

THE
WESTMINSTER
REVIEW.

JANUARY AND APRIL,
1885.

“ 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. LXVII.

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

OS 2 NES
VOL. 123/N = 67.

Ballantyne Press
BALLANTYNE, HANSON AND CO., EDINBURGH
CHANDOS STREET, LONDON

Shriparva JaiKrishna Public Library,

No. 7837 Date 31.7.75.



THE

WESTMINS

AND

FOREIGN QUARTERLY
REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1885.

ART. I.—OVERPRESSURE IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

1. *Copy of Report of Dr. Crichton Browne to the Education Department upon the alleged Overpressure of Work in Public Elementary Schools.*
2. *Copy of Mr. Fitch's Memorandum relating to Dr. Crichton Browne's Report.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, July 24 and August 4, 1884.
3. *Education and the Nervous System.* By J. CRICHTON BROWNE, M.D., LL.D., F.R.S. London: Cassell & Co.
4. *Dr. Crichton Browne's Letters to the "Times,"* October, 1884.
5. *Over Pressure.* In the *Nineteenth Century* for November, 1884. By SYDNEY BUXTON, M.P.

CERTAIN persons connected with the Education Department have lost reputation in connection with the recent controversy as to the existence of overpressure in elementary schools. Indeed, we are surprised that a man of Mr. Mundella's astuteness should have been betrayed into so many and such grave mistakes. It appears that Dr. Crichton Browne, who had achieved a considerable reputation while he acted as Medical Superintendent of one of the largest lunatic hospitals in the country, and who has, since he ceased to be connected with that asylum, held the appointment of Chief Lord Chancellor's Visitor of Lunatics, had been asked to speak at a meeting, which was to be held in the spring of this year at Bradford, upon the

[Vol. CXXIII. No. CCXLV.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LXVII. No. I. A

679
25

Overpressure in Elementary Schools.

subject of overpressure in schools. Unable to be present, he wrote a letter, which was read at the meeting, in which he said that "he would have been glad to have joined in the protest against the grinding tyranny of education, with which we are threatened." He added:—"It seems to me that it is high time for a declaration of rights on behalf of helpless children, and on behalf of future generations also, whom, if we are not careful, we shall load with a burden more grievous than the National Debt: a burden of disintegration and disease." No doubt these were somewhat strong expressions, and falling from a gentleman who is an acknowledged authority in matters pertaining to public health, they attracted some public attention. A question was put to Mr. Mundella in the House of Commons as to whether his attention had been called to the letter referred to. It appears that before answering the question Mr. Mundella had had an interview with Dr. Crichton Browne, and had requested him to visit a few public elementary schools, and to report as to the effect of work done in them upon the health of the children; and when he answered the question put to him in the House, he was able to say that Dr. Crichton Browne had consented to do so. This was Mr. Mundella's first mistake. There is a very large staff of Inspectors of Schools, and from these he ought to have been able to derive the information which he required. To some extent Mr. Mundella's action was a slur upon the officials of the Department. To these gentlemen, the appointment of a special inspector to report upon a matter which ought to have fallen under their official notice cannot have seemed complimentary. It may be said that the inspection was a medical inspection, such as an ordinary inspector, however skilled, could not properly undertake; but that excuse could scarcely avail, for Mr. Mundella has set Mr. Fitch, who is not a medical man, to answer Dr. Crichton Browne's report. If there was no necessity for further inquiry than that which had been previously the duty of inspectors to make, Dr. Crichton Browne ought not to have been appointed. If there was a necessity for further investigation, that inquiry ought to have been made by a Select Committee, or by a Commission, and not by a single individual appointed by the Vice-President of the Council. That then was Mr. Mundella's first mistake. Probably he thought, that, having handed Dr. Crichton Browne over to the principal inspector, Mr. Fitch, that gentleman would be convinced of the non-existence of overpressure by that astute official, and that the Department might be bothered no more about letters which talked of "the grinding tyranny of education," and other sentimental matters. If that was his impression, he was very much mistaken. Dr. Crichton

Browne set about his work with a will. He examined a great many schools, and produced a report which covers 53 folio pages. This report was sent to the Vice-President of the Council, who thought that the safest place for it was the official waste-paper basket. Probably, in due course, it would have found its way thither, had not certain members of both Houses, who ride the hobby "overpressure," got wind of it, and asked Mr. Mundella about it. Then came Mr. Mundella's second mistake. He described the report in exceedingly disparaging terms—farrago of rubbish, and what not—and refused to publish it as a blue-book. Lord Carlingford, too, in the Upper House, said the report was in no sense an official document, and that the Department could not undertake to publish as a blue-book every report which was thrown at its head. This was a double mistake. The report had not been discharged at the head of the Department, but had been asked for by the Vice-President, and now that they had got it, they became aware of the mistake that had been made in inviting it. It is always a mistake to be inaccurate when the inaccuracy can be pointed out in the *Times* of the following day. The author of the report wrote to the *Times*, pointing out the error, and called attention to the language Mr. Mundella had used in answering the first question that had been put to him. That showed that Lord Carlingford was quite wrong.

But not only was the statement that the report was in the nature of a volunteer report, and had been "discharged at the head of the Department," untrue, and, therefore, a grave mistake, but the attempt to suppress the report was another very serious error. That Departments should have the power of appointing eminent persons to make inquiries, and of keeping their reports secret if they do not conform to official views, is a proposition which was involved in Mr. Mundella's refusal to produce the report, but it was a proposition which could not either expressly or by implication be maintained. Such a procedure would at once discredit, and ultimately put an end to departmental government. It may do very well, for, indeed it is the traditional policy of certain despotic and encroaching governments, to accredit agents for a time, to accept responsibility for their acts if they are successful, but to discredit them when it becomes convenient to repudiate conduct which seems unlikely to result in political success. But in this country such a fast-and-loose procedure would not be tolerated for a day. Mr. Mundella failed to understand the situation when he attempted to burke and suppress a document which he had himself instigated. Had the report been in conformity with Mr. Mundella's views, of course it would have been produced; that he should attempt to

support the policy of his Department by the suppression of information which was supposed to show that that policy was erroneous, was an intolerable assumption of power upon the part of the head of a Department, which deserved rebuke. Of course, the report had to be produced and published as an official document.

Some diligent underling of the Education Department had discovered, we suppose, that in a contribution of Dr. Crichton Browne to Cassell's "Book of Health" (a chapter entitled "Education and the Nervous System"), there were some views expressed which would throw doubt upon some of the conclusions in his report; a supporter of the Government in the House of Commons was put up to move that that work should be published as part of the blue-book containing the suppressed report. The House made the order. Here was another mistake. The work in question was of course the copyright of the author or the publishers, and the House of Commons had a few nights afterwards to rescind its order, having discovered that an order of that assembly does not justify literary piracy, and would not protect those who obeyed it from an action for the infringement of the right to copy.

Having failed in this endeavour, Mr. Mundella's evil genius betrayed him into another very serious mistake. He instructed Mr. Fitch to prepare a criticism of Dr. Crichton Browne's report, and the Chief Inspector's contemptuous memorandum is published with Dr. Crichton Browne's report. We shall have occasion to say something about both these documents hereafter; at present we are concerned to point out the grave error made by the Vice-President of the Council. He had invited a report, and when he got it he did not like it, he tried to suppress it, and when forced to publish it, he was afraid to let it go forth without an elaborate and disparaging criticism by one of Her Majesty's Chief Inspectors of Schools. If whenever any report which has been asked for by the Department is at variance with the views of the head of it, it is to be subjected to mauling criticism at the hand of some official who has received "instructions" to make mincemeat of it, there will be an end to all candour in the relations of officials to the public. Besides, there is such an obvious unfairness in the whole proceeding, that it cannot but redound to the discredit of those concerned in it. Dr. Crichton Browne, a man of eminence in science, a high official under the Court of Chancery, is asked to inspect certain schools and to report to Mr. Mundella. He receives no remuneration for so doing, and has of course to work double tides, having to perform his own arduous official duties as well as those which Mr. Mundella has imposed upon him. He sends in his report, in which he expresses views which, be they right or be they wrong, had

been arrived at after a very painstaking investigation: and because these views are distasteful to Mr. Mundella, he is severely criticized, by order, by Mr. Fitch. Mr. Fitch's memorandum is a somewhat curious document. In several of his pages he tries to prove that Dr. Crichton Browne had no qualifications to entitle him to make such a report (and by inference shows that the Vice-President of the Council was foolish and wrong when he asked him to do so); and further, that he does not understand the nature of evidence or scientific inquiry. This would-be damaging criticism was given to the public as an appendix to Dr. Crichton Browne's report, without having been shown to him before its publication. If such a proceeding commends itself to the Vice-President of the Council as fair and proper, he must have an obtuse sense of honour, and for ourselves we say that we cannot in our experience remember so scurvy and pettifogging a trick played by a Government Department upon a gentleman of considerable attainments and recognized scientific position. But mistakes never pay, and the attempt upon the part of Mr. Mundella to discredit his own agent has been resented by the press. Further, although Dr. Crichton Browne had not been told by the Department that his report was to be answered, and that he himself was to be attacked by order of the Vice-President, and although he only became aware of it when the bane (his report) and the antidote (Mr. Fitch's memorandum) were given to the public; he has since replied to the memorandum in two long letters to the *Times*, which are abler and better in many respects than the original report. Mr. Fitch says that Dr. Crichton Browne is not qualified to make such an investigation as that which was the foundation of his report; he can have no doubt *now* that Dr. Browne is a very able controversialist and a somewhat scathing critic. His wounds will tell him so much. We think that few persons who have followed the angry literature of this matter up to the present time will refuse to admit that Dr. Browne has deserved the honours of war.

As we said, apart from these heated personal matters between the antagonists, there has not been such a series of silly blunders committed by a Department of Government for a good while. But this history is interesting not merely because it affords curious instances of how an official can put his foot in it, but because it raises one or two rather important points indirectly. Had Mr. Mundella instead of instigating official criticism left Dr. Crichton Browne's report to be dealt with by the press of this country, he might have felt assured that the subject, and the manner in which it was treated, would not escape thorough investigation. As it is, however, the subject of "overpressure in schools" has suddenly assumed the proportions of a party question. Conservative papers have perceived an opportunity of discrediting the Government,

and have almost unanimously sided with Dr. Crichton Browne in the controversy; while Liberal organs, conscious that the fiery cross was out, and that their opponents desired to make political capital out of this matter, have rallied round Mr. Mundella and have been almost equally unanimous in their praise of Mr. Fitch. This, we say, is exceedingly unfortunate.

The possibility of wise legislation by means of party government is becoming more and more doubtful. Men begin to see that the heat of the greedy contest for the loaves and fishes, is not the condition of wise and prudent law-making. There is more and more a tendency to withdraw vitally important questions from the arena of party politics; and the cases where matters of national importance—which would formerly have been treated as excellent occasions for party strife—are by all conceded to be questions which ought to be treated on broader lines than those which circumscribe the rival political camps, are becoming more and more frequent. "This is not a party question," is a phrase which has only become familiar in recent times. But the tendency of which we have been speaking receives most pertinent illustration from the most modern instance. We know how the political battle raged all the autumn. Our autumn manœuvres were very striking. Not only did thousands of people walk the streets, or spend "happy days" in great noblemen's parks; but the leaders of the rival parties began to speak about marching upon London, resisting such a march, and about breaking each other's heads. Indeed, the play was carried further than this sparkling dialogue, as we know, and culminated in riots at Aston Park and at Dumfries. We are not discussing the Franchise question, but we would say that if ever there did seem to be a party question, it was that which agitated the country during the recess; and now we see that Redistribution has been amicably settled by a committee of the leaders of the two parties, sitting at Downing Street, as if they were both in office. Of course, there are serious questions involved in this new departure in statecraft. Whether matters are to be "squared" *in camera*, or fought out in public in the House, is a question which seems to be raised by this new method of procedure, but for our purpose here nothing could be a better illustration. We say there is a tendency to withdraw many matters from the anomalous position of party questions, and to deal with them irrespective of the consideration whether a certain course of action will catch or lose votes, and we regard that tendency as an exceedingly wholesome one. Thinking thus, we deplore the fact that this matter of the health in schools, which ought never to have been regarded as a party question, has by the blunders of the Department become one in respect of which the "serried rows" of party "are ranked ready." This matter undoubtedly required to be calmly inquired into, and

deliberately discussed. We regret therefore the temperature of this controversy, the purely political aspect of the journalistic criticism which have been offered, and of the discussion which has taken place in the London School Board. As far as we can, we shall deal with this question as if no such tempest had been raised, and give due weight to the arguments on both sides. It may be well to avoid the somewhat rhetorical style of Dr. Crichton Browne on the one hand, and the "instructed" sneers of Mr. Fitch on the other. But before passing to the real merits of the question of "overpressure," let us say a word or two about these rival documents.

Dr. Crichton Browne's report seems to us to be too long, and we cannot free our minds from the idea that, like the pupil-teachers who eat, according to Dr. Browne, with one eye on their plate and the other upon their book, Dr. Crichton Browne's report was written with one eye upon Mr. Mundella and the other upon the British public. The style of the report is no doubt clever, but for a document addressed solely to the Vice-President of the Council it is far too rhetorical. Its pages abound in figures of speech, and in descriptions which seem better adapted to a popular work for the railway-stalls than for the grave interior of a blue-book. Heine said that no woman ever wrote a book who had not one eye on a man and the other on her audience, except the Countess —, and she had only one eye. Dr. Browne has two eyes; we cannot but suspect that we see him close one occasionally towards the public, while he is supposed to be addressing Mr. Mundella. Then, again, this is in some sense a report of what Dr. Crichton Browne saw, and inferred from what he saw, in the elementary schools and the centres which he visited; but to a larger extent it is a treatise upon the subject of overpressure. So far as it is the first, it was, it seems to us, invited; so far as it is the second, it is entirely a volunteered contribution. Much that Dr. Crichton Browne has made out from the statistics furnished by the Registrar-General may be as true as it is interesting; but we think that it would have been more discreet to have confined his report to the matter of his commission, and to have reserved the miscellaneous matter which he has interpolated for separate publication. It is true that he might urge that all the matters treated of have an indirect connection with the subject of overpressure. But although we admit the fact, we cannot but think that the remoteness of the connection would have excused the absence of all discussion from this report of the question of the increase of insanity—the increase of suicides—the question whether "self-destruction arises (*sic*) now earlier in life than it was wont to do in former times." Then the tables which show the increase of (a) diabetes, (b) nephritis, Bright's disease, and uræmia, (c) rheumatic fever, rheumatism of the heart,

rheumatism, and which, no doubt, show the increase of disease in which nervous influences are at work, are interesting; but we cannot but think them unnecessary in this place. Indeed, as we understand the reporter, he ascribes these very diseases to "modern civilization, which imports an ever-growing tax on the brain and its tributaries." Having made these complaints of this report, which is open to some minor criticism, we cannot but admit that on the whole Dr. Crichton Browne's observations go to establish the fact that there is overpressure in the elementary schools in London, and we cannot see that Mr. Fitch's unhandsome, and in some respects (as appears from Dr. Crichton Browne's letter to the *Times* of the 18th September) misleading, criticism has done anything to shake the substance of these observations. That overpressure of the backward and nervous and stupid children is productive of much nervous disease, that headaches and sleeplessness and somnambulism and short-sightedness are more or less caused by the overwork to which these children are subjected, seems to be made out past the paltry cavil of the Chief Inspector that Dr. Browne only examined 6,000 children, while there are some 4,000,000 children in elementary schools, and that Dr. Browne's method of inquiry was not scientific. We do not know what claims Mr. Fitch may have to scientific knowledge, but we fail to understand how he reconciles it with his strict canons to criticize a method which he had not an opportunity of observing, as he appears to have done. But the truth is that almost the whole of Mr. Fitch's ordered criticism consists of disparagement of Dr. Crichton Browne.

To begin with, he seems to think that Dr. Crichton Browne is still Superintendent of the West Riding Asylum, an appointment he ceased to hold some seven or eight years ago. He then endeavours to show, by quoting Dr. Browne's Bradford letter, that he had made up his mind that overpressure existed before he visited the schools. He then pronounces upon his method of inquiry, and describes his judgments as hasty and inaccurate. He expresses regret that he has the unpleasant duty of castigating the reporter thrust upon him, asserts that Dr. Browne "asserts" and does not prove, describes the Court of Chancery as "a remote department of the public service," and, really, that is the whole of the memorandum. The gist of it is that Dr. Crichton Browne is not worthy of credence. Altogether apart from this ungentlemanly method of dealing with a man of eminence, whose inquiries he had been instructed by the Vice-President to "facilitate," and to whom he does not seem at any time to have hinted his objection to the method employed or the results arrived at, but to whom he seems to have lectured on the "Code;" we cannot help thinking that there is too much of the

pedagogue about this memorandum. The whole way through Mr. Fitch whips Dr. Browne, and with the usual clap-trap of the schoolmaster, regrets that his delinquencies have necessitated the use of the rod. But schoolmasters in our experience are too apt to have recourse to the rod when reason fails them, and we cannot but think that the Chief Inspector has had recourse to this somewhat vituperative memorandum because he saw no way of meeting the real substance of Dr. Crichton Browne's report.

Let us inquire into this a little more closely. Mr. Fitch says that Dr. Browne's method of inquiry was not scientific. He seems to imagine that in cases of disease medical men must not have recourse to any information which is derived from the individual who is suffering. But Dr. Crichton Browne is at any rate perfectly candid in the matter, and explains to Mr. Mundella what his method was, so we are in as favourable a position to judge of it as Mr. Fitch. He explained to the children what a headache was, and then asked those who suffered from headache to hold up their hands. No doubt, had his investigations terminated there they would have been open to Mr. Fitch's criticism. A criticism which implied, by the way, that they went no further. But is this fair criticism? Is it honest to suggest that this was all that was done? We know now that Mr. Fitch did not see what was done, but surely he had read Dr. Crichton Browne's report? If so, he must have known that Dr. Crichton Browne tested the accuracy of the result in a way which was perfectly scientific. He found that the numbers separately professing frontal, vertical, and occipital headache, when added up, came to the same as the total numbers which had claimed to suffer from headache, and while that gave a great probability that the first result was an accurate one, the further act of finding that the sum of the numbers of morning, evening, and afternoon headaches (on the supposition that that exhausted the day) amounted to the same total, placed its accuracy beyond doubt. It ought to be remembered too that these results received a striking corroboration from the investigations conducted in a similar way amongst pupil-teachers. Mr. Fitch says that that is a loose and partial method of inquiry. We differ from him: we think "loose and partial" would be more correctly applicable to a criticism of a method with which he was unfamiliar, and to assertions that inquiries were conducted in one district, while, as a fact, they extended over several. Let us test the value of his criticisms by another instance. Dr. Crichton Browne has condemned the system of payment by results. Some of his remarks read as follows:—

It is from this system of payment by results that the examination takes its sting.

The schoolmasters of to-day have an uneasy time of it owing to payment by results.

To all moderate men it will seem that the system of payment by results, that is to say, by proximate or partial results, must be very cautiously applied and surrounded by many safeguards if it is not to prove injurious to the masters and children.

Every child that the teacher fails to pass is so much money out of pocket.

It is unfortunately possible under the present system that the teacher who deserves best of his country might receive least from it, while he who is most damaging it might be most richly rewarded. It is possible that a cruel tyrant, who is ruthlessly over-driving teams of miserable children, and sowing broadcast the seeds of disease, might receive the merit grant, to be classed "excellent," while a humane and wise master, who is gently leading his flock along the path of progress, infusing strength and happiness into many lives, might be damned with faint praise and cut down, as regards his emoluments, to the lowest point.

Upon these quotations, Mr. Fitch thinks it right to make the following criticism. He says: "The two assumptions which underlie these and many similar statements are—(1) That the grant on results is paid to the teachers; and (2) That in the computation of the grant everything depends upon the number of separate passes, while intelligence, order, moral influence, and all the higher considerations which determine the value of a school count for nothing, and are practically disregarded by inspectors. Both assumptions are utterly unfounded. The share of the parliamentary grant awarded to each school is paid to managers, not to teachers. Managers make their own contracts with teachers, and, in making them, *no doubt they sometimes arrange that a part of the stipend shall depend on the goodness of the Government report, and on the amount of the school grant.*"

This is a specimen, and a good one, of foolish and disingenuous criticism. First, the critic will not take Dr. Crichton Browne's plain, if too eloquent, words, but must needs take the "assumptions" which he says underlie Dr. Browne's statements. We think that he has found more underlying the quotations than others would. It is a convenient thing to say—You have not said this, but it is assumed in your statement, and the assumption is unfounded. It is a legitimate process if the exact matter was assumed; if not, the process is foolish and futile. But the object, as we gather it, of Mr. Fitch, was to show that the system of payment by results was not in existence, although Dr. Browne believed it was. That, if it had been established, would have been effective criticism. But see how Mr. Fitch quibbles. The grant is not paid to the teachers, but to the managers, and the managers *sometimes arrange that a part of the stipend shall depend on the goodness of the report, and on*

the amount of the grant. The fact is that they almost invariably make the salary of the teachers depend upon the results. Does this meet Dr. Crichton Browne's statements? Every one of the quoted statements may be equally true if you read payment by results in that sense; and that turns out to be the sense Dr. Crichton Browne understood it in, instead of in the sense which Mr. Fitch says underlies his statements. We say that this sort of criticism is quite unworthy of a gentleman who takes upon himself to pronounce upon what are, and what are not, scientific methods, and what is, and what is not, "evidence." It is the fact that school teachers are paid by results. Dr. Crichton Browne's conclusions against the system are of a sweeping kind. He has a rapid, free, and quick intelligence, and a faculty for generalizing with great rapidity. Many of his suggestions, in our opinion, point too far; but it is always inexpedient to beat an antagonist unfairly, and that is the mistake which Mr. Fitch has fallen into. Dr. Browne's report and his conclusions required to be carefully weighed, diligently scrutinized and inquired into. In consequence of Mr. Fitch's hasty and ill-considered attack, the report has not received the real amount of critical examination which it deserved. This is an instance in point. There is far more to be said for a system of payment by results carefully guarded than Dr. Crichton Browne is aware of.* But Dr. Crichton Browne has, by his position in regard to this matter, secured the adhesion of a great majority of the school teachers throughout the country; and we question whether that support is the most *bonâ fide* tribute to the excellence of the report which it has met with. We admit with Dr. Browne that the system of payment by results, unless it is carefully guarded, may produce, will probably produce, overpressure in a certain class of pupils, but unless there is payment by results we shall to a certainty have

* Mr. Sydney Buxton, in his article on "Over-Pressure," in the November number of *The Nineteenth Century*, shows in some careful criticisms that the system of payment by results is a necessity of any effective scheme of State education, and he points out all the safeguards which exist in connection with existing grants to elementary schools. It is only too evident that the objection of the teachers to this system, is a protest against the overpressure, not of the pupils, but of the teachers themselves, and we cannot see the grounds upon which that system, which secures the strenuous efforts of school teachers, is to be condemned. That there is some truth in the statement of the National Union of Elementary Teachers (November 27, 1883), that to the system of payment by results "nearly all the overpressure in this country may be traced," is beyond question, and they add that they "are of opinion that so long as high grants can be obtained by overpressure, and in many cases in no other way, so long as human nature remains what it is, managers will demand, and teachers will be compelled to obtain, high grants." But we believe that, even with human nature as it is, it is possible to secure good work from teachers without overpressure on their pupils, by means of a careful system of payment in relation to the success of the teachers.

underpressure of school teachers. Now, however unwilling we may be that unstable nervous systems should be unduly taxed; we are equally unwilling that highly paid masters and mistresses in schools should be underworked. That our system of payment by results keeps these teachers "up to the collar," few, who are familiar with the working of our educational system, will doubt, and we suspect that the out-and-out condemnation of this system by Dr. Browne accounts for the unhesitating and enthusiastic support of the school teachers of this country. The laziness of human nature found much to approve in a proposition to abolish a system which makes strenuous work a necessity of success.

