the *Memorabilia*, 21, 22, 23; and with Plato's other writings, 23; Xenophon, the more accurate exponent of the Socratic philosophy, 24; Zeller's estimate of Socrates, 25; Socratic irony, 25; Zeller's theory considered, 26, 27; Socrates' reasons for his self-satisfaction, 28, 29; Socrates and physical phenomena, 30; Socrates before all things an Athenian, 31; and represents the popular Athenian character, 33; philosophy of Socrates, 34, 35, 36; identifies virtue with science, 37; Socrates and "mind," 39; his crotetic method, 39; exemplified in cases of Glauco, 40; and of Euthydemus, 41; his two modifications of the method, 42; Socratic dialogue considered, 43, 44; Socrates introduced method of ideal analysis, classification, and reasoning, 45; traditions of Socratic philosophy preserved by Stoicism, 46; "consistency" expresses the whole character of Socrates, 50; the ideal method seems to have exercised a powerful influence on art, 52; and the dialectic method helped to revolutionize social life, 53; Socrates' "divine voice," 55; threefold charge against Socrates, 56; considered, 57; defence of Socrates, 59; his condemnation condemned, 60; Socrates, Spinoza, and Bruno, 61; Pericles, the ideal of statesmanship, Pheidias of artistic production, and Socrates of philosophic power, 62
- Sonnenschein, A., "Elementary Education at Home and Abroad," 546
- South Australia, 212, 509
- Spencer, Rev. Canon H. D. M., "The Pulpit Commentary," 223
- Spon, E. and F. N., "Spon's Encyclopædia of the Industrial Arts," Division II., 593
- Stanley, the late Edward, "A Familiar History of Birds," 556
- Stanley, J., "Tuscan Fairy Tales," 301
- State Papers: Foreign Series, 156-172; accession of Edward VI., rumours of war, hostility of Henry II. of France, 157; who prepares to recover Boulogne, 159; and thus unites "feuds of the Court," 159; Boulogne sold by treaty, Court of Henry II. described by Sir John Masone, our Ambassador at Paris, 160, 161; Sir John's pecuniary difficulties, 162, 163; poverty-stricken state of England owing to her struggle with Scotland, 164; Mary of Guise, 165; Philip and Mary, 166; meagreness of Foreign State Papers of Mary's reign, 166; Mary's expectation of issue, 167; Elizabeth's accession, Cateau Cambresis, surrender of Calais, 168; accession of Francis II., and revived claims of Mary Stuart, 169; expedition to Leith, 170; death of Francis, and struggle between the Guises and the Huguenots aided by the English, who seize Havre, 171; re-conquest of Havre, and peace, 172
- Stenhouse, Mrs., "The Englishwoman in Utah," 289
- Stephen, Leslie, "English Men of Letters—Alexander Pope," 566
- Stephens, J. Brunton, "Miscellaneous Poems," 581
- Stevenson, T., "Christianity confirmed by Jewish and Heathen Testimony," 223
- Stewart, W., M.D., "Clinical Researches on the Therapeutic action of Chloride of Ammonium in the Treatment of Hepatic Disease," 270
- Stokes, Maine, collected and translated by, "Indian Fairy Tales," 586
- Stone, C. J., "Cradle Land of Arts and Creeds," 222
- Swete, H. B., "Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Minor Epistles of St. Paul," vol. i., 283
- Swinburne, A. C., "Songs of the Spring Tides," 291



- SMITH, J. A., "New and Old: a Volume of Verse," 578  
 TEBBITT, *see* Lloyd  
 THARP, F. A., "The Sword of Damocles," 291  
 THOMPSON, Kate, "A Handbook to the Public Picture Galleries of Europe," 308  
 THOMSON, J., "The City of Dreadful Night; and other Poems," 293  
 TIBBETS, H., M.D., "How to Use a Galvanic Battery in Medicine and Surgery," 272  
 TODHUNTER, J., "A Study of Shelley," 587  
 TRENCH, Archbishop, "An Essay on the Life and Genius of Calderon," Second Edition, 280  
 TREVELYAN, Sir C., Bart., "The Irish Crisis of 1846-7," 552  
 TROLLOPE, A., "The Duke's Children," 574  
 T. U., "Hard Hit: a Newfoundland Story," 290  
 ——— "Wreaths of Smoke," 300  
 TUER, A. W., "Luxurious Bathing," 591  
 TURKOMAN Expedition and Persia, 200  
 TWAIN, Mark, "A Tramp Abroad," 290  
 UHLHORN, Dr. Gerhard, "The Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism," 515  
 URQUHART, J. W., "Electric Light: its Production and Use," 266  
 VAUGHAN, R. A., "Hours with the Mystics," Third Edition, 522  
 Victoria, 211, 506  
 VINCENT, E., and T. G. DICKSON, "A Handbook to Modern Greek," 307  
 VOLKRAFF, J. C., "Greek Writers of Roman History," 591  
 WACE, H., "The Foundations of Faith," 518  
 WALLACE, E., M.A., compiled by, "Outlines of the Philosophy of Aristotle," Second Edition, 235  
 WALPOLE, Spencer, "A History of England from the Conclusion of the Great War in 1815," vol. iii., 275  
 "Wandering Will," 575  
 WARD, A. W., "Chaucer," 308  
 WARD, *see* English Poets  
 WATERS, J. H., "Fits: Diagnosis and Immediate Treatment of Cases of Insensibility and Convulsions," 271  
 WATSON, W., "The Prince's Quest; and other Poems," 298  
 WEATHERLEY, F. E., "Dresden China, and other Songs," 580  
 "Wellington—Despatches of the Duke of," vol. viii., 287  
 Western Australia, 213  
 West Indies, 208, 504  
 Westminster, Marchioness of, "Diary of a Tour in Sweden, Norway, and Russia," 251  
 WHEELER, J. T., "A Short History of India," 278  
 "White Month, The," 290  
 WHITE, Colonel, "Indian Reminiscences," 569  
 WILLIAMS, F. H., "The Princess Elizabeth: a Lyric Drama," 298  
 WRIGHT, R. W., "Life: its True Genesis," 519  
 WYLDE, K., "A Dreamer," 291  
 YARDLEY, E., "The Supernatural in Romantic Fiction, 302

END OF VOL. LVIII.