Now let us say at once, to sum up, that Dr. Crichton Browne has proved what no one with any knowledge of human nature and of a red-tape system as bearing upon it, could for an instant have doubted. There must, with a hard-and-fast system, be overpressure. You must, when you have standards, have them for the average child. These standards must necessarily be too easy for the clever children, and too severe for the stupid ones. If you have to get all the flock in at a door in a certain time, those which run fast require no herding, those that are lame must be hurried. This, we say, ought to have been obvious. What Dr. Browne has done is not only to show that that is the case, but to some extent to point out the results of the overpressure. The most startling results which he brings under the notice of the public is the curious prevalence of headaches amongst children. He found that out of 6,580 children examined 3,034 suffered from headaches, or a percentage of 46.1. Of course, it is scarcely necessary to say that, if these results are borne out by further investigations, they form a very serious indictment against the system.* Children ought not to suffer

* It must be remembered that Dr. Crichton Browne is not alone in the views which he has advocated or illustrated in this report. A large number of medical men have come to the conclusion that school work in elementary schools is causing disease in the children who are subjected to this strain. The fifty-three medical men in Bradford may not have been very wise to refuse to co-operate with the School Board in the investigation of the subject, but the memorial which they signed showed that their miscellaneous experience had impressed them with the evils of the system. It is sometimes said in answer to these complaints that there are very few cases on record where overwork has resulted in the actual breakdown of the pupils. That may be true, but to any one who has any knowledge of the subject, it is obvious that you may be producing a vast amount of mental and nervous disease amongst children without causing many deaths. It is in this aspect that Dr. Crichton Browne's researches are valuable. He has indicated the nature of the mischief which is being done. Mr. Sydney Buxton, somewhat weakly we think, when discussing the question of the health of school children, points to the fact that the sanitary conditions to which they are exposed in school must be

from headaches at all, and it cannot be a question that headaches may be indications of serious nervous disturbance and possibly of brain mischief. For the other facts that have been elicited in the course of Dr. Crichton Browne's investigations we must refer our readers to the pages of his Report. But of course it is obvious that if overpressure exists at all it must tell most hardly upon those children who are underfed. It is scarcely a medical truth that unless the body is well nourished the brain cannot perform its functions. We do not expect the same amount of work from two engines of the same horse-power if we give the one half as much coal as the other. Now, therefore, we say that the conclusion of this controversy is that Dr. Crichton Browne has made good his point, and that Mr. Fitch has necessarily been worsted, and that he has made a very sorry appearance as the champion of the Department with which he is connected. Since Dr. Crichton Browne's two long letters in the *Times* in October, Mr. Mundella must regret having trusted his cause to the "hireling chivalry" of Mr. Fitch's pen.

But beyond the immediate issues of this question there seem to be some very important points which, if not directly raised, are at least by implication mooted in the course of this inquiry. Dr. Crichton Browne's conclusions are that the Code which sanctions the withholding from examination scholars on account of "delicate health or prolonged illness, obvious dulness or defect of intellect, temporary deprivation by accident or otherwise of the use of an eye or hand," ought to receive a more liberal interpretation than it has hitherto done, and that that interpretation ought to be under medical guidance; that schools ought to be subjected to medical inspection, which ought to extend not merely to the sanitary state of the school, but to the lighting of the schoolrooms; that a register of the height, weight, head and chest girth of children should be kept at every school; and that teachers ought to be instructed in physiology. In the course of his report he also condemns two other matters in which to him the system seems defective. He objects to home lessons and to keeping in. In this respect we believe he has a large section of the medical profession with him, and even some of his opponents seem to concur in his views. Thus Mr. Sydney Buxton agrees that home lessons and keeping in should be abolished. "Where," he says, "pressure exists, it must of

much better than those of their own wretched homes. But the suggestion seems to us beside the mark. The object of the Education Acts is not to get children into a warm room but to teach them. It is from the teaching that the overpressure arises. To defend the system on the ground that it is a State Crèche seems to us to be, in the language of Lord Randolph Churchill, "chucking up the sponge."

necessity be intensified by home lessons and keeping in ; the latter prolongs hours already sufficiently extended, the former causes work to be done under the most unfavourable conditions. Yet, unless discouraged by the Department and carefully suppressed or forbidden by managers, both are sure to continue and increase." It is certain that when the children are strained by the ordinary work in school, and by the ordinary hours of attendance, either keeping in or the imposition of lessons to be learnt at home must necessarily be more strains for the already overburdened back, but we are far from certain that the abolition of these would be fraught with benefit. We have not space to discuss the matter at length here, but we think that these means may often be adopted to ensure that the burden of work which is suited for the average child shall not lie too lightly on the clever ones. That keeping in may be a useful disciplinary agent, and better than the force which is often rashly resorted to, we think none will doubt.

But although these are the whole of the formulated conclusions in his report, his discursive pen points to more important changes where he says "feeding ought to go before education" (p. 10), and when he adds: "Future generations may think it curious that these children who cannot get bread enough to eat are provided nevertheless with an excellent education which costs the country about £2 8s. per head" (Report, p. 11). There are other expressions too which floridly point in the same direction. Thus he remarks: "The children want blood and we offer them a little brain polish ; they ask for bread and receive a problem ; for milk, and the tonic-sol-fa system is introduced to them." Mr. Fitch, imitating the wide range of Dr. Crichton Browne, says, "that a school is established for the purpose of instruction, and not for the purpose of dispensing new milk. And I trust the statesmen and philanthropists who are now considering this difficult and anxious question will think twice before complicating the problem of national education by mixing up with it the administration of food and medicine to the children of the poor. It is already a drawback to the success of the Education Act, that it has unfortunately done a little to diminish the sense of parental responsibility. To enforce, with regard to any human duty, a legal obligation, is to weaken in some degree the sense of moral obligation" (Memorandum, p. 77). Now here we have a very grave question raised for consideration. It is a question which was discussed at the time that the Education Act, 1870, was passed into law. But in this country our statesmen pride themselves upon being practical men. That there are strong theoretical grounds against a measure seems to be a recommendation to the English legislator,

who, if he has a good ground in principle for his legislative acts, at once begins to suspect that he deserves to be stigmatized as a doctrinaire. Although the grave consequences which would follow from substituting for a moral duty a legal obligation were to some extent anticipated by the wise at the time the Education Bill was promoted, the far-reaching consequences of that false step in legislation could not then be foreseen. We find, moreover, that the inevitable results are now becoming apparent, and one or two of these are very plainly brought out in relation to this controversy as to overpressure. It has become apparent that the compulsory education of the children has resulted in the deterioration of the parents. You cannot substitute legal duties, enforceable by courts of law, for moral claims enforceable only *in foro conscientia*, without injury to the character of those from whom the duties are exacted. The law is, of course, a necessary institution, but the limits of its beneficial action are circumscribed. When Mr. Fitch uses the words "a little diminished," he is speaking with the necessary guardedness of an official. Those who are intimately acquainted with the present system will fully endorse his statement, substituting a larger adjective for his "little." It was said by many that the Education Act was a step in the wrong direction—that law was going out of its real province when it was associating the schoolmaster with the policeman, the judge, and the gaoler; and now we see, as a result of that departure, that the law is invited to a hundred other divagations. Paternal government soon becomes tyranny, and in this country we are in danger of a tyrannous rule of law in every department, which will put an end to the freedom of our institutions, which was once our boast. Our Legislature never seems to understand that an indiscreet step implies the necessity of a whole journey. No one thought that the teaching of reading was to lead to the free-breakfasting by the State of starving scholars.* But now we find that expedient brought recklessly forward as a remedy for the evils that the hard-and-fast system of education is inflicting upon the children of the State. But that is not the end of it. Dr. Browne, with loyalty to his profession, seems to think that a great deal might be done for the scholars if there was a regular medical inspection

* "A conference of persons engaged in teaching and others interested in the work of elementary education, including Mr. Mundells, assembled at the Society of Arts, Adelphi, on Saturday afternoon, when a committee was appointed to arrange a plan for providing penny dinners for the most destitute of the school children."—(*The Standard*, December 8, 1834.) So we see what we are coming to. In the same newspaper it was announced that "the Earl of Wemyss had given notice that after the re-assembling of Parliament he would call attention to the spread of Socialism."

of schools, and if the withdrawals from examinations were to be made on medical authority. This, then, is another step in the wrong direction which has been necessitated, if it is necessary, by the first foolish departure of the State from its true functions. Every error in legislation is sure to be the parent of a brood of necessities, which will require further departures from legislative rectitude. Dr. Crichton Browne finds certain evils, and he proposes what seems to him the most obvious remedy. But he ought to remember that it is an error in medical practice to treat a symptom, and he ought to recognize these evils only as indications of a deeper-seated evil than he has detected. But he would unhesitatingly throw even larger duties than these upon the toiling State. His idea of a school register, which he first mentions in his work upon Education and the Nervous System, and of which Mr. Fitch makes some fun, in ignorance of the fact that the suggestion was made by the Anthropological Committee of the British Association, shows that he would impose the most miscellaneous duties upon Government. Dr. Browne says, feeding before reading; but clothing goes before reading too; and we cannot but think that if Dr. Crichton Browne had used the much criticized method to ascertain the percentage of children who are insufficiently clothed, and whose rags gaped piteously, he would have arrived at some very startling results. Logically, we think Dr. Browne was bound to say so, for he does not quite go the length of saying, "not only feed before you teach," but "clothe before you educate." But he is silent as to that duty of the maternal State, to put the children "in their gear," as the Scotch have it, but is most anxious that the State should "devil," to use the word in its technical legal sense, for the scientific man of the Dr. Francis Galton type. It is in their interest that he recommends the scales and the tape-measure to the Government, and asks it to be a "chief" among the children "taking notes," for it must, according to the reporter, keep a complete history of the "vital changes and educational progress of each boy, as long as he remains at school." These registers "would speedily become mines of wealth to the statistician and anthropologists, and the collocation and comparison of the facts contained in them would help to the solution of many problems of national importance."

We may admit at once that these school registers might be very valuable, but we object to the State becoming the collectors of facts for the statistician and the anthropologist. It is conceivable that any large enough system of statistics applied to any department of human life, might be the means of determining many important questions in vital history, but the importance of the result cannot justify the derelictions from governmental duty

which is involved in the application of national funds to such purposes. Were the State a wealthy corporation with funds at its disposal commensurate with its leisure, it might possibly be harmlessly employed in devoting itself to the accumulation of vital statistics, in schools and elsewhere; but as the State is a trustee for the people, and has no funds to squander, and is already overburdened with work, we object to this new duty which Dr. Browne's enthusiasm for statistics would thrust upon her. We cannot but think that these recommendations have been made without due consideration as to the true duties of the State in connection with the subject. It is quite true that it is impossible to judge of the real functions of Government from ascertaining what Government has as a fact undertaken. Our statute-book already covers far too large a field, and that fact may seem to excuse a specialist here asking the State to preserve ancient monuments, a specialist there asking the State to subsidize the theatre, and another demanding food for hungry children, and a school register for the hungry anthropologist. It would be well if we looked facts in the face, and saw to what all this over-government, which is worse than overpressure, is drawing us. It is well for us to recognize the fact that the State no longer confines itself to the protection of life and property from the encroachments of other persons, but in performing a hundred social duties in these days which used to be regarded as foreign to its proper function. The mere accumulation of debt by the various corporations throughout this country is an indication of the extent of the duties which Government is now performing. We see that in most towns the corporation not only keeps order, but that it inspects and abates nuisances, that it collects dust; that it supplies water and gas and electricity; that it provides against the adulteration of various articles of commerce; that it compels the vaccination of children; and when one machinery fails another is instituted to see to the education of the children, the prevention of the spread of certain contagious diseases, the regulation of railways, and the like. This very incomplete list shows the wide range of State interference in this country, and it comes to be a very serious question whether such interferences, while they may produce a temporary convenience in one place, or one department, do not inevitably result in serious inconvenience elsewhere. It will be remembered, on Scriptural authority, that it is unwise to put a piece of new cloth into an old garment, for that which is put in taketh from the garment, and the rent is made worse. So it is with the framing of our social fabric. Each new patch taketh from the fabric, and there is a worse rent in consequence of our interference. There is an illustra-

tion to hand. Crime, it was said, resulted from the ignorance of the people. The moral duties of parents were not performed; and why, because parents were deaf to conscience, should the poor children grow up ignorant? The State stepped in, and held a rod over the parents. As a result, we have first the Education Code, and then the overpressure in schools, and the whole of the pathetic evils which Dr. Crichton Browne has spoken to. But is the remedy still further patching up the garment which is already too frail to hang together? Dr. Crichton Browne seems to think it is: and in this we differ from him. The State has already done too much. You cannot make men good and happy by law. You cannot educate them in any true sense in your schools, or give them a taste for art by your free picture galleries. But every one of these institutions paves the way for further socialistic advance. The more the State deserts its old rôle of securing freedom to all men to do what they choose, whether to educate themselves or to study art, or what not, and performs in the new character of the hero of "a finger in every pie," the more it will be called upon to interfere. The State is no wiser than charity, and charity, with all its heavenly intuitions, is often very silly. Let us illustrate what we mean. Some years ago, as most readers will remember, there was very great distress in the East-end of London. There are many kind hearts in England, and charity opened its purse and poured out its treasures. The amount subscribed for the relief of the distress was very large. To most people the prompt answer to the haggard request seemed most fortunate. There was money enough freely given to keep all these poor people from starving. The administration of the funds was undertaken by a careful committee. With what result? The result was, that every penny that had been subscribed for the relief of distress found its way into the pockets of the owners of the hovels in the East-end of London. The thing is incredible at first, but it is true. Whenever the poor, in other districts, heard that there was to be a distribution of funds in East London they flocked there in great numbers. The immediate consequence was that the rents rose, and the extra amount paid by the starving poor in the eastern parts of the metropolis was greater than the fund which had been devoted to relieve the famine. That instance shows how difficult it is, even for charity, to put a new piece into an old garment without increasing the tatters. State interference has often put such results in unexpected quarters. Education has resulted in overpressure, which shows itself in the deterioration of the health of the people. For remedy, we have further interference suggested. We are advised to feed the children and to medically inspect the schools. We might have to wait a little while

to ascertain the whole of the evils which would result from this further departure from the wise rule of legislation ; but that evils would show themselves is certain, and that these would be more serious than those which at present exist, we can well believe. It is enough to have the eye of the sanitary inspector on our dust-box, to have the hand of the tax-collector constantly at our throat, without having the State physician constantly beside our beds with his fingers continually upon our pulse. This country has been spoken of as "priest-ridden," but we cannot say that it would be better if the country gave "a mount" to the medical man instead of the cleric. But we protest against any such interference. We have been, as our history shows, for centuries struggling to achieve our emancipation from the tyranny of laws which were made in the interests of individuals, or of narrow classes. Something more requires to be done before "privilege" shall have passed away, and before men are really their own masters. But it is not the time, when we are on the eve of this new birth of freedom, to become the slaves to new masters. It was the horse, was it not, in the fable, that invited man to assist him in his war against his enemies, and, in the eagerness of the strife, submitted to be bridled and harnessed. But when peace came it came without honour, for the bridle and the harness have been worn ever since. Men have been anxious to throw off the yoke which feudalism left upon them. In doing so they have collocated with men of science, and now these gentlemen want to rule instead of the feudal lords. We are far too much governed. This has been pointed out by Mr. Herbert Spencer, and although Professor Huxley dubbed him an "administrative nihilist" and thought that the State could not interfere too much, so long as the interference was beneficial, time has fought in favour of the views of the former. And it becomes more and more obvious that in this country, as in America, we are losing our liberty to the standing armies of voters, who are officered by the Caucus. But we are travelling too far from this matter of overpressure, which is only one illustration of the evils which, as we take it, result from the unwise interference of the State with matters which are better left to the individual.

We confess that we have not much hope that this protest of ours will have any effect upon the policy, which was inaugurated, in this matter, in 1870. That is one reason for being very careful in legislation, that it is almost impossible to go back ; but at any rate it may do something to prevent a further progress in a wrong direction, which is advocated by Dr. Crichton Browne. But the matter which is more pertinent to our present purpose, is what is to be done now? It was doubtful at the time that Dr. Crichton Browne was appointed, whether any inquiry other

than that which might have been instituted by the Education Department through its own staff, into the subject of overpressure, was necessary at all; now, there can be no question, that the necessity for a further, and more complete investigation of the whole subject has been demonstrated. Dr. Crichton Browne's inquiries were necessarily limited. He accomplished a very great deal, but of course his investigations could not be exhaustive. The inquiries which have been instituted by the School Board of London will not content the public. Very many members of that Board have already expressed views at variance with those of Dr. Crichton Browne, some of them upon somewhat insufficient grounds, as has appeared from some lively correspondence which has passed between these gentlemen and that indefatigable controversialist, Dr. Crichton Browne. But neither the report of the Committee of the School Board on the one hand, nor the enthusiastic resolutions of various bodies of school teachers on the other, will satisfy the public. There must be a thorough investigation of the subject by a Royal Commission. It might have been better if this course had been earlier adopted by the Education Department; but better late than never; we are certain that sooner or later Mr. Mundella will have to have recourse to this means of arriving at the truth. When that Commission reports, we shall be surprised, if, in the main, they do not come to the same conclusions, in so far as the existence of overpressure is concerned, as those in Dr. Crichton Browne's report; but we hope they will suggest remedies which are not open to the serious objections which can be urged against those which are hinted at, as we have said, by Dr. Browne. The inquiry is called for, and Mr. Mundella will make another serious mistake if he resists the demand longer.

ART. II.—ON THE STUDY OF THE TALMUD.

THE object of this article is to show how little progress has been made in the modern study of the Talmud; to suggest some of the unavoidable causes of this, and to indicate, in some measure, that great as are the inherent difficulties of this study they are too frequently aggravated by the ignorant, unscientific, or prejudiced treatment to which the Talmud is subjected.

Notwithstanding the widespread tendency towards minute philological investigation which has characterized the last half century, and the enormous results which have thus been obtained in the increased knowledge, not only of the ancient

forms of Indo-Teutonic speech, but of most other languages, living and dead; and notwithstanding the omnivorous character of the science itself, modern philology has done but little, so far, for the study and elucidation of the Rabbinical classics. We say modern philology advisedly, bearing in mind the loyal accuracy, the dispassionate criticism, and the indefatigable research which have raised the methods of the true philologist to a level with those of the exact sciences.

Of work, of a kind, upon the Talmud there has been plenty, and to spare. Of this we shall treat later. But of real, honest study and scientific criticism, there has been comparatively little. At first sight this might well seem strange, and even inexplicable. It might seem strange that important portions of the literature of that people to which the world of civilization owes so much of its spiritual life, precisely as to the Greeks it owes so much of its intellectual life, should remain as little known as the literature of China, or should absorb even less interest than the Cuneiform inscriptions. That the literature of the Jews should occupy a lower place in the consideration of the Western peoples than do the Sanscrit or the Pali, might well be wondered at. But this is the case, and it would be no exaggeration to say that for every Englishman who has ever read a line of the Talmud there are ten who have read the Rig Veda.

Yet to complain of this neglect is not our purpose. Indeed, much as we regret it, we cannot but admit that it is in many respects intelligible. The difficulties which beset the proper study of the Talmud are very great, very numerous, and very varied. These difficulties are both internal and external.

The internal difficulties arising from the history, form, and character of the work are calculated to terrify all but the most indomitable. The mere preliminary question with which Deutsch began his brilliant, though one-sided article, seventeen years ago, "What is the Talmud?" is impossible of answer. Deutsch did not attempt to answer it, nor shall we. The Talmud is a work of too varied, too disconnected, and too divergent elements to be concisely defined at all, or to be even approximately described within the limits of an English sentence. It is easier to say what the Talmud is not than what it is. Yet so little is popularly known of its character and composition that it is necessary to say a few preliminary words in regard to these points, if only to make the use of two or three indispensable technical terms generally intelligible. This much, at all events, it may be useful to state as to the so-called divisions of the Talmud to which reference is frequently made. One is a physical division in form; the other a classification of

substance represented by the words "Halachah" and "Haggadah." From one point of view the Talmud may somewhat loosely be said to consist of the "Mishnah" and the "Gemara." The former is the ill-arranged* transcript of one version of the "Oral Law," in the narrower sense of the words, and is a book of no very considerable size. It was drawn up in its present form, though not written down, about 200 A.D. The Gemara may be roughly described as a sort of gigantic commentary upon the Mishnah, but it is a commentary of which enormous portions have absolutely nothing to do with the text on which it comments. Yet one main business of the Gemara is the elucidation and development of that oral law which comprised within its view all sides of human life, and not merely affairs of ritual or of faith. We are there presented with interminable legal discussions, not elaborated for us into polished phrases, but simply the raw material itself fresh from the Rabbis and their schools. Intermingled with these legal discussions there is a vast amount of theological data and suggestion, and, since all Hebrew Law rests upon the Pentateuch, there is found room for interpretations of Scripture of the most different kinds—ingenious or clumsy grotesque or beautiful, as the case may be. Moreover, these very interpretations and citations of Scripture lead on to all kinds of remarks, stories, and allusions in regard to any other religious or secular subject which the quoted passage may chance to call up to the mind of the speaker or reporter. That the thread of the argument, or the course of the "commentary," is interrupted by these excursions is not of the least consequence. Form was not a consideration, and, obviously according to this method, or want of method, there was room for the work to expand indefinitely. For it was not written all at once, or with a defined object: it simply grew. It was not a building, but a conglomerate. And as the various sides of the Law are successively handled, any stray point connected with any particular law may be dwelt upon and illustrated at a length totally disproportionate to its importance. Thus the Talmud is full of fragmentary notices relating to almost every "subject" under the heavens, and much of this varied material of statement and story is the offshoot of the book's main object—the practical working out of the religious life as manifested in all branches of human conduct. This practical or legal part is called the "Halachah" (literally "Rule"). But opposed to the Halachah, and yet often inextricably connected with or issuing from it, is the other great side of the Talmud, which is called

*The epithet, "ill-arranged," although deliberately used, will not be acceptable to all authorities.

name of Haggadah. The outward manifestation of religion in life was regulated by a series of minute laws and observances; but if no divergency was here permitted—for though individuals may argue differently, they are in practice compelled to follow the majority or the one particular authority whose prestige excels that of the majority—in the field of religious imagination the widest licence was freely allowed. One object of the Talmud is to record the mass of floating stories and parables, legends and miracles, which formed a large part of the real religious food and sustenance of Rabbinical Judaism. This heterogeneous mass is the Haggadah. Where the Mishnah in any way lends itself to Haggadic treatment, the Gemara becomes sometimes more Haggadic than Halachic. In other portions of the Gemara there is very little Haggadic matter, but often on the slightest provocation this element suddenly reappears, and once fairly started it flows on irrepressibly. It will consequently be readily realized that these two elements in the Talmud are not clearly separated in the text, but are often closely interwoven and blended with each other.

Now, still evading the impossible question "What is the Talmud?" let us glance at what we know of its history and how it grew into existence in the form in which it is presented to us. The completed Talmud is the outcome of a long course of transcription, which, however, did not begin till the second part of the fourth century after Christ. Previous to that time, the prohibition to commit to writing the teaching handed down by tradition, was still in force.* Of what then did this prolonged work of transcription consist? It was not a case where an editor or editors had merely to collect matter already written, and, after due comparison and collation of the whole, to arrange and edit it on a given principle. There was, in fact, no editing, for there was nothing to edit.† From first to last it was almost exclusively a matter of reducing to writing what up till then had been carried by memory and handed down by oral tradition. And the so-called editors had no materials save the oral communications made to them from various sources.‡ This circumstance would obviously defeat the possibility of exhaustive

* Some portions of the Haggadah, however, were written down still earlier. Cf. Frankl, "Introductio in Talmud Hierosolymitanum," 51 a.

† The treatises and essays touching the publication of the Talmud are too numerous to be enumerated here. We would, however, refer to the excellent article, "Ueber die Entstehung des Talmud," by N. Brüll; which appeared in the second year of his "Jahrbücher zur jüdischen Geschichte und Literatur," where the whole of this literature is treated of. Besides this we must point to the third volume of Weiss, "Geschichte der Tradition," published in 1883.

‡ See Frankl's lecture on the study of the Talmud, p. 16. The question there mooted by Frankl has never yet been satisfactorily answered.

arrangement or elaborated method. The oral communications referred to were received successively and not in parallel relation to one another; they were written down as they came, that is, they were compiled and not edited. The probability is, that even this unsystematic compilation was due, not to deliberate plan, but to necessity. The continuous and evergrowing stream of oral doctrine, flowing and swelling in volume through centuries, had at last begun to exceed the powers of human memory, and recourse to transcription became inevitable. A teacher, one Rabbi Aschi, who worked in the latter half of the fourth century, is said to have resolved to collect the material. Whether he ever began to commit it to writing is very doubtful. It is certain that neither he nor his immediate successors accomplished this undertaking, and it is equally certain that neither he nor they confined themselves entirely to the work of collection. They were editors and authors at one and the same time. But the shape in which the Talmud is now presented to us as a completed entirety—if we are justified in so speaking of it—was not attained until the end of the eighth century.* Now here we find, at once, one great difficulty in the study of the Talmud, namely, the utter want of form, of continuity, of connected method, of even verbal consistency. It is moreover clear that parts of this voluminous text, carried in the memory and orally transmitted for centuries, must have suffered alteration, injury and mutilation in the process. When we recollect that there was absolutely no aid to memory in the nature of the material, is it credible that such a chaotic pile of matter could, under the conditions, escape this fate?†

The language of the Talmud lacks every phonetic advantage. One passage does not naturally suggest the next, and the context often helps us little. There is no metre and no rhythm. Now these defects, while calculated to impair the fidelity of the written Talmud, render its study difficult and sometimes bewildering to the point of exasperation. The Jews of older times were wont to speak of the Talmud as "Yam H'Talmud," the "Sea" of the Talmud. And the figure has much force. To one who has grasped its meaning and felt its spirit there is the ocean-like sense of immensity and movement. Its great broad surface is at times smooth and calm, at other times disturbed by breakers of discussion, stormy with question and answer, assertion and refutation. Its waves of argument as they follow and tumble over one another, all give a constant sense

* See Weiss, *ibid.*

† See Brüll, *ibid.* Also the "Mnemotechnik des Talmuds," by Jacob Brüll. But the mnemotechnical helps to the Talmud are probably, as Rapoport holds, comparatively modern, and, in any case, are of doubtful assistance.

of largeness and of motion. And, to continue the figure, we find this sea fed by innumerable brooks and mighty rivers of traditional lore: we remember that those sources ran not through unbroken country but through bad times and good, so that it were little wonder if, on the one hand, some of them lost volume on the way, and, on the other, some of their streams were defiled and corrupted by foreign elements gathered in their course and borne into this great sea.

If it is probable that the text of the Talmud, as we have it, suffered from the delay in beginning transcription, it is not less probable that it suffered similarly during the extended period which the completion of that transcription occupied. This period extended over about four centuries. The delay was not, however, due to the great care and scrupulous precautions which were expended upon the work. It must rather be attributed to the unfortunate condition of the people and to the unquiet times which often interrupted the labours of the scribes. There were, during this space of time, whole periods in which, owing to bitter religious persecutions and to political disquietude, the study of the Law entirely ceased and neither teachers nor scholars remained.* The work was certainly again taken in hand as soon as circumstances were more favourable, but there is little doubt that, owing to the interruptions above referred to, any attempt at a uniform plan, if such were ever contemplated, must have been defeated and abandoned.

It will thus be readily believed that a work of this magnitude, with such a history, and of such a character, must present considerable difficulties to the systematic and conscientious student. That, after centuries of residence in the fallible memories of men, followed by centuries of unmethodic and interrupted compilation, there should be inconsistencies and contradictions in the resulting whole was inevitable. Thus we find one Rabbi assigning to his own master a particular opinion on a particular subject; while in another passage another Rabbi credits the same authority with precisely the opposite view.† That errors found their way into the text was equally inevitable;‡ that matter was lost or misplaced, that some texts were accidentally mutilated or misunderstood,§ and that others were wilfully and maliciously distorted is tolerably certain. These defects give rise to doubts, and obscurities, in dealing with

* See Brill, *ibid.*

† Out of very numerous instances we here may refer to Nedarim. 25b. Cf. H'Chaluz, xi. p. 7, ff.

‡ See N. Krochmal's book, "Moré Neboché H'Zeman," p. 217, *seq.*, and Rapoport's "Erech Millim," pp. 5-9.

§ See Tesehuboth H'Geonim. Ed. Cassel, p. 23b.

which neither text-criticism, nor philological acumen are of much help; for all other sources of the older Rabbinical literature which might be consulted suffer from similar blemishes.*

The foregoing list of difficulties will probably justify us before our readers when we say that a definite verdict on the merits or demerits of the Talmud as a whole is an impossibility. Such a verdict were inconceivable, even supposing that the Talmud had been most systematically compiled, and that we were in possession of the most desirable certainty with regard to its sources. Even a question put in the form "How does the Talmud think on this or that subject?" is inappropriate. For how can a true answer to such a question be gathered from a work which does not reproduce the system of any given man or any given school, but is, as already stated, a mere collection of sayings, statements, discussions, views, reminiscences and stories flowing from some four to five hundred Rabbis,† and embracing a period of more than eight hundred years? In the course of those centuries the Jewish people experienced so many vicissitudes of fortune, came into contact with so many foreign nations, and passed through so many internal and external convulsions, that the Rabbis, themselves a part of this people and subject to the same influences, must of necessity have felt, thought, and spoken variously, at different times, on the same points. One single aim, and one only, was common to all Rabbis alike, namely, *to do what the law enjoined and to avoid doing what it forbade, and, as far as possible, to render the non-fulfilment of any command and the contravention of any prohibition an impossibility.* But how this great aim should be secured, in what manner that which was enjoined to be done should be done, and how that which should be avoided was to be avoided, opinions widely differed. External influences and individual impressions combined to constitute the varying sayings and teachings of the Rabbis. It is not, then, the general opinion of the Talmud on any given point which we must ask for, but the opinions of the particular Rabbis, and we must always be prepared to find the affirmation of one met by the direct negative of another. Thus, to go one step farther, it would not be profitable to ask whether the Rabbis as a body are tolerant or intolerant. Though the

* We have here confined ourselves, in order not to be too prolix, entirely to the Babylonian Talmud, but it will escape no one interested in the matter, that the same uncertainties are to be met with in all the old Rabbinical writings. Cf. Frankl, *ibid.*, Zunz's "Gottesdienstliche Vorträge;" Weiss' "Geschichte der Tradition," vols. ii. and iii.; as well as J. Levy's excellent and classic treatise, "Ueber die Mishnah des Abba Saul" (Berlin 1874), and Schwarz's work on the Tosefta, &c.

† Cf. Frankl's lecture above referred to.

majority were probably what we should now call intolerant, it is obvious that in the course of so many centuries, and in the midst of such changes of fortune, their attitude towards other races and creeds could not have remained unchanged. Is there any record of a people retaining through centuries the same collective attitude towards a single subject? The adage, *autres temps autres mœurs*, was probably as true of the Jews in the first half-dozen centuries after Christ as of any other people during a similar period of its history. The Jews undoubtedly had their moments of wild excitement and frenzied indignation. The same false and exaggerated patriotism that bade the noblest of the *Freiheits-dichter* in Germany exclaim, *Nieder mit den Wälschen*, extorted from the Rabbis the words "slaughter the best of the Gentiles." And the same impulses which in Europe led to acts of vandalism, "judicial murders," and fanatical cruelty prompted the powerless Rabbis—with, perhaps, even better justification*—to speak of the Gentile world with that contempt and hatred which is too frequently disclosed by the Talmud. But in the same Talmud we find that in happier times Jewish Rabbis had Gentile friends, whose death they lamented with the words "Woe to the bond which is broken,"† and that others were keenly alive to the art and intellect of Hellas ‡

In dealing with an unwieldy and amorphous mass of material like the Talmud, a familiar method of procedure consists in separately abstracting all matter connected with a special subject and systematizing it. The whole work is thus gradually absorbed and utilized in a series of monographs. We should accordingly proceed to deduce "The Theology of the Talmud," "The Philosophy of the Talmud," and so on. The method is a valuable one and often affords the best form of assistance to subsequent students of the same matter. But in order that it should be used successfully, it is necessary that the facts should pre-exist the theory. This unhappily is not the case with the Talmud, which thus does not lend itself to this plan of treatment. What might be called the "operative part" of the Talmud—the legal discussions and ordinances which compose the Halachah—was always approached by the Rabbis strictly and carefully. But all the vague imaginings on metaphysical and theological questions which incidentally occur in the course of discussion or story are little more than the outcome of the individual fancy and natural bent of the several teachers. On this side of their work they allowed themselves almost unre-

* See Döllinger, "Heidenthum und Judenthum" (Regensburg, 1857), especially the last chapter.

† "Aboda Zarah," 10b,

‡ Megillah 9b and the parallel passages.

strained latitude. Any attempt to construct a series of systems—say of Rabbinical theology or Rabbinical philosophy—upon their unconnected, and we might almost say irresponsible, utterances, can only be misleading. What there is of speculation concerning the nature of God, of His wisdom and justice in governing the world and so on, was in no wise the result of profound and continuous thought. The various ideas were not in any one case the issue of careful trains of reasoning on the part of a single Rabbi, still less were they the conclusions of a school. They were the mere *obiter dicta* of individual Rabbis, momentary inspirations, products of the imagination rather than of the reason. The wide range of anthropomorphic figure applied to descriptions of the Deity—from a destroying warrior to a master of dialectic—suggests how unrestrained was the play of fancy in which the Rabbis indulged.*

So again in Taanith (25a), we are told that a certain Rabbi Levi, in a time of great drought, complained that God behaved as a careless Father who had no compassion on his children. Another Rabbi, when rain had been granted in exact accord with the wishes of the people, spoke of God as an indulgent Father who could not refuse his spoilt children a single boon (23a). But the Talmud is wholly unaware of any radical difference in these two views of God, and their authors were not giving vent to the convictions of a system, but to the casual feelings of the moment. The inferences from the facts as to the Nature of God were as simple as the facts themselves; they were not meant to be applied beyond the occasions on which they were used. Each case stood by itself, and it would never have occurred to the compilers of Taanith that a theory was needed whereby the apparent inconsistency might be reconciled. We may here add incidentally that, on the whole, the old Rabbinic way of regarding the Deity may fairly be described as at once childish and childlike. We say, on the whole, because no doubt there is in places evidence of higher and more intellectual conceptions.†

* Cf. Mechilta 38b. (ed. Friedmann). Chagiga 14a.

† See Mechilta 38b, Bartolucci, "Bibliotheca Magna Rabbinica," vol. i. pp. 552-642, Ben-Chananja, 9th Series, Supplement to No. 35. Bacher's "Agadah der Amoraer" and other works. We need scarcely add that we have touched upon this important subject with the utmost superficiality, wishing rather to suggest than to draw positive conclusions. One warning, however, may be given in all certainty, namely, that no kabbalist or semi-kabbalist works should be adduced or used in an attempt to sketch out a Talmudic theology. Of all these works, such as Jezira, Bahur, the Zohar, and others, there is not a single one the early date of which has not been denied by the most competent critics and bibliographers. Whatever the exact epoch to which they belong, they are at all events posterior to the completed Talmud. See on this

What we have said as to theological questions may be said with equal correctness of the philosophy of the Talmud. There is no philosophy of the Talmud, but only scattered and varied notions on philosophical questions risked by individual Rabbis. Here and there a Rabbi lighted on a philosophical idea, he knew not how; but he delivered himself of it in all innocence, and passed on. It never occurred to one of them to follow up such an idea to its conclusions. They were in no sense formal philosophers, but they talked so much *de omnibus rebus* that they could hardly escape touching, never so unconsciously, on philosophy.

Just as it is easier to say what the Talmud is not, than what it is, so, it will be seen, it is easier to say how it may not, than how it may, be studied. We might easily multiply instances such as we have just given of this difficulty, each one representing a pitfall into which unwary or injudicious writers on the subject have already fallen. But we have said enough of the internal difficulties. We have now to contemplate those which are not inherent to the work itself. These are both negative and positive. The former amount to this, that, to a work of surpassing difficulty, there is practically no outside assistance. The latter are roughly represented by the unscientific treatment to which the Talmud has been the victim. We suffer, in other words, from a lack of good guides and from a surfeit of misleading ones. We have suggested how the text must have suffered in its earlier stages of oral transmission and prolonged compilation. It fared still worse after it had been compiled. In the Middle Ages it was not only confiscated and burnt by Papal authority, but it was mutilated and tortured by a fanatical and ignorant censorship, which not unfrequently disfigured its most harmless passages.* But if, in approaching the study of a text as confused and obscure as that of the Talmud, we turn for the help of those friends and guides familiar to us in the study of other ancient texts—Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit—we turn in vain. Scientific study of the Talmud is of very recent date, being hardly more than half a century old. We are indeed greatly indebted to the gigantic labours of the Spanish and Franco-German schools of the Middle Ages.† But

point Zunz, Rapoport, Steinschneider, and many others. It is incomprehensible to us how Dr. Schiller-Szinessy (Art. Midrash, "Encyc. Brit." xvi. 9th ed.), even if he ventures to oppose this noble band of scholars, should have left the student utterly ignorant that he was dogmatically maintaining a position which all the great authorities have declared to be wholly untenable.

* See Rauscher, "Index der verbotenen Bücher," vol. i. p. 45, seq. (Bonn, 1883). Rapoport, "Erech Millikn sub voce Edom," and Levinsohn "Toula Israel," p. 78, note 6.

† See Jellinek, "Kunteros Hamofaresch." Vienna, 1877.

what they have left us was the work of devout Jews, whose treatment of the subject was not only very unlike the scientific method of modern research, but lacked that preliminary scepticism which is rightly held essential to honest inquiry. These writers, though profound and serious investigators, were also profound and serious believers, and were therefore incapable of using the scalpel of criticism to what was, in part, their religious code.* But true science, as is now acknowledged, which looks not at things but into, and if possible behind, things, requires this unflinching procedure.†

It was not till the third decade of the present century that any real critical study of the Talmud was commenced. And even now the work is but begun. We are not unmindful of, or ungrateful for, the splendid labours of Rapaport, Krochmal, Zunz, Frankl, Geiger, and many more earnest and honest investigators. These writers, endowed with a wide and varied knowledge, and gifted with a profound historical interest as well as accurate philological tact, subjected the Talmud and its kindred literature to a new criticism. They sought to unravel difficulties and to solve problems which were themselves the product of a hitherto unheard-of scepticism. They began to dig out the buried sources, to compare individual parts of the Talmud with each other, and to bring within the sphere of their researches whole portions to which, up to that time, very little attention had been paid. They introduced the critical study of manuscripts, in order so far as possible to trace the historical development of this stupendous work from its origin to its conclusion. In consequence of the surprising results of their investigations, which very soon attracted the attention of the Jewish literary world, they gradually succeeded in starting a school of disciples who sought to continue the new inquiries in the spirit of their masters.‡

* That the Talmud was not even regarded by mediæval Jews in all its parts as religious scripture, may be gathered from many sources. Cf. The letters of Chemdah Genusah, p. 39, *seq.*, and especially p. 41, Königsberg, 1856.

† Writings like Modena's "Bechinath Ha'Kabbalah," which confine themselves to general accusations against the Talmud, can make no claim to be regarded as scientific productions. De Rossi's "Meor Enayim" (written in the 16th century) has every right to be regarded as a critical and scientific work, but its influence among the Jews was exceedingly small.

‡ We need only mention here that grand and deep book "Moré Neboché H'Zeman," by Krochmal (Lemberg, 1835), Rapoport's "Erech Millim," and his other larger and smaller works, which are scattered about in different Hebrew periodicals. Especially do we feel it our duty to draw renewed attention here to Zunz's "Gottesdienstliche Vorträge" (Berlin, 1832), and Frankl's "Hodigetica in Mishnam (Lipsiae, 1859), which laid the foundation for all true study of the Midrash and the Mishnah. We take this opportunity of expressing our surprise that Schiller-Szinessy in his articles upon 'Midrash'

The world is indebted to the illustrious men to whom we have here referred and to their school, but so immense is the field and so few are the workers, that we are still justified in saying that to the complete study of the Talmud there is but fragmentary assistance to hand.

For centuries the literature of Greece and Rome have been the main study of a hundred universities. Patient, loving students have devoted their lives to the elucidation of fragments of this lore, and the results of their labours have passed into the hands of succeeding generations who have added new stores of knowledge to the large in-gatherings of the past. Aided by the authority of a powerful church, the encouragement of princes, and the endowments of the wealthy, classical learning has grown and extended till there is hardly a single incident in the history of any little township in ancient Hellas which we may not find faithfully portrayed for us with all its local and contemporary surroundings, and portrayed, moreover, without bias or passion, but simply as the issue of cold, calm investigation. But for the Hebrew literature there has been none of this wealth of interest and labour. The Talmud has never yet been systematically taught and expounded in the lecture rooms of European universities; its study is practically confined to the Jews, who have neither scholarships nor pensions to bestow upon impecunious inquirers. Thus, very naturally, the number of devoted labourers demanded by such an immense and neglected province is not forthcoming. And, owing to the fact that the number of workers in the whole field of Jewish literature is so limited, and that many of these are occupied with post-Talmudic writings, there exists a want of even those most necessary resources which in every literary investigation compose the scientific apparatus.

There is still wanting an exhaustive grammar to the Talmudic idiom, a grammar which should not merely help the student over his declensions and conjugations, but which should furnish critical information as to the whole structure of the language and its frequent doubtful constructions.* There exists at present no complete dictionary on a level with the famous Liddell and Scott, which we might confidently take as a guide to the elucidation of that Babel of tongues, which have found their way

and 'Mishnah' in the 9th ed. of the "Encyclopædia Britannica" (vol. xvi.) has strangely enough thought fit to make no mention of, or allusion, to these truly monumental works.

* See Luzatto's observations in his preface to his "Grammatik zum Talmudischen Idiom," p. 10, in Krüger's German translation. Berlin, 1873.

into the Talmud.* We have no complete and trustworthy indexes and concordances of names and subjects.† There is a wretched paucity of good monographs relating either to the most prominent Rabbis or to the many archæological puzzles which are scattered through the text. Lastly, there are no complete translations of the Talmud extant which could be consulted in obscure passages.‡

In other branches of ancient literature there is scarcely a single work of which the manuscripts from the earliest copy downwards have not been utilized and investigated for the purpose of establishing a fixed and definite text. It is not without a pang of envy that the student of the Talmud regards those beautiful editions of the classics, with their revised texts, their critical and explanatory notes, and their voluminous references, all carefully elaborated to meet the requirements of modern philology. Here, at all events, so far as it lies in human power, man has performed his duty to truth. But in the case of the Talmud things are very different. Neither of the Haggadic nor yet of the Halachic part of the Talmud do we possess even in the present day a text corrected according to the best manuscripts, and collated with the earliest editions. The want of such revised editions of the old Rabbinical literature was bitterly lamented by the famous German Orientalist, Lagarde, in his preface to the "Clementia" edited by him nineteen years ago; "a dilettante handling of these texts," he says, "has only led to misconceptions."§ It is true that much has been done since Lagarde wrote his preface, but it is a miserably small amount in comparison with that which yet remains to be achieved.||

* See Jellinek's treatises, above cited; Stade's "Zeitschrift für die Alt-Testamentliche Literatur," 1881, p. 334-338; 1882, 53-72, 177-192. In order to obtain a notion how difficult it often is to find the correct definition of a word or term, see Hoffmann's essay in the above-mentioned periodical, upon the single word, "Malben," and Freudenthal's treatise on the term "Chazakah," in Frankl's "Monatschrift," 1860.

† See Jellinek's "Kunteros H'Miphteach" (Vienna, 1881); and cf. Friedmann in his introduction to "Sifré," chapter iv.

‡ See "Orient. Literatur Blatt," 1840. But the greater part of the translations there enumerated have never yet been published. That since then many good and bad translations of various Rabbinical writings have been made is well known. We may here add that Frankl, in his lecture cited above, declared the Talmud to be untranslatable.

§ "Clementia," edited by P. de Lagarde, Leipzig, 1865, p. 13, note 5; cf. Nöideke, in the preface to his "Mandäische Grammatik," Halle, 1875; and Lebrocht's treatise, "Handschriften und erste Ausgaben des Babylonischen Talmuds," Berlin, 1862.

|| We mean works like that of Friedmann on "Mechilta," Baber on the "Pesikta," Rabinowitz on some tractates of the Babylonian Talmud, the "Tosefta," edited by Zuckerman, the "Mishnah," edited by H. Lowe, &c.

Enough, perhaps, has been said of the difficulties to satisfy our readers that the way is long and steep, and with but few trustworthy signposts. Unhappily, it is beset with many dangers and snares—false signposts and misleading lights. If, as a field of inquiry, the Talmud were virgin soil, it were an easier task to master it than as it is. The greatest stumblingblock to its study is the pernicious way in which that study has hitherto been pursued. We do not so much complain of the neglect from which it has suffered as of the attention of the wrong sort which it has received; not so much of the injury of being ignored as of ignorant handling. For, in truth, if the Talmud was burnt and disfigured in the flesh by the mediæval censor, it is tortured and mutilated in the spirit by many a modern writer.

The object of the remainder of this article is to protest against, and to some extent to illustrate, the manner in which the Talmud has been used or misused for every purpose except that of honest, dispassionate, and scientific inquiry. It has been praised and decried equally without reason; it has been the victim of enthusiasts kindly and unkindly.*

So over violent or over civil

That every man with them is God or devil.

The exaggerated praise of Deutsch and the other panegyrists is just as revolting to the critical sense as is the unmeasured abuse of Eisenmenger and his school. Thus, according to some writers, so Christian is the tendency of the Talmud, that it is hard to say why the Rabbis were not long ago canonized *en bloc*. According to others it is so anti-Christian that we wonder a good Christian like Reuchlin should have read it in all seeming unconsciousness of the fact. To some it is the perfection of the Beautiful and Good: to others the acme of revolting wickedness and ugliness. Its stories are now deep parables and lovely legends: now they are silly fables, insipid exaggerations. It is now profound and logical: now shallow and soulless, and so forth *ad infinitum*.

Of the numerous writers who have never read a line of the Talmud, and yet have not hesitated to judge it, we need here say nothing. What we deplore is the extent to which men, with sufficient knowledge and ability to read and understand the Talmud, neither read nor understand it, or read and misunderstand it, or, reading and understanding, misuse it and

* Cf. on the one side Deutsch's famous Essay on the Talmud, *Quarterly Review*, October, 1877; and, on the other Eisenmenger "Entdecktes Judenthum," (Königsberg, 1711). But these two are merely typical instances out of a long list.

distort it. Our charge against these writers is that they do not study the Talmud for itself. They do not read it in order to understand it aright, to grasp its real nature, to penetrate to its real being; but they read it for wholly extraneous purposes, to support a theory, to afford illustrations, to prove a case, to supply surprises. To them it is not a museum, but an old curiosity-shop. It does not contain scientific specimens to be respected, but bric-à-brac to be displayed. It is not searched for truth's sake, but rummaged for curios. The belief prevails that touching every subject something may be found in the Talmud. You have only to dig deep enough and you will find something which will either straightway suit your purpose or which with a little violence can be made to serve. Many the philosophical systems which have been elicited from the Talmud; many the strange ideas which have been ingeniously extracted out of it.* The authors of these discoveries have usually been actuated by the most amiable motives, but the effects of their perfervid zeal and their naïve anachronisms have been none the less disastrous. How much further should we be in our knowledge of the book if these writers could have been induced to study it in the proper way. Much enthusiastic labour directed to idle and foolish ends have been utterly thrown away, and the Talmud itself continually twisted and perverted out of all recognition, has been put to every conceivable purpose except the right one.

How different is the treatment accorded to the better known branches of literature. No one dares to pervert or even carelessly to use the texts of any familiar Grecian classic. The small chance of detection in the case of the Talmud gives a sense of security to the writers we complain of. They do not risk liberties with texts in which a schoolboy may trip them up, but they may say what they like of the Talmud.

Of all works the Talmud, on account of its internal difficulties, most needs careful, unbiassed, and critical treatment, and of all works it has least received it. To understand it is a life-long task, to form a comprehensive opinion of it almost an impossibility. And yet otherwise conscientious authors do not scruple to approach it lightly, to excerpt it, and generalize on it after far less study than they would give to a Latin historian or a Greek philosopher.

All this is not only a loss to the Talmud student; it is a loss to mankind whose interests are only served by truth.

It is our purpose now to choose, for cursory examination, from

* See Z. Frankl in his "Monatschrift," 1865, p. 472. Since Frankl wrote a goodly number of fresh instances might be added to his list by way of supplement.

a long list of books answering the above description, one which, from the learning, authority, and evident honesty of its author, is calculated to carry unusual weight, and consequently to spread more widely the errors it contains. We are alluding to Dr. Edersheim's "Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah."* The book is one eminently designed to attract attention. Not only is the subject one of superlative interest to the educated and religious world, but the evident conviction and fervent faith of the author give it a persuasiveness difficult to resist. The style is for the most part lofty and appropriate, and the whole wears the impression of great erudition and earnestness of purpose. If, therefore, it is also, as we propose to show, a signal example of the manner in which the Talmud is misinterpreted and misapplied, it will be understood that such a book is more than ordinarily calculated to disseminate these errors, and by its very merits to give them a wider currency than need be feared in the case of less powerful productions.

In limine it must be understood that the following remarks are in no sense a review or a critique of the book: they are intended solely to discuss the value and correctness of part of the evidence adduced by Dr. Edersheim, in support of one of his central propositions. A large portion of the book is devoted to asserting or re-asserting the originality of the teachings of Christ, in reply to those writers, Christian and Jewish, who, by a comparison of passages from the Rabbinical literature with passages from the New Testament, have sought to establish a marked connection between the personality of Jesus and the time in which he lived. Dr. Edersheim contends that not only are the doctrines of the Gospel not borrowed from the Rabbis, but are everywhere in glaring opposition to their views, and that where Christian doctrine is most characteristic it is most divergent from Rabbinical teaching.

It is true, "Jesus of Nazareth was a Jew, and moved among Jews" (Preface viii); but nevertheless in the main point "there is not a difference, but a total divergence" (I. 106), "an absolute contrariety," (I. 107) "an infinite distance between Christ and the teaching of the Synagogue," (II. 15) so that the "Messiah of Judaism is the Anti-Christ of the Gospel" (I. 293). And the proof of this result is largely dependent on a use, or as we propose to show, a misuse of Talmudic quotations. Having once arrived at "this absolute contrariety," Dr. Edersheim deduces therefrom "one of the strongest evidences of the claims of Christ, since it raises the all-important question, whence the Teacher of Nazareth had drawn His inspiration (Preface ix); or as Dr.

* London, 1883. Our references throughout are to the first edition.

Edersheim expresses himself in another place, "if Jesus was not of God, not the Messiah, whence this wonderful contrast?" (I. 17). We venture to hold that the glory of such a sublime figure as that of Jesus Christ in no wise requires the process adopted in dealing with a microscopic object, namely, the obscuration of its surroundings. Be that as it may, we are not disposed to discuss with Dr. Edersheim the propriety of a comparison between the teaching of Jesus and that of the Rabbis. Nor shall we investigate Dr. Edersheim's evidence drawn from the New Testament, nor dispute the results, at which he arrives. The former belongs to the province of New Testament criticism, the latter is a matter of controversial theology. Whether Dr. Edersheim succeeds or fails in establishing his proposition is not for us to inquire. We have to do with one part of his evidence only; it is exclusively with his use of the Talmud that we are here engaged.

We contend that Dr. Edersheim has not studied exhaustively all the great commentators, especially those whose writings are in Hebrew; that he has not always been sufficiently careful to grasp the real meaning of quoted passages by comparing them with the context; that he has allowed his enthusiasm for his argument to blind him to other passages; that his misapprehension of their utterances has jaundiced his opinion of the Rabbis as a body and individually, and that this effect has reacted so as to colour his interpretation of the Talmud. On the whole we maintain that he has too often departed from the attitude of the unbiassed investigator.

In endeavouring to support these charges we warn the reader that we may seem to attach too much importance and to devote too much space to what may appear trifling and subordinate details. But if this be so, it is due to Dr. Edersheim's method. The skeleton of his argument, as well as the matter with which it is filled in, hinges on very numerous quotations from the Rabbinical writings, and not on large questions. It is composed of minutiae depending on one another, and it is some of these which we have to attack, recognising, as we hope the reader does also, that to some extent the strength of the chain of such an argument is the strength of its weakest link.

A keen controversialist, Dr. Edersheim has a poor opinion of the Rabbis, and treats them as a body with but scant courtesy. When he quotes them—under whatever name, Pharisee, Scribe, Rabbi, or Sage—his antipathy betrays him into the use of warm language, and he speaks of them as "self-righteous, self-seeking sects" (Vol. I. 185) who are "mad with self-exaltation" (II. 15) and whose doctrines are brim-full of "profanity," (I. 113) "superstition," (I. 106) and "self-glory" (I. 136) Their writings

are replete with "absurd and silly legends," (I. 254) "foolish repulsive," (I. 292) even "blasphemous stories" (II. 116) and the like. It is no part of our work to whitewash the Rabbis. They have survived centuries of even less discriminating opprobrium than the above. Dr. Edersheim will not expect us seriously to criticise the uncomplimentary epithets he applies to the Scribes as a body, further than to suggest that in a grave and important work such language is out of place. It does not better an argument, and it is apt to recall the familiar expedient of the Law Courts, "with a bad case abuse the plaintiff's attorney."

In speaking of individual Rabbis Dr. Edersheim is not more tender. We find, however, one exception to this rule. In Vol. I. page 136, a noteworthy passage occurs:—

"There is much about those earlier Rabbis—Hillel, Gamaliel, and others—to attract us, and their spirit oft-times contrasts with the narrow bigotry, the self-glory, and the unspiritual externalism of their successors."

Now these Rabbis were the contemporaries of Jesus Christ, and we would suggest *par parenthèse* that in a work dealing with the life and times of Jesus the utterances of his contemporaries would be of the first importance, notably when that work professes to contrast the teachings of the Gospels with those of the contemporary Rabbis. It is perhaps not irrelevant to note here, for what it is worth, that the vast majority of Dr. Edersheim's references to the Talmud are to portions assigned to Rabbis who lived not earlier than the second century after Christ.

Later on, however (I. 239), Dr. Edersheim seems disposed to modify his opinion of Hillel, and this for the drollest of reasons. Because Dr. Edersheim holds that the school of Shammai was more national in its aspirations than that of Hillel, he finds it necessary to depreciate the personal reputation of the latter. He says in this relation (I. 239):—

Generally, only one side of the character of Hillel has been presented by writers, and even this in greatly exaggerated language. His much-lauded gentleness, peacefulness, and charity were rather negative than positive qualities. He was a philosophic Rabbi, whose real interest lay in a far other direction than that of sympathy with the people, and whose motto seemed indeed to imply, "We, the sages, are the people of God; but this people, who know not the law, are cursed."

The reference is to Aboth, I. 13, 14, and no reference could well have been more unfortunate. Not only does the *soi-disant* quotation not appear in the text, but it cannot by any violence

be derived from it. The passage, according to Taylor's excellent translation, runs as follows :—

Hillel said " Be of the disciples of Aaron ; loving peace, and pursuing peace ; loving mankind, and bringing them nigh to the Torah " (the Law). He used to say, " A name made great is a name destroyed ; he, who increases not, decreases ; and he who will not learn (or teach) deserves slaughter ; and he who serves himself with the tiara perishes."

These utterances are not addressed, and do not refer to the people at large, but are clearly injunctions to the disciples. Taylor's* note throws further light on the passage :—

He who learns from his teacher and adds not to his words, not having intelligence to go beyond what he has been expressly taught, *will come to an end*, " his mother will bury him ; " or will *bring to an end* and lose what he has learned by rote. Cf. St. Matt. xxv. 29. He who refuses to impart his knowledge (or " who will not learn at all ") commits a deadly sin.

If this quotation from Aboth gives us any impression of the disposition of Hillel, it is hardly that he was a cynical or even unsympathetic egoist.†

Dr. Edersheim lays much stress upon the vain-glory and pride of the Rabbis, and the arrogant claims for respect, authority, and almost divine reverence, which they made for their utterances and ordinances. He cites, with evident satisfaction, the three or four well-worn passages in which the words of tradition are praised above the words of Scripture. (See I. 98, 100, II. 15, 407. Cf. Eisenmenger I. 5, 10, 312, 322 and *passim*.) Now we must perforce refrain from entering on the controversy in regard to the supposed " Oral Law," and the living stream of divine tradition which the Rabbis believed they were handing down to posterity. We may, however, again refer to Taylor's Commentary on Aboth (page 119 ad fin.), where, in speaking of the " sayings tending to the exaltation of *παράδοσις* and Scribe-Law," he adds, that " in drawing inferences from them allowance must be made for their rhetorical and dialectic character. They are commonly put forward as private opinions in debate

* " Sayings of the Jewish Fathers," edited by Charles Taylor, 1877.

† That Dr. Edersheim has made considerable use of Delitzsch's polemical pamphlet " Jesus and Hillel " is very natural. But Delitzsch is too conscientious a scholar to venture as far as Dr. Edersheim, even in the very heat of his conflict with Geiger. As regards the assertion that " Hillel was actually wont to mispronounce words, because his teacher before him had done so," (I. 98.) which is based on Edajoth, (I. 8), it seems a pity that our learned author, even if he did not care to make use of Abraham ben David's Hebrew Commentary, should not have looked up Graetz (Vol. III. 540). The German historian would have explained to him that Maimonides has mistaken the sense of this passage, which refers not to a " mispronunciation," but to the use of a Biblical name for a certain measure, instead of the usual Talmudical one.

rather than as authoritative decisions." Two essential points should be noted here. First, that one main reason for the high account set upon the orthodox Traditional Law in the age of Jesus, was due to the fear of national schism, which was best avoided by a rigid adherence to a single and authoritative exposition and expansion of the Pentateuchal Code: and we must always remember that Politics and Religion were not severed from each other in the Judæa of that period. Secondly, that the "words of the Scribes," which are so exalted in these familiar passages, are not the words of any chance Rabbi or of all of them together, but those words only which were officially promulgated by generally accepted authorities. Such necessary and historical qualifications cannot be gathered from Dr. Edersheim's attacks, but, as we shall see, they can be gathered from the Rabbinic quotations by which these attacks are supported. He says:—

Each Scribe outweighed all the common people, who must accordingly pay him every honour. . . . Such was to be the honour paid to their sayings, that they were to be absolutely believed, even if they were to declare that to be at the right hand which was at the left, or *vice-versâ* (I. 94; cf. Eisenmenger, I. 331).

It will be observed that this excessive belief and respect is to be paid to all the Scribes as a body.

The reference adduced in support of this statement is Siphre 105, a. This passage runs as follows:—

Any turning aside from the teaching of the Sanhedrin of Jerusalem is punishable by death, but a turning aside from the teaching of the Sanhedrin of Jabneh is not so punishable. For a transgression of an ordinance based upon the Pentateuch law death may be imposed: not for the transgression of a law which is purely traditional. If they tell you that what is right is left, and what is left is right, hearken to them.

From this passage we see incidentally that in one most significant particular the words of the Scribes are made inferior in importance to the words of the Bible. But as regards the main allegation of Dr. Edersheim it is plain that the last portion of the passage does not refer to all the Scribes but to the Sanhedrin of Jerusalem, that is to the highest Court of Justice in Council assembled. That, again, the reason why the judgments and decisions of the Sanhedrin were rated so highly was mainly a fear of national and political schism, is clearly indicated by the statement that the Sanhedrin of Jabneh could not punish a transgression of its ordinances with death.*

For the Sanhedrin of Jabneh was founded after the destruc-

* See Neubauer's "Geographie du Talmud," p. 74, and D. Hoffman's essay "Der Oberste Gerichtshof," Berlin, 1877.

tion of the Temple, when, the national unity having ceased, there was no longer any danger of national schism. This, the correct interpretation of the passage referred to by Dr. Edersheim, will show how very seriously he misunderstood it. But this is not all, for that very blind obedience to the rulings of the Sanhedrin of Jerusalem, claimed in this passage, is not undisputed in the Talmuds. Dr. Edersheim so frequently refers to the Talmud of Jerusalem that it is a pity, for the sake of justice, that he did not refer to it here. We will supply the omission. The passage in Siphre plays upon the verse in Deuteronomy (xvii. 11) where it is said: "Thou shalt not diverge from the sentence which they shall tell thee to the right hand nor to the left," or as the literal translation of the Hebrew idiom would run "right and left." Now, in J. Horajoth, 45 b, we read: "We might believe that we were bound to obey the Sanhedrin even if they told us of the right that it was left, and of the left that it was right; to prevent this the Law says 'when they tell you right and left.'" Here, by a characteristically Talmudic manipulation of the words, the text is supposed to mean: "Only when they tell you that right is right, and left is left are you to obey them, but not otherwise." This strange use of scripture words may be a surprise to those who are not familiar with the Rabbinical method of reasoning, but, at all events, we have here a direct contradiction of even our very modified version of the passage on which Dr. Edersheim's proposition depends.

We now take a still more conspicuous illustration of the way in which Dr. Edersheim, at the expense of an accurate exegesis, endeavours to prove his thesis of the arrogance and pride of the Rabbis.

"Perhaps we ought here to point out one of the most important principles of Rabbinism, which has been almost entirely overlooked in modern criticism of the Talmud. It is this: that any ordinance, not only of the Divine Law, but of the Rabbis, even though only given for a particular time or occasion, or for a special reason, remains in full force for all time, unless expressly recalled by God." (Bezah, 5. b.) (I. 35, note 5, cf. I. 98).

The passage is, no doubt, somewhat intricate, but it is hardly so obscure as to justify the entirely erroneous version given by Dr. Edersheim. We can only partly explain this curious view of its meaning by assuming that he has confounded the thing to be proved with the evidence which is to prove it.

The general drift of the passage is the following: Its object is to prove that any decision of a majority (in a Sanhedrin of Rabbis) can only be repealed by the decision of another majority, even although the reason for the former decision has ceased. The proof is taken from two passages in Scripture and one from

tradition. The Scripture passages give two cases, in each of which God formally repealed his own command, although the occasion for that command had ceased. The example from tradition gives a third case, where a purely Rabbinic ordinance was formally repealed by the Rabbis. The whole passage in *Bezah* runs as follows:

Every ordinance of a majority can only be repealed by another majority, even although the cause of its original promulgation has disappeared. Rabbi Joseph said, "how can I deduce this?" Because it is written, "Go get you into your tents again" (*Deut. v. 30*), and it is also written "When the trumpet soundeth long they shall come up to the mount" (*Ex. xix. 13*). We have also learned that the produce of fruit trees in the fourth year of their growth, situated within a day's journey of Jerusalem, must be brought thither in kind and eaten on the spot. It may not be turned into money, and merely its value eaten at Jerusalem. According to *Ula*, the reason for this ordinance was, that part of the produce might be used to decorate the streets of Jerusalem. A *Boraitha*, moreover, mentions the following incident.* Rabbi *Eliezer* had a vineyard within a day's journey of Jerusalem. He was about to place its fruit of the fourth year at the free disposal of the poor, in order to avoid the trouble of taking it himself to Jerusalem, when one of his disciples said to him, "This ordinance has been formally repealed by the body of your colleagues."

This stringing together of three apparently disconnected texts is a fairly typical example of Talmudic argument, but is really more simple than it looks. It merely gives the two instances from Scripture and the one instance from tradition already referred to. The verse from Deuteronomy when compared with *Exodus xix. 15*, shows that, although the cause for the command given in *Exodus*—namely, the approaching promulgation of the Ten Commandments—had lapsed, it was nevertheless necessary that a new divine injunction should be given before the people were at liberty to return to their wives and to their tents. The second instance from Scripture, namely *Exodus xix. 13*, as compared with *Exodus xix. 11*, is a similar illustration to the same effect. The instance from tradition is somewhat more complicated. According to *Leviticus xix. 23*, the produce of all fruit trees was forbidden for the first three years after they were planted, and the produce of the fourth year was to be "holy for a merrymaking unto the Lord." This expression was traditionally understood to mean that these fruits, like the tithes mentioned in *Deuteronomy xii. 22-27*, were to be brought to Jerusalem and eaten there as a thanksgiving to God. But the same concession which was made with regard to the tithes was also

* A *Boraitha* is a law or teaching of the Mishnic period, but not taken up into the "authorized version" of the Mishnah, which underlies the Talmud.

granted here; it was allowed to turn the produce into money, and take that to Jerusalem.* This concession, however, was not permitted in the case of those whose land was situated within a days' journey of Jerusalem. But if—a point explained by Raschi and the other commentators—the fruits of the fourth year were actually given away, the responsibility of bringing them to Jerusalem vested with those who accepted the gift. Such recipients would naturally be the poor. The reason why the Rabbis wished that the produce should be actually brought to Jerusalem was that part of it should be used for decking the streets of the beloved city. But Rabbi Eliezer lived after the destruction of the capital, and yet he was going to fulfil the law by putting his vineyard at the disposal of the poor. The reason for the law had ceased. There were no streets to decorate, but the Rabbi did not regard himself free from obligation, till he was told that the law had been formally repealed by a fresh ordinance of the Rabbis.

Thus we see that where an ordinance has been given by God, God repeals it: where the ordinance is given by the Rabbis, the Rabbis repeal it. But that "any ordinance, even of the Rabbis, remains in full force for all time, unless expressly recalled by God"—of this most extraordinary allegation, Bezah, 5b, says not a single word. And, as our readers will remember, it is upon this passage from Bezah that Dr. Edersheim bases his argument.

If one favourite charge of Dr. Edersheim against the Rabbis is that they set tradition above the Writ, another is that they set the study of that tradition and of the law generally above the practice of pious works. Dr. Edersheim is here treading a path which has been made wide and easy for him by the labours of previous writers. But as he always endeavours to substantiate his accusations by Rabbinical allusions, so here too the marginal note at the very crisis of his charge has a reference ready to our hand. Our author assures us that:—

The merits of Israel might in theory be supposed to flow from "good works," of course, including the strict practice of legal piety, and from the study of the law. But in reality it was "study" alone to which such supreme merit attached. Practice required knowledge for its direction, such as the *Am-ha-arez* ("country people" plebeians, in the Jewish sense of being unlearned) could not possess, who had bartered away the highest crown for a spade with which to dig. And the sages, "the great ones of the world," had long settled it that study was before works (I. 85).

We are bidden to turn to "Jer. Chag. I. hal. 7, towards the

* Cf. Geiger's "Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel." p., 181, seq.

end," and we very willingly accept this invitation. The passage in question shall be literally translated for our readers:—

Rabbi Jehudah, when he saw a bridal or a funeral procession pass along the street, was wont to turn to his scholars, and say, "Works go before study." In the house of Arim, at Lud, a vote was taken on the question, and it was decided that study went before works. Rabbi Abuha, who lived at Cæsarea, sent his son to Tiberias to study there.* After a time, he was told that his son was devoting himself to acts of charity, such as helping in the burial of the dead. Then he wrote to him and said, "Is it because there are no graves in Cæsarea, that I sent you to Tiberias?" Long ago, moreover, was it decided in the upper chamber of the house of Arim that study went before works. But the Rabbis in Cæsarea taught that this pre-eminence of study only applies when the acts of charity can be performed by some one else, but if there is no one else to perform them then works go before study.

As a preliminary explanation of this passage, it must be noted that it was regarded as a work of charity to accompany the bride to her husband's house and to follow a funeral to the cemetery. Rabbi Jehudah was therefore accustomed, when he saw either a marriage or a funeral procession passing before him, to break off his disquisitions on the law, and, surrounded by his disciples, to follow the party of mirth or mourning to its destination. It was in such occupations that the son of Rabbi Abuha was spending his time, and his father (playing upon Exodus xiv. 11, "Because there were no graves in Egypt hast thou taken us away to die in the wilderness") wrote to remonstrate with him, in that he was "sent to college" for one thing and was wasting his days upon another. We will quote one more parallel passage before going further. It is found in Kiddushin 40b:—

It happened long ago, that Rabbi Tarphon and the elders, were assembled in the upper chamber of the house of Nithsah, and the question was started, "which is greater, works or study?" Rabbi Tarphon argued that works were greater, while Rabbi Akiba set study before works. Then they all declared unanimously that study was greater *because it led to works*.

Now the impression left on the mind after reading Dr. Ederheim's words is, that while the bare theory of the Rabbis might be that Israel's merits flowed from works, in their heart of hearts they really believed that the most meritorious and "paying" thing was study and study alone. That would hardly be the

* Tiberias is a city in Galilee, to which the Sanhedrin had finally migrated after the destruction of the Temple. The study of the oral law flourished there for some centuries. (Herzog's "Encyclopædie," art. Tiberias.) Yet Dr. Ederheim professes to know that "even the soil and climate of Galilee were not favourable for Rabbinic study" (l. 233).

view which would be taken by an impartial reader of the quoted passages, even as they stand without a word of commentary. And with some exegetical and historical explanation almost the very contrary of Dr. Edersheim's suggestions will be seen to be the truth. It is a pity that Dr. Edersheim has not made more frequent use of Graetz's *History of the Jews*.* He would have found there (iv. 173, 175, and note 17) an accurate account of the historical circumstances under which the decisions at the houses of Arim and Nithsah were made. Both refer to the same occasion, a time of unparalleled calamity in Jewish history. The awful persecution of the Jews under Hadrian aimed at the entire destruction of spiritual life among the people. The practice of the various religious ordinances was forbidden under the most appalling penalties, but perhaps the direst punishments awaited those who met for the purpose of teaching and studying the Divine law. Hadrian or his vicegerents were astute enough to see that if the stream of tradition failed, and if the religious life were no longer fed by the usual supply of teachers and scholars, Judaism must assuredly perish by means as certain as the almost impracticable annihilation of an entire race. Under these circumstances, the decision referred to in either passage was made. It was felt that, whatever the peril, the law must still be studied, and that teaching and learning were more important (not more "meritorious") than practice, because they were its indispensable condition and forerunner. In the story relating to Rabbi Abuha and his son this decision of the conference at Lud is applied for a somewhat different purpose. In the former case the "works" which are subordinated to "study" refer especially to the various ordinances of the law—such as the prohibitions of labour on the Sabbath, the celebration of the Passover and so on—the observance of which might be neglected were life endangered by their fulfilment. In the latter case the "works" allude to definite acts of charity which are of an all engrossing character when once earnestly pursued. It is obvious that just as the fellows and scholars of our own universities must devote the main portion of their time not to "works" but to "study," so in ancient Judæa was it necessary that the learned class should act in a similar manner. But we

* In not a few passages our learned author might have been aided by Graetz. Cf. his treatment of R. Eliezer ben Hyrkanos (ii, 193) with Graetz vol. iv. note 5, and especially his daring statement on note 2, p. 91, vol. i., that even idolatry was allowed in secret, if life were in danger, with Graetz, vol. iv. p. 173, and note 17, where almost the very opposite of Dr. Edersheim's words appears to be the truth. To ignore Graetz—the greatest Jewish historian—is now-a-days impolitic and childish. Graetz is too well known to render such a silence of any avail.

also see that in Judæa works depended on "study," and "study" paved the way for "works;" moreover, that if "workers" were really wanted "study" had to go to the wall. How far Dr. Edersheim then has drawn a legitimate conclusion from his Talmudic reference, when he says that it was "study and study alone to which such supreme merit attached," we will now leave with some confidence to the unprejudiced consideration of our readers.

If the misapprehension of the text, due to inadequate reading and coloured by preconceived notions, has led Dr. Edersheim into strange errors, he has been no less unfortunate with his translations of individual words. Of these we might multiply instances, but we shall content ourselves with a couple of sufficiently striking and characteristic cases. In the first of these, Dr. Edersheim apparently believes that the Greek word ἰδιώτης is the equivalent of the English word "idiot." In the second case, he translates the Chaldaic word "Safrā" by "Scribes" when it ought to be rendered by "schoolmasters." Speaking of Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, he says:—

Zacharias could not have been one of the "learned," nor to the Rabbinites a model priest. They would have described him as an "idiot," or common "rustic" priest, and probably have treated him with benevolent contempt (I. 141).

In a footnote our author gives the word "Hediot" in Hebrew characters, adds that it means an unlearned or common priest, and complacently refers to Jebamoth, 59a. Turning to the reference we find no word about an unlearned or rustic priest. The word "Hediot"—transliterated into Hebrew from the Greek—merely meant an ordinary priest as distinguished from the high priest. Thus in Mishnah Joma, vii. 5, we are told that the High Priest performs the functions of his office in eight garments, while the ordinary priest (Cohen Hediot) ministers in only four garments. In Sanhedrin (x. 2) "Hediot" is used to distinguish a private person from a Royal person. If Macaulay's fourth-form prodigy had made this mistake it would have been discreditable but comic; if it had occurred once in a purely critical work, we should have regarded it as unimportant and probably attributed it to a printer's mistake. But Dr. Edersheim having adopted it, fastens upon it heartily, and reproduces it five times in as many consecutive pages (I. 141-144). In fact it is made to give the necessary colour to one prolonged picture.

Again, "these are questions of the Scribes," the Talmud observes ironically on one occasion. Jer: Megill: 74b, line 80 from 'the top' showing, of course, that the verbal subtlety of

the Scribes was already proverbial among the Scribes themselves. The reference is, indeed, accurate to a line, but the translation supplies a counterbalance of inaccuracy. The word "Safra," which Dr. Edersheim renders "Scribes," unhappily for the fate of a long crescendo passage of indictment, does not here refer to the Scribes at all, but means *children's teachers* or *schoolmasters*, and the whole sentence signifies merely "these are elementary questions." A glance at the commentaries, or at Frankl's introduction in "Talmud Hierosolymitanum," would have rescued Dr. Edersheim from this grotesque blunder. Frankl's book is, indeed, included in Dr. Edersheim's list of authorities, but unfortunately it is written in Hebrew.

Dr. Edersheim is not wholly successful when he deals with the laudatory Rabbinical figures, "a well-plastered cistern" and "a welling spring of water." At vol. i. 93, in a passage already frequently referred to, he mentions the former epithet as one among the many exaggerated phrases applied to the Scribes. At page 412, while improving a detail of his elaborate contrast, Dr. Edersheim triumphs in the idea that a "well-plastered cistern" was the limit of praise that could be given to the teachings of the Rabbis, and he states categorically that the figure of the "well of water springing up" was never applied to them. "The difference," continues Dr. Edersheim, "is very great."

For it is the boast of Rabbinism, that its disciples drink of the waters of their teachers; chief merit lies in receptiveness, not spontaneity, and higher praise cannot be given than that of being a well-plastered cistern, which lets not out a drop of water, and in that sense is a spring whose waters continually increase. But this is quite the opposite &c. (I. 412).

On this proposition Dr. Edersheim builds a portion of his "Contrast." Now the question is here of no great importance in itself, but as a matter of fact Dr. Edersheim's argument is entirely baseless. The "welling-spring," so far from being an unused metaphor by the Rabbis, was quite well known to them in this relation. The very passage (Aboth ii. 10, 11) upon which Dr. Edersheim relies, cuts the ground from under his feet. It runs, according to Taylor's literal translation:—

Five disciples were there to Rabban Jochanan ben Zakai, and these were they: R. Li'ezer ben Hyrqnos, and R. Jehoshua ben Chananiah, and R. Jose the Priest, and R. Shimeon ben Nathanael, and R. Eleazar ben Arak. He used to recount their praise; Eliezer ben Hyrqnos is a plastered cistern which loseth not a drop; Jehoshua ben Chananiah, happy is she that bare him; Jose the Priest, is pious; Shimeon ben Nathanael, is a sinfeare; Eleazar ben Arak is a welling-spring. He used to say, if all the wise of Israel were in.

a scale of the balance, and Eliezer ben Hyrqnos, in the other scale, he would outweigh them all. Abba Shaul said in his name, if all the wise of Israel were in a scale of the balance, and Eliezer ben Hyrqnos with them, and Eleazar ben Arak in the other scale, he would outweigh them all.

The two figures were thus used, and used in contrast, about different Rabbis, and to adopt for once Dr. Edersheim's method of reference—only we do it with textual support—it will be seen that the waters of the welling spring were intended to serve no other purpose than to benefit the world. For, in the Aboth de Rabbi Nathan, the same R. Eleazar ben Arak is called "A welling spring, overflowing, whose waters ever increase, so that the words may be fulfilled, "' Let thy fountains be dispersed abroad, and rivers of waters in the streets'" (Proverbs v. 16).

No feature of Rabbinism is more commonly held up by the enemies of the Talmud to scorn and loathing, than its attitude towards the heathen and the whole Gentile world. We should expect similar things of Dr. Edersheim, nor is our expectation doomed to disappointment. He returns again and again to the charge, and refers to or quotes without scruple all those passages which a long array of writers, from the Eisenmenger of the last century down to the Rohling of our own, have reiterated with dogged, unwearied pertinacity.* It is no surprise to us that Dr. Edersheim should have passed over in silence, or in a few instances sought to explain away, the many passages on the other side which the apologists of the Talmud are wont to bring forward. Such a suppression is, nevertheless, not wholly commendable in a scientific work which attempts *sine studio et ira* to present a complete picture of a past age. Nor should it be forgotten that most of Dr. Edersheim's references are demonstrably later than the times of Jesus, in other words subsequent to the siege and sack of Jerusalem. The memories of that event and all its horrors—above all, of the destruction of the Temple—were calculated to embitter and exasperate the feelings of the Jews towards the Gentile. And, be it noted, the Rabbis *did* care for their national temple and its services, Dr. Edersheim's statements to the contrary notwithstanding. But it may be granted that at no time did the vast majority of the Rabbis think better of their enemies than their enemies did of them. It is for the historian—though it was not for Dr. Edersheim—to weigh and consider how far either side was or was not excused in its hatred of the other by the circumstances of the time.

* See i. 85, 91, 271, 532, 547, 550. ii. 41, 237, 290, etc. Cf. Eisenmenger i. 576, 615, 711, ii. 41, 215, 227, 242, 605, and MacCaul, "Old Paths," i.—iv.

Dr. Edersheim contends that the Gentile world is excluded from the ordinary Rabbinic conception of the "kingdom of Heaven." The eschatology of the Talmud is one of its most difficult points. What exact relation the terms, "the world to come," "the kingdom of Heaven;" and "the days of the Messiah" bear to each other, in what order they follow, and what the places where they shall be experienced, are all questions which have been variously disputed by Jewish scholars without any very satisfactory result having as yet been obtained. But it is clear that they are precisely those points on which individual Rabbis gave their phantasy the rein, and where we can least hope to deduce a rational or connected system.

The liturgy of the Jews is a better exponent of the real feelings of the people than these morbid excrescences of a diseased imagination brooding over its own wrongs which are so frequently quoted by Dr. Edersheim. That liturgy is often cited by him on other occasions; he might with advantage have cited it in this connection. Here we give a translation of a short Hebrew prayer—at least as ancient as Dr. Edersheim's references—which was, and is still, recited on one of the most solemn festivals in the calendar, the day of memorial or the new year.

Our God and the God of our Fathers, reign Thou in Thy glory over the whole world, and in Thy majesty be exalted over the whole earth: shine forth in the excellency of Thy supreme power over all mankind, that everything which has been made be sensible that Thou hast made it; that everything formed may know that Thou hast formed it, and that all who have breath in their nostrils may declare that the Lord God of Israel reigneth, and in his supreme power ruleth over all.

While referring to Dr. Edersheim's belief in the bitterness with which the Jewish writers regarded all those outside their own Faith, it may not be out of place to indicate a curious blunder into which his enthusiasm has led him. He is speaking of the enmity that existed between the Jews and the Samaritans, and he says:—

To the same hatred, caused by national persecution, we must impute such expressions as that he who receives hospitably a Samaritan has himself to blame if his children have to go into captivity (I. 401).

The marginal note refers us to Sanhedrin, 104a, where we shall certainly find the word "Cuthi," the Hebrew for Samaritan. But we should have imagined that the veriest tyro in Talmudic study was aware that the word Samaritan or "Cuthi" is one of the various expressions which an all too scrupulous censorship has substituted for the generic term "Nochri" or foreigner.

"Nochri" might possibly, so the censor believed, refer to Christians: hence Cuthi, or Samaritan, which could not allude to Christians, was a convenient alternative. Whether the substitution changed the meaning of a passage or turned it into nonsense was a matter of the most trifling insignificance to the censor. In the present instance Dr. Edersheim might have been saved from his elementary mistake if he had glanced at the passage in Isaiah which is the basis and authority for the churlish statement in the Talmud. Isaiah (xxxix. 1-8) prophesies the captivity of Hezekiah's descendants, because the king had shown courtesy and hospitality to the ambassadors of Merodach Baladan, the prince of Babylonia. This Merodach was a simple heathen and no Samaritan; in the rare first edition of the Talmud which escaped the censor's alterations Dr. Edersheim will find that "Nochri" and not "Cuthi" is the subject of the extract in question.

This mistake is certainly of no very great importance, but when taken together with others which we have already pointed out, the few we have yet to mention, and the many we could add, did space permit, does it not raise a not unwarranted suspicion that Dr. Edersheim, in spite of his learning and erudition, is yet, from whatever cause, not qualified to lay before us a trustworthy picture of the Talmud and its teaching?

The Religion and Theology of the Rabbis is subjected by Dr. Edersheim to severe criticism. Their religion, according to him, was pure externalism, which, while it "indicated, with the most minute and painful punctiliousness, every legal ordinance binding on the conduct, left the inner man, the spring of actions untouched alike as regarded faith and morals." (I. 105).^{*} Their Theology lacked "system" and "authority," and was nothing more "than a mass of conflicting statements and debasing superstition." "A man might hold or propound almost any views so long as he adhered in practice and teaching to the traditional ordinances." It is impossible for us to discuss these charges in this place; they are familiar charges and very fashionable at the present time.† The eager anxiety of the

* Dr. Edersheim has much to say about the absurdities of the Talmudic Sabbath Law (Appendix XVII. vol. ii.), its burdensome details, and soon. But those who are most intimately acquainted with the Jews, who both in Eastern and Western Europe most faithfully fulfil these innumerable "observances and ordinances," know best that the Sabbath is a day of gladness and delight, on which no sense of burden or painful obligation makes itself felt.

† Out of a considerable list, we will here draw especial attention to Weber's "System der Alt-synagogalen Theologie" (Leipzig, 1880), which attempts, on the strength of a supposed legalism running through the whole Rabbinic literature to construct an elaborate and connected system of Rabbinical theology. But

Rabbis to regulate all conduct (not excluding *moral* conduct be it remembered) by an endless series of detailed enactments, their naïve ignorance of dogmatic theology as a system, and the free liberty they granted towards the unrestrained exercise and play of the religious imagination, are all indicative of a peculiar religious attitude, but not necessarily of a want of religion. It is not, however, our object on this occasion to present the religious ideas of the Rabbis in a more favourable light: we must confine ourselves to Dr. Edersheim's method of using the Talmud in support of his own statements.

Dr. Edersheim is apparently not perfectly at one with himself on these questions. In one passage, where he is speaking of the conditions under which a Jewish child began its life, he says, "these conditions were indeed for that time the happiest conceivable, and such as only centuries of Old-Testament life training could have made them." Our readers will observe the words "*Old Testament* life training:" but surely, if the "life training" depended ultimately on the Old Testament, it was more immediately fostered and tended by the very Rabbis whom Dr. Edersheim so industriously decries. "There were not homes like those in Israel," where "from the first days of its existence a religious atmosphere surrounded the child of Jewish parents" (I. 226, 227). But though there was a "religious atmosphere," there was no "spirit." That had been "crushed:" religion had been "externalized," and the Judaism of the days of Christ "was no longer the pure religion of the Old Testament" (I. 107).

But leaving these somewhat apparent contradictions, which in a writer less imbued with enthusiasm for his subject would wear the aspect of disingenuousness, let us turn to a few individual passages where Dr. Edersheim seeks to prove the general drift of his argument by direct references to the Rabbinical literature.

Dr. Edersheim has a great deal to say about the contrast between the teaching of the Gospels and that of the Rabbis in regard to sin and repentance. Thus he concludes that "Rabbinism knew nothing of a forgiveness of sin free and unconditional, unless in the case of those who had not the power of doing anything for their atonement" (I. 510). The reference

these favourite epithets, 'legalism,' 'want of contact with God,' 'abstractness,' and so on, are little more than empty phrases to those who are at once most familiar with the spirit of the Rabbinic Literature, and also best acquainted with Jewish life as it exists. Weber's book is dangerous because, being attractively written, it is likely to become the recognized authority on this subject; whereas, apart from his fundamental prepossessions and misconceptions, his Talmudic knowledge was far too limited to qualify him for such a post of honour.

adduced in support of this statement is Sifre, 70 b. Alluding to Deut. iii. 23-26, and II. Samuel xxiv. 10, the passage runs thus :—

Israel had two good rulers—Moses and David. Each prayed for forgiveness of their sins, not in virtue of the number of their good deeds, but as the free grace of God. But if they whose worth was so great acted in this manner how much more should we imitate them herein, who may not compare ourselves to the least of their disciples ? ”

The exhortation is that we can only justly ask forgiveness as a grace of God, and not as a reward for our own righteousness. This teaching, which can hardly be considered as good evidence of the “ self-righteousness ” of the Rabbis, has obviously nothing whatever to do with Dr. Edersheim’s mysterious allegation. Again, our author admits that the Rabbis are continually praising repentance, but as repentance is in itself a good thing, which is also admired in the Gospels, he is bound to show, in order to maintain throughout his contrast between “ Scribe ” and Evangelist, that Rabbinic repentance was a cheap caricature of the true article. Thus we find passages of this kind (I. 509.) :—

Although Rabbinism had no welcome to the sinner, it was unceasing in its call to repentance, and in extolling its merits. . . . “ One hour of penitence and good works outweighed the whole world to come.” But this repentance, as preceding the free welcome of invitation to the sinner, was only another form of work-righteousness. “ The penitent ” was really “ the great one,” since his strong nature had more in it of the “ evil impulse,” and the conquest of it by the penitent was really of greater merit than abstinence from sin.

For this last statement the marginal note refers us to Sanhedrin, 99 b. The passage is too long to quote, but from previous examples, our readers will believe us when we tell them that there is not a word in it which could possibly be made to justify Dr. Edersheim’s assertion. There is a quaint passage in the Talmud (Berachot, 34 b) where a discussion takes place on the relative merits in the eyes of God of the repentant sinner and of him who has never yielded to sin. It is not the undisputed view of the Talmud, as Dr. Edersheim suggests, that “ the true penitent really occupied a higher place—‘ stood where the perfectly righteous could not stand ; ’ ” but if it were, would it be in flagrant contrast to the celebrated dictum of Jesus, “ Joy shall be in Heaven over one sinner that repenteth more than over ninety-and-nine just persons which need no repentance ? ”

When, indeed, Dr. Edersheim comes to that passage he appears to have entirely forgotten all that the much-abused Rabbis said

about penitence and its merits in the sight of God. Here, to illustrate the "terrible contrast," he says merely :—

Christ said, "There is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth." Pharisaism said—and we quote here literally—"There is joy before God when those who provoke Him perish from the world."

Now we are quite willing to allow that in this instance Dr. Edersheim has correctly translated his Rabbinical reference ; but we would fain ask the learned Doctor if he has read another passage, which finds a prominent place in the Mishnah, where an arch-Pharisee says, "When man has to suffer because of his sin, the Schechinah [Divine Manifestation] laments, 'Woe to my head, woe to my arm.' If, then, it is so painful to Heaven when the blood of the wicked is shed, how much more when that of the righteous?" (Sanhedrin Mishnah, VI. 5). This extract, and many others of a similar character, have been carefully ignored by Dr. Edersheim ; they are nevertheless in existence, and they prove that, since not all Pharisees thought alike on these questions, the "terrible contrast" cannot, at any rate, be proved in the manner in which Dr. Edersheim attempts to prove it.

If we stop here it is not for lack of material wherewith to continue. Our initial difficulty was which instances to select. But our promise will have been sufficiently fulfilled if our readers will believe that Dr. Edersheim's book is not an extreme illustration of the superficial and unscientific treatment ordinarily accorded to Rabbinical literature. And if our readers wonder how a learned writer, who in other respects appears to be an honest inquirer, can have committed such mistakes, we refer them to our chief proposition—that the Talmud is not studied for its own sake, but always to subserve some foreign purpose. Dr. Edersheim has apparently searched the Talmud diligently, but he has done so with a mind preoccupied. He has arduously ransacked it for "contrasts," and he has found them by misunderstanding some parts of it, and by neglecting others.

Is, then, the proper study of the Talmud a hopeless undertaking? By no means ; but the study must be approached honestly, and with singleness of purpose. A thorough and unselfish study, free from all preconceived opinions, from all intention of attack or defence, from all idea of using the Talmud for any extraneous purpose, should precede any attempt to write about it. We do not promise the student, as others have done, that he will find in the old Rabbinical literature all the sciences and philosophies of our later and varied civilization buried in its pages. We do not bid "philologists, historians, and statesmen" seek in the records of the Rabbis for instruction and counsel. We say nothing of the "many discoveries thought to belong to

a recent age, but in truth well known to these ancient doctors."* But this much we do say with confidence, that any one who cares for the history of Religion and its phenomena will find the study of the Talmud and its kindred literature no thankless task ; for in the Talmud he will discern an earnest desire—not surpassed, and scarcely equalled, elsewhere—to fill and penetrate the whole of human life with Religion, and the sense of Law and Right. This is the grand purpose of the Talmud, so far as it can be said to have any definable purpose at all. That the Rabbis have not always succeeded in their twofold aim, and that an inflexible carrying out of the principles of Law has occasionally conflicted with the true interests of Religion, we are fain to admit. It was the adage of an old Rabbi that "the Torah (by which he here probably meant the Pentateuch, to him the source of both Law and Religion in one) was not given to the angels, but intended for men." And the Rabbis were not gods, nor demigods, nor angels ; they were mortal men ; and, if their holy aims have frequently been shipwrecked on the rocks of human imperfection, as mortals they should not be too harshly judged.

But be our opinion of the Rabbis what it may, we may fairly claim, in the name of scientific justice, as well as that of Christian charity, that he who proposes to pass judgment upon them shall first hear their case, and understand it ; in other words, that he shall read the Talmud, and critically examine it, before he begins to write about and expound it.

ART. III.—ENGLISH CHARACTER AND MANNERS AS PORTRAYED BY ANTHONY TROLLOPE.

THE common obstacle to any profitable discussion of national defects or qualities, lies much less in the difficulty of estimating a character, or set of characters, when given, than in the difficulty of agreeing as to what characters shall be considered representative. The variety of individuals is so immense, the range of each observer is comparatively so limited, that no two judgments are likely to agree. When A, generalizing from the

* The words in inverted commas are taken from Dr. Schiller-Szinessy's article on "Midrash" above referred to. He there also reckons up a list of eighteen sciences, ranging from morphology to political economy, and supplemented by three etceteras, on which the "philosopher" will find "abundant and valuable notices," in the various collections of the Midrashim. *Verb. sap.*

two or three dozen instances which have come under his eye, asserts, for instance, that the French are a vain nation, it may be easy for B, supported by an experience of about the same extent; to qualify or contradict the statement, and meet each instance in his opponent's record with a different instance taken from his own. The two observers will thus be unable to join issue. Both are correct in casting up their figures, but if the items be dissimilar, how shall the totals be the same? There is but one escape from such a quandary, the appeal, namely, to a wider experience and a richer record. Let A and B subordinate their own few specimens to the great collection made by the most competent observers of the time (the French, of course, standing foremost in the list), let them note the features most common to the series, the types under which the promiscuous diversities may most satisfactorily be classed, and then, when they have effected this, they will be able to resume their discussion with a reasonable prospect of ending in agreement.

It is neither in the purpose nor the power of the present writer to undertake, on any so formidable a basis, an inquiry into the character and manners of modern Englishmen. Sufficient for his ambition it will be if he succeeds in presenting a fair abstract from the writings of a single English novelist. He hopes, however, that this endeavour may be regarded as a step in the right direction. The testimony of good novelists, as regards the character of their own countrymen, is certainly among the most available and trustworthy. Let it not be objected that fiction is no proper test of fact. The *accidents* of good novels are fictitious; the *essentials* are all real. A novelist must of necessity be an excellent observer; he is thrown by his calling into contact with all sorts and conditions of men, and he is nothing unless he can retain a correct conception of all these, and evolve therefrom true types. His experience has the advantage of being cast into a concrete form, and placed on record in a manner accessible and intelligible to all. With him we have to fear no abstract judgments, no vague generalizations, no maxims which are both true and false, according to the sense in which they may be taken, the mental restrictions under which they are repeated. The novelist must show us real men and women, bone of our bone, flesh of our flesh, and he must place them in such circumstances as will compel characteristic action on their part, and shed a light into the inmost recesses of their mental, moral mechanism. If he does this in such a way as to carry us along with him, and command the recognition of his puppets as our brethren, what better ground can we desire for the appreciation of our race and time?

It will be objected that the novelist has other aims than that

of simply holding the mirror up to Nature; that his preoccupation must be also, if not chiefly, to fascinate and to amuse; that his tendency will therefore be to strain the proportions both of good and evil; that his characters must be selected for effect; and hence, that even though each separate delineation should have its counterpart in life, the novel will not represent that average humanity which mainly constitutes the nation. But whether this objection be true or false as regards novelists in general, it does not apply, at any rate, to the particular writer we have now in view. Anthony Trollope is not only eminently a *realist* (without which he would be nothing to our present purpose), but a realist whose taste was evidently to portray commonplace reality. As a painter, he would have preferred a leaden sky and diffused light; as an architect, the unpretending, comfortable dwelling-house; as a botanist, the herbs which may be found in every lane. He eschews effect even in his plots, and scorns to have any secrets from his readers: "How grievous a thing," he says, "it is to have the pleasure of your novel destroyed by the ill-considered triumph of a previous reader!"*

"Oh, you needn't be alarmed for Augusta; of course she accepts Gustavus in the end!" "How very ill-natured you are, Susan!" says Kitty, with tears in her eyes; "I don't care a bit about it now!"—"Dear Kitty, if you will read my-book, you may defy the ill-nature of your sister. There shall be no secret that she can tell you. Nay, take the last chapter, if you please; learn from its pages all the results of our troubled story, and the story shall have lost none of its interest, if, indeed, there be any interest in it to lose."

Like plot, like characters—the novelist who insists that everything shall be above-board in the former, will hardly look for any sensational goodness or badness in the latter. And indeed Anthony Trollope is so exclusive in this respect that even such a one as Henry Esmond will hardly go down with him. The heroic is his bugbear; he tells us in a dozen places that as he has not met with it in Nature, neither shall his readers find it in his writings. At heart he disbelieves in it, and grows fretful at the mere suggestion of it. It has been remarked of the great Balzac that whenever he depicts a particularly good character, he is at pains to *account for* the phenomenon, and show it to be the product of peculiar circumstances. A similar comment would be true of Trollope. And on the other hand, whenever he depicts some character exceptionally base, it is rarely without some palliation. He says to the reader: "You are astounded at such meanness, are you not? but you forget, my friends, that we are behind the scenes. If you and I were to be turned inside out,

* "Barchester Towers."

as the custom is in novels, I doubt whether we should exhibit a much fairer spectacle." And there is no doubt but that, in speaking thus, he is perfectly sincere.

Now, there is peculiar interest in studying the record of an observer such as this. Doubtless he saw Nature through a coloured glass (as we all do), but coloured rays, when properly commingled, are the very constituents of white light. In what precise proportion shall the indigo combine with the yellow and the red,—that, alas! is a question which each individual must determine approximately for himself, since there is no scientific method of determining it. We should be sorry indeed if Trollope's delineation of English men and women were to be accepted unreservedly, for the picture is a gloomy one—far gloomier, to our eye, than the author had any consciousness of. Be that as it may, the work is good and valuable of its kind—so true, so faithful of detail, so exempt from idealization that Trollope has often been described by his contemporaries as a photographer rather than a painter. A photographer? Well, then, without further preamble, let us turn over the pages of his album, and examine in the first place the collection of his English gentlemen.

The first, and perhaps also the most durable, impression is that expressed by the Senator from Mickewa (the Hon. Elias Gotobed) when his friend John Morton takes him to a "meet" near Bragton.*

"Everybody is so gloomy," observes the Senator, as he lights his third cigar. "I've been watching that young man in the pink boots for the last half-hour, and he hasn't spoken a word to any one."

"Perhaps he is a stranger," suggests Morton.

"And that's the way you treat him!"

The Senator's remark is true not only of the Bragton meet, but of all the other human groups to which Trollope introduces us. There is a heaviness in the social atmosphere, a certain latent moodiness of temper, which is rendered all the more perceptible by the efforts made to mask or to dispel it. We are inclined to believe that a nation's capabilities of enjoyment are in inverse ratio to the pains expended in ministering thereto. Now, of all pleasure-seeking apparatus in the world, the English is surely the most costly, the most elaborate, the most unproductive.

"Have you ever observed, Grace," says Lily Dale† to her friend, Miss Brawley, "how much amusement gentlemen require, and how impossible it is that some other game should be provided when one game

* "The American Senator."

† "The Last Chronicle of Barset."

fails? Now, with women, it is supposed that they can amuse themselves, or live without amusement. Once or twice in a year, perhaps, something is done for them. There is an arrow-shooting party, or a ball, or a pic-nic. But the catering for men's sport is never-ending, and is always paramount to everything else. And yet the pet game of the day never goes off properly. In partridge time, the partridges are wild and won't come to be killed. In hunting time the foxes won't run straight . . . ; they show no spirit and will take to ground to save their brushes. Then comes a nipping frost, and skating is proclaimed, but the ice is always rough, and the woodcocks have deserted the country. As for salmon, when the summer comes round, I do believe that they suffer a great deal about the salmon. I'm sure they never catch any. So they go back to their clubs and their cards and their billiards, and abuse their cooks and black-ball their friends."

But the subject deserves graver investigation than is afforded us by a conversation savouring somewhat of levity: we must let the sportsmen speak for themselves. Take foxhunting, that most characteristic of English pastimes, as an instance. What an organization it requires, what concatenation, management, and labour; what a concourse of social forces must be brought to bear on it; what an amount of broken collarbones have to be taken into the purchase! Let us say nothing as to the morality of the pursuit—an allusion may be made to this hereafter—let us look upon it, now, simply in its instrumentality to pleasure. Suppose, if you please, that the preliminaries have all been vanquished; that the county has been canvassed, and the necessary amount of subscriptions got together; that a suitable Master of the Hounds has been selected, willing (like Lord Chiltern) * to get up at three o'clock of the morning to inspect his kennels, and devote his vital energies exclusively to this engrossing work of love; suppose that the neighbouring gentry, far and wide, have been inoculated with the fox-hunting virus; that woods and gorse-coverts have been cultivated in the right proportion; that pheasants have been kept subordinate; that farmers have been conciliated—nay, interested in having their young crops ridden over, or their fences broken down—that *Goarly* † has been brought to justice for strewing poisoned herrings in his copse; suppose that the winter morning is bright, and yet not frosty; that the scent lies well, that *Trumpet Wood* is not drawn blank; that the fox is not "chopped up," and does not take to earth; that the Master of the Hounds, by dint of imprecations, prevents the impatient horsemen from "getting away" too soon; that the fox runs straight, and that the gentlemen of the hunt, after dawdling

* "Phineas Redux,"

† "The American Senator."

three hours in the wood, are at last gratified with a twenty minutes' gallop across country; suppose, we say, that all this has been accomplished, what then is the reward? Let us listen to a bit of conversation between Lord Chiltern and Miss Palliser, as they are riding home, one November afternoon, while the huntsman and the whips are trotting on before them with the hounds.*

"You call that a good run, don't you?" says Miss Palliser.

"No, I don't."

"What was the matter with it? I declare it seems to me that something is always wrong. Men like hunting better than anything else, and yet I never find any man contented."

"In the first place, we didn't kill."

"You know you're short of foxes at Gartlow," said Miss Palliser, who, as is the manner with all hunting ladies, liked to show that she understood the affairs of the hunt.

"If I knew there were but one fox in a county, and I got upon that one fox, I would like to kill that one fox—barring a vixen in March."

"I thought it very nice. It was fast enough for anybody."

"You might go as fast with a drag, if that's all. I'll tell you something else. We should have killed him if Maule hadn't ridden over the hounds when we came out of the little wood. I spoke very sharply to him."

"I heard you, Lord Chiltern."

"And I suppose you thought I was a brute?"

"Who? I? No, I didn't—not particularly, you know. Men do say such things to one another."

"He doesn't mind it, I fancy."

"I suppose a man doesn't like to be told that directly he shows himself in a run the sport is all over, and the hounds ought to be taken home?"

"Did I say that? I don't remember what I said, but I know he made me angry. Come, let us trot on. They can take the hounds home without us."

At that moment Gerard Maule rode up behind them with a cigar in his mouth, apparently quite unconscious of the displeasure as to which Miss Palliser had supposed he was chewing the cud in solitude.

"That was a goodish thing, Chiltern?" said he.

"Very good!"

"And the hounds hunted him well to the end?"

"Very well!"

"It's odd how the scent will die away in a moment. You see they couldn't carry on a field, after they got out of the copse."

"Not a field!"

"Considering all things, I'm glad we didn't kill him."

"Uncommon glad," said Lord Chiltern. †

Then they rode on in silence for half an hour (‡), at the end of which

* "Phineas Redux."

Gerard pulled out his cigar-case and lit a new cigar from the old one, which he threw away.

"Have a baccy, Chiltern?" he said.

"No thank you—I never smoke going home; my mind is too full; I've all that family behind to think of, and I'm generally out of sorts with the miseries of the day. I must say another word to Cox, or I should have to go to the kennels on my way home." And so he dropped behind. . . .

Just before they reached Harrington Hall, up came Lord Chiltern, full of wrath. One of the men's horses was thoroughly broken-down, and, as the Master said, wasn't worth the saddle he carried. He didn't care a — for the horse, but the man hadn't told him. "At this rate, there won't be anything to carry anybody by Christmas."

"You'll have to buy some more," said Gerard Maule.

"Buy some more!" said Lord Chiltern, turning round and looking at the man. "He talks of buying horses as he would sugar-plums." Then they trotted in at the gate, and in two minutes were at the hall door.

Much more might be quoted from Trollope's hunting scenes, for it is a subject in which his own interest never flags, and to which he constantly recurs. It is, indeed, so illustrative of character and manners that a monography of the hunting field might easily be made to embrace all the principal traits of Trollope's Englishmen. The limited space at our disposal does not permit us to do more, however, than glance at each aspect of our subject. The characteristics of all English sport remain, moreover, essentially the same. The exercise is generally violent, and pursued with a grim determination to get as much fatigue out of it as possible. A party of men, selected with a view to their destructive powers, assemble in some shooting lodge on the Scotch moors, and shoot grouse as though they were working for dear life. Each gun is expected to bring down so many head of game, and any lagging behind, any faltering of purpose, any truant visit to a lady in the neighbourhood, is visited with severe reproof. When the grouse fail, it is time for the partridges, then for the pheasants, and so on through the series. As far as possible, no gap is tolerated, the visits to successive country houses are carefully dovetailed, and the young lord who has, this evening at ten, declared his passion to the lady of his heart, does not forget that he must be up at five A.M. to-morrow, to look at a horse some twenty miles away. But in all this eagerness of pleasure-seeking, it is difficult to recognize any genuine enjoyment. These gay young fellows, to whom Fortune has been apparently so kind, seem to work at their amusements as a roadmaker works at breaking his stones, with a dim feeling that it must be done for fear of something worse. Dulness sits in their private closet like the skeleton of which Thackeray tells,

and instinctively, by weaving their external life into one continuous chain of occupation, they struggle to stave off the hour when that closet door shall open.

One cause, at least, of this heaviness consists, as we take it, in the lack of artistic sensibility and general intellectual interest. We mean this statement to apply, not only to the sporting class of which we have just spoken, but generally to all the types of Englishmen which Trollope has portrayed. We do not remember, in the long series of his principal or even secondary actors, one single instance of an artistic nature, or of a mind eager and happy to exercise itself beyond the range of its possessor's special business. There is not a musician, not a poet, not a painter in the lot.* There are clergymen, physicians, lawyers, men of business, newspaper writers, politicians; they are useful, able, eminent in their respective callings, but not one of them has anything to say outside of it. They do their day's work honestly, thoroughly, doggedly; as soon as they are released, they grow heavy over their port, or seek refuge in a game of whist. We can imagine Clive Newcome standing enraptured before the Venus of Milo in the Louvre; we can imagine J. J. painting his "Stranded Boat" by the seashore, filling his soul with all the varying loveliness of sea and sky; we can imagine Klesmer at his piano, forgetful of everything except the harmonies stirring in his mind; or Lydgate, baffled, but still happy, in the silent pursuit of some medical discovery. These men have all, at times, a *fairy by their side*; a sense capable of raising them above their worldly troubles, and of imparting sweetness to an hour of solitary reverie. But where shall we find anything of the sort in Trollope's personages? Never, by any chance, do they get beyond the range of their personal preoccupations; most of them are involved in pecuniary difficulties, owing to irrational expenditure; with nearly all, the burden of life seems to grow heavier as they grow older, and clings to their shoulders even to the grave. No wonder they are moody, since they lack that substratum of *impersonal* interests which tends precisely to make existence light. They are fit for business and for physical hard exercise; when the latter fails them, we find them becoming very attentive to their dinner (for which the elderly gentlemen are usually impatient), and sitting in semi-silence over their wine. Let gout supervene, and the family hearth will be anything but cheerful.

* Mr. Harding has indeed a taste for music, but he is chiefly represented as verging on senility. A portrait-painter is introduced in "The Last Chronicle of Barset," but he plays an insignificant part, and is altogether an exception to our statement.

Their reserve is extreme. The cud of their trouble is chewed in solitude, and it is only by an occasional grunt or moan that the difficulty of the operation is betrayed to the external world. Our author does indeed advise, as, for instance, in "Framley Parsonage," that a husband should confide to the wife of his bosom at least pecuniary distresses, but the advice is rarely acted upon until the bailiffs are at the door. "I'm sure," says Lady Pomona Longstaffe to her daughters, "I'm sure I don't know what your papa is to do, or how it is that there is never money for anything. I don't spend it." And the communications between the parents and the children are still more difficult. The family live together like a company of snails, each shrinking back into his shell as soon as anything goes wrong. We presume that the effort of unbosoming oneself is found to give more pain than any subsequent reception of sympathy gives pleasure. Nay, such sympathy is not pleasurable at all—is quite the reverse of pleasurable—unless it be of an extremely subdued and discreet kind, as noiseless and retiring as the grief itself. When Lily Dale* is deserted by the man to whom she has given her whole heart, she escapes to her room and locks her door. The only assistance she can accept, even from her mother and sister, is that they shall not speak to her about it. And the reticence of other girls, with respect to far less distressing preoccupations, is almost equally great. As for the sons, they would as soon think of going for advice or sympathy to their father, as of going to the town-crier. Nor is this solely because between them and their father there is no affectionate intimacy. They have sisters, they have friends, but neither do they go to them unless it be for some material help. The fact is, that it is incompatible with the whole theory of stoicism, of which Trollope is an exponent, to show grief outwardly. "Don't squeak," says Dolly Longstaffe to Major Tinto, when the latter would fain expatiate on his ill-luck at the Epsom. "Don't howl," says John Fletcher to his brother Arthur, when the latter is observed to ride in rather a break-neck fashion because the girl of his heart has married a rival candidate. (A man is said to "howl" when he allows a trouble to drive him out of his ordinary course.) And Earl de Guest preaches the same principle to his young friend Johnny Eames, when the latter is dispirited by his unsuccess with Lily Dale. "A man should never allow himself to be cast down by anything—not outwardly—in the eyes of other men. His pluck should prevent it. . . . He should always be able to drink his wine and seem to enjoy it. If he can't, he is so much less of a man than he would be other-

* "The Small House at Allington."

wise." Now, this system of neither howling nor squeaking is undoubtedly a manly one—and we understand that it should receive the fullest commendation from those neighbours who do not care to be disturbed in their repose by calls upon their sympathy—but it is not calculated to develop social qualities, either in the family or among friends.

A certain awkwardness of speech and manner is often very noticeable. How should it be otherwise with people who live so much within themselves, and are so jealous of their privacy? Must they not look upon any approach as the possible preliminary to an intrusion; may they not compromise themselves by too gracious an advance; does it not behove them to tread warily, except on well-known neutral ground? Their very forms of speech are full of non-committals. "*You may as well come to us for the week of the assizes,*" was intended by Judge Staveley as a cordial invitation. "*I am not so sure that . . .*"; "*I don't know that I think a great deal of . . .*"; "*You know what I mean,*" are the common evasions or abridgments of an explanation. "He has quarrelled with the bishop, you know," says Mr. Walker, speaking of Mr. Crawley.* "Has he indeed?" replies Mr. Toogood. "But I'm not sure that I think so very much about bishops, Mr. Walker."

Such a man as Major Grantly†—and there are many such—will hardly speak to his own father on a matter of any moment without first revolving it repeatedly within himself, making up his mind as to the day and to the hour, applying for an appointment, and girding up his loins for the approaching effort. "*I have a few words to say to you, sir*"—or, "*I should like to see you for a couple of minutes,*"—such is the minimum of preamble required for a communication. The father gravely replies that he will be at liberty to "see" his son to-morrow morning after breakfast. But, before the author of this intended communication has got even so far, how often will he have felt the weight of it, and how many inner excuses he will have made to put it off! It is as bad as a visit to the dentist. When Lord Silverbridget is finally accepted by Isabel Boncassen under the proviso that his father will countenance the match, he actually allows a couple of months to pass away before he can muster up sufficient courage to speak to his father on the subject. "Do not delay my fate," the young lady had said to him at parting; "it is all in all to me." Nevertheless the ardent lover reconciles himself to quite a series of delays; he rushes off to Cornwall to assist at an election; after the election he goes up to London

* "The Last Chronicle of Barset."

† "The Duke's Children."

(perhaps to consult his tailor on the subject of some breeches), and finally, on his return to Matching, defers his communication until a certain other lady shall have left the house. Dilatoriness is a frequent trait in Trollope's characters, but it is never so marked as when the action required of them is to speak.

The most trying and, to a tender-hearted reader, the most interesting occasions are of course the declarations of love. These are in Trollope's stories exceptionally numerous; so much so that three to a volume may be set down as an average allowance. The finding of an opportunity—a pliant hour, as Othello terms it—is of itself a serious difficulty. One lover* selects the moment when his mistress, having lapsed with her horse into a brook, is riding, dripping, to the nearest inn; a second† takes up his position in the uncle's study, and desires that the young lady be sent up to him; a third‡ asks her, after breakfast, for an appointment in the evening; a fourth goes courageously up to her in the midst of other ladies in the drawing-room, and murmurs a request that she will come out into the garden. It will be allowed that these preliminaries are somewhat arduous, but the hardest part of the work is still to come. When the gentleman has thus far gained his point, he usually proceeds with a strategical attempt to throw the onus of the communication on his partner. "I've got something that I want to settle: I think you must know what it is." Or, "Of course, Grace, you know why I am here." Or, "I think, Mary, you know what it is that I want." It may be doubted whether this manœuvre is quite generous; any rate, it fails in its object, as the lady invariably declines to be enticed out of her entrenchments. The gentleman is therefore compelled to fall back for a fresh attempt. We will not follow him any further for the present; his blood is up, and we may rest assured that he will go through with his task, let the cost be what it may. The climax is usually reached when he concludes upon making the offer of his hand by holding it out. "There is my hand; if you can take it, be assured that you have my heart with it." Let us hope that the young lady will at last so far overcome her reticence as to touch the outstretched brawny palm with the tips of her little fingers.

After all . . . we do not know . . . we are not quite sure . . . (to use our author's language) . . . but that the above species of eloquence will be as successful as any other. Love does not manifest itself best by glib speaking. At any rate, the awkwardness to which we have alluded infuses a peculiar interest into Trollope's dialogue. A number of his Englishmen ex-

* "The Eustace Diamonds."

† "Ralph the Heir."

‡ "Orley Farm."

perience such trouble in coming to the point, they are so unskilful in directing the conversation, they have to hew down so many trees in the forest of difficulty before they can make a clearing for themselves, that the reader becomes a co-labourer in their embarrassment, and feels a genuine relief when the decisive words are spoken. They come out with a kind of burst, like the jokes which Charles Lamb used to ejaculate with stammering, and are all the more enjoyed on that account.*

Of conversation, the best is usually at dinner, when men's spirits are warmed by the prospect of good cheer, and not yet rendered heavy by digestion. We are not in a position to speak confidently of what takes place later in the drawing-room, as Trollope is very scant of information on this point; but from the few hints that he does drop, we should gather that the intercourse there is not of the liveliest. We remember, for instance, that when Mr. Palliser† makes up his mind to practise illicit seductions on the beautiful Lady Dumbello—he does so chiefly because his uncle has affectionately requested him to do nothing of the kind—he finds it very difficult to say more than three or four words, and is greatly relieved when the lady desires him to explain to her what is meant by an *ad valorem* tax on sugar. We remember also that when Lord Dumbello‡ makes hot love to Griselda Grantly at Mrs. Proudie's *conversazione*, he breaks a long and presumably happy silence at her side only to say that he thinks he has now had enough of this sort of thing, and will go away. Nor does Griselda think for a moment that her admirer has been remiss in his attentions. She did not expect him to say more; and is quite satisfied to have had him standing by her. We are aware, however, that our impartiality might perhaps be doubted were we to dwell upon such instances as these; and hasten therefore to invite our reader into the dining-room, where our position will be such as to defy suspicion.

Our first scene shall be laid at the house of Theodore Burton §—certainly one of the most intelligent and estimable characters to be found in the whole range of Trollope's novels. He and his wife, Cecilia, are about to entertain Harry Clavering—engaged to Burton's youngest sister, Florence—and the only other guest

* It will doubtless have been noticed, by those well-versed in Trollope's novels, that when one of his personages has at last reached the point of expressing himself decisively, he usually retires swiftly, leaving the room or at least breaking off the subject. He requires rest or change of air after his exertion.

† "The Small House at Allington."

‡ "Framley Parsonage."

§ "The Claverings."

is a brother of Mrs. Burton's—namely, a Mr. Jones, editor of some London newspaper.

There was some wild fowl, and Harry was agreeably surprised as he watched the mental anxiety and gastronomic skill with which Burton went through the process of preparing the gravy with lemon and pepper, having in the room a little silver pot and an apparatus of fire for the occasion. He would as soon have expected the Archbishop of Canterbury to go through such an operation in the dining-room at Lambeth as the hardworking man of business whom he had known in his chambers at the Adelphi.

"Does he always do that, Mrs. Burton?" Harry asked.

"Always," said Burton, "when I can get the materials. One does not bother oneself about a cold leg of mutton, you know, which is my usual dinner when we are alone. The children have it hot in the middle of the day."

"Such a thing never happened to him yet, Harry," said Mrs. Burton.

"Gently with the pepper," said the editor. It was the first word he had spoken for some time.

"Be good enough to remember that yourself, when you are writing your article to-night."

"No more for me, Theodore," said Mrs. Burton.

"Cissy!"

"I have dined, really. If I had remembered that you were going to display your cookery, I would have kept some of my energy, but I forgot it."

"As a rule," said Burton, "I don't think women recognize any difference in flavours. I believe wild duck and hashed mutton would be quite the same to my wife if her eyes were blinded. I should not mind this were it not that they are generally proud of their deficiency. They think it grand."

"Just as men think it grand not to know one tune from another," said his wife.

When dinner was over, Burton got up from his seat. "Harry," said he, "do you like good wine?" Harry said that he did. Whatever women may say about wild fowl, men never profess an indifference to good wine, although there is a theory in the world, quite as incorrect as it is general, that they have given up drinking it. "Indeed I do," said Harry. "Then I'll give you a bottle of port," said Burton, and so saying, he left the room.

"I'm very glad you have come to-day," said Jones, with much gravity. "He never gives me any of that when I'm alone with him, and he never by any means brings it out for company."

"You don't mean to accuse him of drinking it alone?" said Mrs. Burton, laughing.

"I don't know when he drinks, I only know when he doesn't."

The wine was decanted with as much care as had been given to the concoction of the gravy, and the clearness of the dark liquid was scrutinized with an eye that was full of anxious care. "Now, Cissy,

what do you think of that?" "She knows a glass of good wine when she gets it, as well as you do, Harry, in spite of her contempt for the duck."

As they sipped the old port, they sat round the dining-room fire, and Harry Clavering (who had been somewhat prejudiced against his future brother-in-law because he had seen the latter dust his shoes with his pocket-handkerchief) was forced to own to himself that he had never been more comfortable.

"Ah," said Burton, stretching out his slippers, "why can't it be all after dinner, instead of that weary room at the Adelphi?"

"And all old port?" said Jones.

"Yes, and all old port. You are not such an ass as to suppose that a man, in suggesting to himself a continuance of pleasure, suggests to himself also the evils which are supposed to accompany such pleasure. If I took much of the stuff, I should get cross and sick, and make a beast of myself, but then what a pity it is that it should be so."

"You wouldn't like much of it, I think," said his wife.

"That is it," said he. "We are driven to work, because work never palls on us, whereas pleasure always does. What a wonderful scheme it is, when one looks at it all. No man can follow pleasure long, continuously. When a man strives to do so, he turns his pleasure at once into business and works at that. Come, Harry, we mustn't have another bottle, or Jones would go to sleep among the type."

Now, we would not have it supposed for a moment that we feel dissatisfied with the above sample of dinner conversation. It is excellent of its kind; the tone is cordial, home-like, humorous; and the present writer would be delighted, for his part, to take the seat of Mr. Jones at Burton's hospitable table. The only point we wish to make is, that such conversation ought not to be the *nec plus ultra* of social intercourse between intellectual men. Talk of wine; talk of horses; talk of wild duck, if you please; but *occasionally* may we not take a little flight *beyond*? In Trollope there is no "beyond." We shall not be expected to demonstrate a negative; we can only assert deliberately that, in some three-score volumes which we have read of Anthony Trollope's, we have found nothing more intellectual than the fragment above quoted. This is the highest pitch; the usual tone is far below.

Here, now, is an extract of a different kind. Johnny Eames takes Miss Demolines to dinner: *

"Don't you like winter dinner-parties?" began Miss Demolines, when the assembled guests had taken their allotted seats. "I mean especially in winter. There are always so many other things to go to in May and June and July. Dinners should be stopped by Act of

* "The Last Chronicle of Barset."

Parliament for those three months. I don't care what people do afterwards, as we always fly away on the 1st of August."

"That is good-natured on your part."

"I'm sure what I say would be for the good of society—but at the time of the year a dinner is warm and comfortable."

"Very comfortable, I think."

"And people get to know each other"—in saying which Miss Demolines looked very pleasantly up into Johnny's face.

"There's a good deal in that," he said. "I wonder whether you and I will get to know each other."

"Of course we shall; that is, if I am worth knowing."

"There can be no doubt about that, I should say."

"Time alone can tell. But, Mr. Eames, I see that Mr. Crosbie is a friend of yours." (The two gentlemen had met and shaken hands in the drawing-room.)

"Hardly a friend." (There had been a personal encounter between them in the course of which Mr. Crosbie had received a black eye.)

"I know very well that men are friends when they step up and shake hands with each other. It is the same as when women kiss."

"When I see women kiss, I always think that there is deep hatred at the bottom of it."

"And there may be deep hatred between you and Mr. Crosbie, for anything I know to the contrary," said Miss Demolines.

"The very deepest," said Johnny, pretending to look grave.

"Ah, then I know he is your bosom friend, and that you will tell him anything I say. . . . And now, Mr. Eames, pray look at the *menu*, and tell me what I am to eat. Arrange for me a little dinner of my own, out of the great bill of fare provided. I always expect some gentleman to do that for me."

So Johnny Eames took up the card of the dinner, and went to work in earnest, recommending his neighbour what to eat, and what to pass by. "But you've skipped the *pâté*!" she said with energy.

"Allow me to ask you to choose mine for me instead. You are much more fit to do it." And she did choose his dinner for him.

Miss Demolines was evidently a lively and experienced diner-out; one to whom the little devices and resources of chit-chat were familiar. But talents such as these are not bestowed on all; and the task of keeping up a conversation is often felt, as Trollope happily expresses it, to be a drawing of the cart uphill. We have, however, sufficiently dwelt upon this difficulty already, and must now point to another aspect of these dinner-scenes, namely, the discourtesy and ill-humour—nay, gross rudeness—which are occasionally displayed there. Trollope's Englishmen possess eminently the power of making themselves disagreeable, and they exercise it freely, on occasion, especially towards their dependents or inferiors in station. The brutality of the hunting field is not so far beneath the surface but what a little

scratching will bring it to day. Here is a family party at the mansion of Sir Hugh Clavering—a personage represented as holding a high station; intelligent; not ignorant although he rarely opened a book; every inch an English gentleman in appearance, and therefore popular with men and women of his own class who were not near enough to him to know him well. The dinner is given in honour of Miss Florence Burton, already mentioned, who is accordingly taken to table by Sir Hugh himself. Other persons present: Lady Clavering, the hostess; Captain Archie Clavering, brother to Sir Hugh; the rector of Clavering, uncle, to Sir Hugh; the rector's wife; and, lastly, his son Harry engaged to Florence Burton.

When the soup had been eaten, Sir Hugh makes an attempt at conversation with his young and prepossessing guest.

"How long have you been here, Miss Burton?"

"Nearly a week," said Florence.

"Ah, you came to the wedding? (The wedding of one of Harry's sisters.) I was sorry I couldn't be here. It went off very well, I suppose?"

"Very well indeed, I think."

"They're tiresome things in general—weddings. Don't you think so?"

"Oh dear no—except that some person one loves is always being taken away."

"You'll be the next person to be taken away yourself, I suppose."

"I must be the next person at home, because I am the last that is left. All my sisters are married."

"And how many are there?"

"There are five married."

"Good Heavens, five!"

"And they are all married to men in the same profession as Harry."

"Quite a family affair," said Sir Hugh. Harry, who was sitting on the other side of Florence, heard this, and would have preferred that Florence should have said nothing about her sisters. "Why, Harry," said the baronet, "if you will go into partnership with your father-in-law, and all your brothers-in-law, you could stand against the world."

"You might add my four brothers," said Florence, who saw no shame in the fact that they were all engaged in the same business.

"Good Heavens!" exclaimed the baronet, *and after that he did not say much more to Florence.*

Sir Hugh spoke once to Mrs. Clavering (his uncle's wife) during the dinner, saying that he hoped she was satisfied with her daughter's marriage, but even this he said in a tone which seemed to imply that any such satisfaction must rest on very poor grounds.

"Thoroughly satisfied," said Mrs. Clavering, drawing herself up and looking very unlike the usual Mrs. Clavering at the rectory. After that there was no further conversation between her and Sir Hugh.

We will now add the after-dinner scene, when the gentlemen are sitting together over their wine, and beg the reader to observe how Sir Hugh, although his uncle and nephew are present as his guests, directs his conversation almost exclusively to his brother Archie.

"I see they're going to have another week after this with the Pytchley" (the Pytchley hounds), says Sir Hugh to his brother.

"I suppose they will—or ten days. Things ain't very early this year."

"I think I shall go down. It's never any use trying to hunt here after the middle of March."

"You're rather short of foxes, are you not?" said the rector, making an attempt to join the conversation.

"Upon my word I don't know anything about it," said Sir Hugh.

"There are foxes at Clavering," said Archie, recommencing his duty. (His duty, as he conceived it, was that of *drawing the coach up-hill*.) "The hounds will be here on Saturday, and I'll bet three to one I find a fox before twelve o'clock—or say half-past twelve—that is, if they'll draw punctually and let me do what I like with the hounds. I'll bet a guinea we find, and a guinea we run, and a guinea we kill; that is, you know, if they really look for a fox."

The rector had been willing to fall into a little hunting talk for the sake of society, but he was not prepared to go the length that Archie proposed to take him, and therefore the subject dropped.

"At any rate I shan't stay here after to-morrow," said Sir Hugh, still addressing himself to his brother. "Pass the wine, will you, Harry; that is, if your father is drinking any."

"No more wine for me," said the rector, almost angrily.

"Liberty Hall," said Sir Hugh; "everybody does as they like about that. I mean to have another bottle of claret. Archie, ring the bell, will you?"

Captain Clavering, though he was further from the bell than his elder brother, got up and did as he was bid. The claret came and was drunk almost in silence. The rector, though he had a high opinion of the cellar of the great house, would take none of the new bottle because he was angry. Harry filled his glass and attempted to say something. Sir Hugh answered him with a monosyllable, and Archie offered to bet him two to one that he was wrong.

"I'll go into the drawing-room," said the rector, getting up.

"All right," said Sir Hugh. "You'll find coffee there, I dare say." "Has your father given up wine?" he asked, as soon as the door was closed.

"Not that I know of," said Harry.

"He used to take as good a whack as any man I know. The bishop hasn't put his embargo on that as well as on the hunting, I hope? (The rector of Clavering had occasionally followed the hounds, at an earlier period of his career, but Bishop Proudie, on his arrival in the diocese, had expressed his strong disapproval of such a

recreation, and the rector, reluctantly, had yielded.) To this Harry made no reply.

"He's in the blues, I think," said Archie. "Is there anything the matter with him, Harry?"

"Nothing as far as I know."

"If I were left at Clavering all the year, with nothing to do, as he is," said Sir Hugh, "I think I should drink a good deal of wine. I don't know what it is—something in the air, I suppose—but everybody always seems to be dreadfully dull here. You ain't taking any wine either. Don't stop here out of courtesy, you know, if you want to go after Miss Burton." Harry took him at his word, and left the brothers together over their claret.

One more extract, and we shall have done with dinner conversation. The scene is at Mr. Dick Roby's, in London; several Members of Parliament are present (the reader will please note that we are moving in high circles, and it is altogether quite a distinguished affair). Unluckily, one of the high-born guests, Lord Mongrober, has been slightly ruffled in his temper by having been kept waiting a few moments for the arrival of another guest, and the consequences are as follows:—

"I suppose you've got to the bottom of that champagne you used to have," said Lord Mongrober, roaring across the table to his host, holding his glass in his hand, and with strong marks of disapprobation on his face.

"The very same wine as we were drinking when your lordship last did me the honour of dining here," said Dick.

Lord Mongrober raised his eyebrows, shook his head, and put down the glass.

"Shall we try another bottle?" asked Mrs. Dick with solicitude.

"Oh no; it'd be all the same, I know. I'll take a little dry sherry, if you have it." The man came with the decanter. "No, dry sherry—dry sherry," said his lordship.

The man was confounded, Mrs. Dick was at her wits' ends, and everything was in confusion. Lord Mongrober was not the man to be kept waiting by a Government subordinate without exacting some penalty for such ill-treatment.

"His lordship is a little out of sorts," whispered Dick to Lady Monogram.

"Very much out of sorts, it seems."

"And the worst of it is, there isn't a better glass of wine in London, and his lordship knows it."

"I suppose that's what he comes for," said Lady Monogram, being quite as uncivil in her way as the nobleman.

"He's like a great many others. He knows where he can get a good dinner. After all, there's no attraction like it. Of course a handsome woman won't stand that, Lady Monogram."

"I will not admit it, at any rate, Mr. Roby."

"But I don't doubt Monogram is as careful as anybody else to get the best cook he can, and takes a great deal of trouble about his wine too. Mongrober is very unfair about that champagne. It came out of Madame Clicquot's cellars before the war, and I gave Spratt and Burlinghammer 110s. for it."

"Indeed."

"I don't think there are a dozen men in London who can give such a glass of wine as that. What do you say about that champagne, Monogram?"

"Very tidy wine," said Sir Damask.

"I should think it is. I gave 110s. for it before the war. His lordship's got a fit of the gout coming, I suppose."

When the cloth had been removed, and the ladies had withdrawn:

"You remember that claret, my lord?" said Dick, thinking that some little compensation was due to him for what had been said about the champagne.

But Lord Mongrober's dinner had not yet had the effect of mollifying the man sufficiently for Dick's purpose. "Oh yes, I remember the wine. You call it '57, don't you?"

"And it is '57—'57, Leoville."

"Very likely—very likely. If it hadn't been heated before the fire. . . ."

"It hasn't been near the fire," said Dick.

"Or put into a hot decanter. . . ."

"Nothing of the kind."

"Or treated after some other damnable fashion, it would be very good wine, I dare say."

"You are hard to please, my lord, to-day," said Dick, who was put beyond his bearing.

"What is a man to say? If you will talk about your wine, I can only tell you what I think. Any man can get good wine—that is, if he can afford to pay the price—but it isn't one out of ten who knows how to put it on the table."

Dick, who on occasions could be awakened to a touch of manliness, gave the bottle a shove, and threw himself back in his chair. "If you ask me, I can only tell you," repeated Lord Mongrober.

"I don't believe you ever had a bottle of wine put before you in better order in all your life," said Dick. His lordship's face became very square and very red as he looked round at his host. "And as for talking about my wine, of course I talk to a man about what he understands. I talk to Monogram about pigeons, to Tom there about politics, to Hupperton and Lopez about the price of Consols, and to you about wine. If I asked you what you thought about the last new book, your lordship would be a little surprised."

Lord Mongrober grunted and looked redder and squarer than ever, but he made no attempt at reply, and so the victory rested with Dick. "We had a little tiff, me and Mongrober," he said to his wife that night. "He's a very good fellow and of course he's a lord and all that. But he has to be put down occasionally, and, by George! I did it to-night. You ask Lopez."

Discussion is not only difficult, but dangerous. Trollope's Englishmen seem to look upon any attempt in such direction as an indiscretion to be resented—a liberty taken with the privacy of their convictions. Whether this be owing more to their sluggishness of thought or more to their extreme reserve is difficult to determine. Trollope says of Sir Thomas Underwood : *

Whether Christ did or did not die for sinners was a question with him so painfully obscure that he had been driven to obtain what comfort he might from not thinking of it.

We fancy that a considerable number of our author's personages are in a similar predicament with respect to other questions. If they have not made up their minds, then any discussion will only re-open their wound ; if they *have* made up their minds, they are unwilling to have their rest disturbed by an intruder. It is amusing to see what agony the American Senator inflicts by his pertinacious questioning on his English entertainers. He meets, however, with severe rebuffs, as, for instance, at Rufford Hall : †

There was a public breakfast downstairs at which all the hunting farmers of the county were to be seen, and some who only pretended to be hunting farmers on such occasions. A great deal was said about Goarly (accused of poisoning a fox), to all of which the Senator listened with eager ears—for the Senator preferred the public breakfast to the private meal upstairs, as offering another institution to his notice. "He'll swing on a gallows afore he's dead," said one energetic farmer, sitting next to Mr. Gotobed—a fat man with a round head and a bullock's neck, dressed in a black coat with breeches and top boots. John Runce was not a riding man ; he was too heavy and short-winded, too fond of his beer and port wine ; but he was a hunting man all over, one to whom it was the very breath of his nostrils to shake hands with the hunting gentry, and be known as a staunch friend to the U.R.U. To his thinking a man more injurious than Goarly to the best interests of civilization could not have been produced by all the evil influences of the world combined.

"Do you really think," said the Senator calmly, "that a man should be hanged for killing a fox?" John Runce, who was not very ready, turned round and stared at him. "I haven't heard of any other harm that he has done, and perhaps he had some provocation for that."

Words were wanting to Mr. Runce, but not indignation. He collected together his plate and knife and fork, and his two glasses, and his lump of bread, and, looking the Senator full in the face, slowly pushed back his chair, and, carrying his provisions with him, toddled off to the other end of the room. When he reached a spot where place was made for him, he had hardly breath left to speak. "Well," he said, "I never——!" He sat a moment in silence shaking his head,

* "Ralph the Heir."

† "The American Senator."

and continued to shake his head and look round upon his neighbours as he devoured his food.

But this is only an untutored farmer! you will say. Well, then, let us fly to the other extremity of the social scale, and select a personage from whom the utmost, in regard to culture, amenity, and forbearance, may be expected—a bishop! The Bishop of Elmham* is clearly a favourite with Trollope, and is accordingly depicted with every advantage on his side. He is now dining at Sir Roger Carbury's, in company, among others, with Father Barham, priest at Beccles.

When the ladies were gone, the bishop at once put himself in the way of conversation with the priest, and asked questions as to the morality of Beccles. It was evidently Mr. Barham's opinion that "his people" were more moral than other people, though very much poorer.

"But the Irish always drink," said Mr. Hepworth.

"Not so much as the English, I think," said the priest. "And you are not to suppose that we are all Irish. Of my flock the greater proportion are English."

"It is astonishing how little we know of our neighbours," said the bishop. "Of course I am aware that there are a certain number of persons of your persuasion round about us. Indeed, I could give the exact number in my own diocese. But, in my own immediate neighbourhood, I could not put my hand on any families which I know to be Roman Catholics."

"It is not, my lord, because there are none."

"Of course not. It is because, as I say, I do not know my neighbours."

"I think, here in Suffolk, they must be chiefly the poor," said Mr. Hepworth.

"They were chiefly the poor who first put their faith in our Saviour," said the priest.

"I think the analogy is hardly correctly drawn," said the bishop with a curious smile. "We were speaking of those who are still attached to an old creed. Our Saviour was the teacher of a new religion. That the poor in the simplicity of their hearts should be the first to acknowledge the truth of a new religion is in accordance with our view of human nature. But that an old faith should remain with the poor after it has been abandoned by the rich is not so easily intelligible." (Oh, bishop!)

"The Roman population still believed," said Carbury, "when the patricians had learned to regard their gods as simply useful bugbears."

"The patricians had not ostensibly abandoned their religion. The people clung to it, thinking that their masters and rulers clung to it also."

* "The Way We Live Now."

"The poor have ever been the salt of the earth, my lord," said the priest.

"That begs the whole question," said the bishop, *turning to his host and beginning to talk about a breed of pigs which had lately been imported into the palace styes.*

Comment is superfluous. It may be said that the antagonism in this case was too deep. . . . But even when the question of issue is not one which either party has at heart, and when the disputants are men trained to controversy, they cannot for five minutes keep their temper. As a case in point, we may quote the passage-at-arms between Mr. Supplehouse, a veteran politician and writer in the *Times*, and Mr. Harold Smith, M.P., about to occupy a high seat in the Cabinet. Mr. Harold Smith is going to deliver a lecture at Barchester on Borneo, in connection with the Papuan Mission; and the said passage-at-arms takes place at Chaldicote, the seat of Mr. Sowerby, in the presence of numerous guests sitting over their wine.

"They are the most magnificent islands under the sun," said Harold Smith to Bishop Proudie.

"Are they indeed?" said the bishop, opening his eyes wide, and assuming a look of intense interest.

"And the most intelligent people."

"Dear me," said the bishop.

"All they want is guidance, encouragement, instruction——"

"And Christianity," suggested the bishop.

"And Christianity, of course," said Mr. Smith, remembering that he was speaking to a dignitary of the Church. It was well to humour such people, Mr. Smith thought. But the Christianity was to be done in the Sunday sermon, and was no part of his work.

"And how do you intend to begin with them?" said Mr. Supplehouse, the business of whose life had been to suggest difficulties.

"Begin with them—oh!—why, it's very easy to begin with them. The difficulty is to go on with them, after the money is all spent. We'll begin by explaining to them the benefits of civilization."

"Capital plan," said Mr. Supplehouse. "But how do you set about it, Smith?"

"How do we set about it? How did we set about it in Australia and America? It is very easy to criticize, but in such matters the great thing is to put one's shoulder to the wheel."

"We sent out felons to Australia," said Supplehouse, "and they began the work for us. And as for America, we exterminated the people instead of civilizing them."

"We did not exterminate the inhabitants of India," said Harold Smith, angrily.

"Nor have we attempted to Christianize them, as the bishop so properly wishes to do with your islanders."

"Supplehouse, you are not fair," said Mr. Sowerby, "neither to Harold Smith nor to us—you are making him rehearse his lecture,

which is bad for him, and making us hear the rehearsal, which is bad for us."

"Supplehouse belongs to a clique which monopolizes the wisdom of England, or at any rate thinks that it does," said Harold Smith. "But the worst of them is that they are given to talk leading articles."

"Better than talk articles which are not leading," said Mr. Supplehouse; "some first-class official men do that."

Courtesy in discussion, good temper under railery, are evidently not among the strong points of Trollope's personages. The reader of his novels will probably remember that "the American Senator," before departing from our shores, attempts to deliver a lecture in London, of which the subject is entitled, "The Irrationality of Englishmen." With much esteem and sympathy for Mr. Gotobed, we venture to think that his title was not happily chosen, and that the inability of Trollope's Englishmen is not so much to *act* by reason as to *talk* by it. The Senator's interlocutors were certainly no match at all for him in controversy. They could decide a practical issue on practical grounds; their attempts to explain and justify their decision in theory were, if made at all, uncouth in the extreme. And, indeed, no mental characteristic in Trollope's personages is more striking than this. Their argumentation among themselves may generally be compressed into a nutshell: one party supports his view by putting an extreme case, and the other retorts that the extreme case aforesaid is not the case under examination. When Dean Lovelace is accused of having ridden after the hounds, taking several hedges and ditches in his way—nay, when the Dean has courageously confessed to his iniquity—Mr. Groschut, chaplain to the bishop of the diocese, urges his lordship to take some action in the matter.*

"If he rides after every pack of dogs in the country, I don't know that I can help it," said the bishop.

"Suppose he were to take to gambling on the turf?" said Mr. Groschut, with much horror expressed in his tone and countenance.

"But riding after a pack of dogs isn't gambling on the turf," replied the bishop.

Again, when the Marquis of Brotherton marries a horrid Italian countess, and announces to his relations in England the birth of a male child, there is much discussion as to whether this little foreign brat is to be accepted without inquiry as Lord Popenjoy.

"If a man went and married some woman in Kamschatka," says a lady arguing the case, "surely you would not look upon such a marriage as valid without investigating it?"

"But Italy is not Kamschatka," retorts the interlocutor.

"Is he Popenjoy?"

It is no wonder if, under such circumstances, discussion is looked upon as both disagreeable and useless. The gist of public sentiment upon the matter is happily expressed by Baron Maltby at the table of his legal colleague, Judge Stavely :—

“Arguments on such a matter” (the reform of English law) “are worth nothing at all,” said the baron. “A man with what is called a logical turn of mind may prove anything or disprove anything, but he never convinces anybody. On any matter that is near to a man’s heart, he is convinced by his own thoughts as he goes on living, not by the arguments of a logician, or even by the eloquence of an orator. Talkers are apt to think that if their listeners cannot answer them, they are bound to give way, but non-talkers generally take a very different view of the subject.”

“But does that go to show that a question should not be ventilated?” asked Felix.

“I don’t mean to be uncivil,” said the baron, “but of all words in the language, there is none which I dislike so much as the word ‘ventilation.’ A man given to ventilating subjects is worse than a man who has a mission.”

The above selections must suffice as regards the intellectual constitution of Trollope’s Englishmen, and there remains now to be considered their family affections, their sexual attachments, their moral qualities, and their rule of life.

That they are, on the whole, undemonstrative and cold in manner, is beyond discussion. So much, we believe, will be conceded by every reader of Anthony Trollope. The only question which admits a doubt, is whether such coldness is merely one of manner, or whether it has a deeper seat. It is frequently asserted with regard to Englishmen, and indeed we believe it to be a favourite maxim with most persons of very reserved demeanour, that those who show least, feel most. The human heart, upon this theory, is like a teapot, which keeps all the warmer for being placed under a non-conducting cover. Now the present writer, for one, utterly repudiates any such belief. Sympathy is bred of sympathy, affection of affection, and the person who shows little or nothing of his feeling, will neither induce tenderness in others nor will he be able, through want of reciprocity, to develop his own. Trollope’s observation fully confirms this view. His characters—we are speaking of the male characters especially—are, for the most part, eminently cold-hearted. We shall consider them presently as lovers; for the moment, let us consider them in their relation as fathers and as sons. The best fathers which Trollope has delineated—and we think that Archdeacon Grantly may be selected as a specimen—take just that sort of interest in their children that a good farmer takes in the cultivation, the improvement of his freehold.

They are not selfish, not indifferent; far from it. They are sincerely happy to see their daughters marry advantageously, and will part with considerable dowers for that purpose. They are hospitable, good-natured, indulgent to their sons, producing for their welcome a bottle of the rare old port, arranging for their riding, fishing, shooting; anxious to see them hold up their heads before the world, and be a credit to their name. But . . . such solicitude as this is what the planter feels for his young plantations. There is no real intimacy, no communion of the heart, no tender yearning such as Thackeray shows us, for instance, in his Colonel Newcome.* Sir Harry Hotspur † is stricken almost to the earth by the death of his only son; he never entirely recovers from it; but he mourns chiefly for the HEIR, in whom the plans and prospects of a lifetime were bound up. Squire Newton ‡ scrapes and saves throughout some twenty years on behalf of his son Ralph, but Ralph is an illegitimate child; he is debarred from the natural succession, and the father's fixed idea to secure a social position for his boy, is mainly a conscientious scruple become dominant. Archdeacon Grantly, for a description of whom we must refer the reader to the Barchester series of novels, is certainly a kind-hearted, generous parent, but his worldly ambition for his children is the mainspring of his action, and he is ready to cut off Henry with a shilling should the latter persist in that mad and wicked project of marrying the daughter of an impecunious curate. Nay, when Henry Grantly, straitened in his means, but all the more resolute on account of his father's opposition, prepares to leave a country-seat which has become too costly, and to go and live at Pau, the Archdeacon's sorest trial is to see placards posted up on walls and gateways announcing in large letters the sale of furniture at Cosby Lodge. That a Grantly . . . in the face of Barsetshire—should be reduced to selling horses, milch cows, a patent clod-crusher! and should betake himself to lead a beggarly life among Frenchmen; . . . he, of whom his father had always been so proud—for whom his father was still willing to do so much—that was indeed wormwood. The Archdeacon raised his umbrella, and poked at the obnoxious bill until it tore from top to bottom.

Such being the *best* fathers in our author's collection, it is not difficult to surmise what are the middling and the bad. The following extract, § in which Gerard Maule (already mentioned

* Here again, Mr. Harding may be quoted against us, but Mr. Harding is exhibited as a feeble old man, and his character is in all respects a solitary exception.

† "Sir Harry Hotspur of Humblethwaite."

‡ "Ralph the Heir."

§ "Phineas Redux."

as hunting with Lord Chiltern) announces his impending marriage to his father, Mr. Maule of Maule Abbey, may be considered as characteristic of the middling quality. Gerard had written the day previous to announce his arrival, and though Mr. Maule, Senior, had not the slightest desire to see his son—yet, as they were on amicable terms, he could not deny himself after the receipt of his son's note. Just as he had finished his first cigarette after breakfast, Gerard was announced.

“Well, Gerard!”

“Well, father, how are you? You are looking as fresh as paint, sir.”

“Thanks for the compliment, if you mean one. I am pretty well. I thought you were hunting somewhere.”

“So I am, but I have just come up to town to see you. I find you have been smoking—may I light a cigar?”

“I never do smoke cigars here, Gerard. I'll offer you a cigarette.” The cigarette was reluctantly offered, and accepted with a shrug. “But you didn't come here merely to smoke, I dare say.”

“Certainly not, sir. We do not often trouble each other, father, but there are some things about which I suppose we had better speak. I'm going to be married.”

“To be married!” The tone in which Mr. Maule repeated the words was much the same as might be used by any ordinary father if his son expressed an intention of going into the shoe-blackening business.

“Yes, sir. It's a kind of thing men do sometimes.”

“No doubt. And it's a kind of thing they sometimes repent of having done.”

“Let us hope for the best. It is too late, at any rate, to think about that, and, as it is to be done, I have come to tell you.”

“Very well. I suppose you are right to tell me. Of course you know that I can do nothing for you, and I don't suppose that you can do anything for me. As far as your own welfare goes, if she has a large fortune——”

“She has no fortune.”

“No fortune!”

“Two or three thousand pounds perhaps.”

“Then I look upon it as an act of simple madness, and can only say that as such I shall treat it. I have nothing in my power, and can therefore do you neither good nor harm, but I will not hear any particulars, and I can only advise you to break it off, let the trouble be what it may.”

“I certainly shall not do that, sir.”

“Then I have nothing more to say. Don't ask me to be present, and don't ask me to see her.”

“You haven't heard her name yet.”

“I do not care one straw what her name is.”

“It is Adelaide Palliser.”

"Adelaide Muggins would be exactly the same to me. My dear Gerard, I have lived too long in the world to believe that men can coin into money the blood of well-born wives. Twenty thousand pounds is worth more than all the blood of all the Howards, and a wife even with £20,000 would make you a poor, embarrassed, and half-famished man." (Gerard had £800 a year.)

"Then I suppose I shall be whole famished, as she certainly has not got one quarter of that sum."

"No doubt you will."

"Yet, sir, married men with families have lived on my income."

"And on less than a quarter of it. The very respectable man who brushes my clothes no doubt does so. But then you see he has been brought up in that way. I suppose that you, as a bachelor, put by every year at least half of your income."

"I never put by a shilling, sir. Indeed, I owe a few hundred pounds."

"And yet you expect to keep a house over your head and an expensive wife and family, with lady's maid, nurses, cook, footmen, and grooms, on a sum which has hitherto been insufficient for your own wants! I didn't think that you were such an idiot, my boy."

"Thank you, sir."

"What will the dress cost?"

"I have not the slightest idea."

"I daresay not. Probably she is a horse-woman. As far as I know anything of your life, that is the sphere in which you would have made the lady's acquaintance."

"She does ride."

"No doubt, and so do you, and it will be very easy to say whither you will ride together if you are fools enough to get married. Is there anything else?" And Mr. Maule, who had hitherto been standing, seated himself as he asked this last question, and took up the French novel which had been prepared for his morning's delectation.

The proverb says: "Like father, like son." But, as regards our present subject, it would be more correct to say: "Brown father, black son," or something to that effect. The sum of affection expended by the parents on the children being almost always far in excess of that returned by the children to the parents (the balance being carried forward and placed subsequently to the credit of the third generation), it may confidently be expected that, wherever the parents spend little, the children will return less. And Trollope is far too faithful an observer not to furnish a confirmation of this rule. As Archdeacon Grantly is exhibited both in the paternal and in the filial relation, his case affords an easy test. When the Archdeacon stands by the bedside of his dying father,* he has strong hopes of being appointed to the bishopric of Barchester in his

* "Barchester Towers."

father's stead. Indeed, the Ministry have almost promised him so much. But the Ministry are tottering on their base, and if they go out before the vacancy occurs, the Archdeacon will lose the nomination. The Bishop is very low—Sir Omicron Pie has quite given him up—but . . . it is a question of hours! Would it not be better that . . . the Archdeacon's bereavement . . . should not come too late? The Archdeacon—be it said to his credit—struggles to repress the thought; but not the less, as soon as he has closed his father's eyes, does he despatch Mr. Harding in all haste to the telegraph! Unfortunately, the Cabinet has just resigned.

When Frank Gresham comes of age, a general rejoicing is held at Greshamsbury, and some of the great relatives at Courcy Castle come over for the occasion. Frank's cousin, John de Courcy, is amongst the number.*

"Well, my boy, I wish you joy with all my heart," said the Hon. John, slapping his cousin on the back as he walked round to the stable-yard with him before dinner to inspect a setter puppy of peculiarly fine breed which had been sent to Frank as a birthday present. "I wish I were an elder son, but we can't all have that luck."

"Who wouldn't rather be the younger son of an Earl than the eldest son of a plain Squire?" said Frank, wishing to say something civil in return for his cousin's civility.

"I wouldn't for one," said the Hon. John. "What chance have I? There's Porlock's as strong as a horse, and then George comes next. And the governor's good for these twenty years." And the young man sighed as he reflected what small hope there was for him that all those who were nearest and dearest to him should die out of his way and leave him in the sweet enjoyment of an Earl's coronet and fortune. "Now, you're sure of your game some day, and, as you've no brother, I suppose the Squire 'll let you do pretty well what you like. Besides, he's not so strong as my governor, though he's younger."

Frank protested that he would consider it as the greatest misfortune if anything should happen to his father.

"Oh, of course, my dear fellow," said the Hon. John; "that's a matter of course. We all understand that without saying it. Porlock, of course, would feel exactly the same about the governor, but, if the governor were to walk, I think Porlock would console himself with the £30,000 a year."

And the Hon. John winds up his discourse with an anecdote about Fred Hatherly, who, having been summoned home post-haste on account of his father's illness, arrives only the day before the funeral, and finds a hatchment, with "Resurgam" painted on it, put up over the door.

* "Doctor Thorne."

“ ‘*Resurgam*,’ you know what that means,” said the Hon. John.

“ Oh, yes,” said Frank.

“ ‘*I’ll come back again*,’ ” said the Hon. John, construing the Latin for his cousin’s benefit. “ ‘ No,’ said Fred Hatherly, looking up at the hatchment; ‘ I’ll be blessed if you do, old gentleman. That would be too much of a joke; I’ll take care of that.’ So he got up at night and he got some fellows with him, and they climbed up and painted out ‘*Resurgam*,’ and they painted in its place ‘*Requiescat in pace*,’ which means, you know, ‘ You’d better stay where you are.’ Now I call that good.”

The above selection is not presented as illustrating the filial attitude of Trollope’s ordinary young Englishman. The Hon. John de Courcy is very certainly below the average. But he is so chiefly because he utters, with cynical outspokenness, thoughts which in the majority of his comrades are very dim—ray, perhaps never crop out into clear consciousness. This is of course an important difference, and we are anxious not to under-rate it. But, as regards *action*, the Hon. John is very much in the same category as the rest of them. There is no doubt but that, if Squire Gresham had been suddenly removed from the land of the living, Frank would have borne his loss pretty much as his cousin John predicted. He would have conformed without difficulty to the rule laid down by Earl de Guest, and quoted by us on a preceding page—namely, that, whatever may befall a man, he should always be able to drink his wine, and seem to enjoy it. It so happened that Frank had never had any words with his father.* The Squire was too much depressed by the remembrance of the inroads he had made on the Greshamsbury property to “ interfere ” much with his son. As a consequence, Frank liked the “ governor,” and was disposed to take his part against his mother and his aunt de Courcy. But it is a legitimate inference, from all that Trollope shows us in other English families, that, if the Squire had so interfered, Frank would have been quite ready to stand upon his “ rights as the heir,” and declare war. None of these young fellows have the slightest idea of sacrificing themselves to please their parents. There is no instance of such a thing within the whole range of Trollope’s novels. Lord Lufton† may be considered (in default of a better) as a model son; indeed, as his mother idolizes him, and as it suits him to hunt from Framley (his mother’s residence) rather than from Lufton, which is dilapidated, he has no reason to neglect her; but when Lucy Robarts refuses to be

* Is it not confirmatory of Trollope’s observations, as commented on above, that “ to have words ” with any individual means “ to quarrel ” with him ?

† “ Framley Parsonage.”

his wife unless Lady Lufton herself will come forward to request it, Lord Lufton is quite prepared to quarrel with his mother in case she does not conform to his desires. He first speaks to her of Lucy on the eve of starting for a six weeks' fishing trip to Norway; on his return, he expects her to carry out, at once, his high behests. Everett Wharton, who describes himself as highly endowed with filial qualities, quarrels with his father because, having lost in a single night £150 at whist, which of course he is utterly unable to pay, his father tells him that he is a gambler.†

"Of course I was a fool," says Everett to Lopez, speaking of this matter. "My father has the whip-hand of me because he has money and I have none, and it was simply kicking against the pricks to speak as I did." (Everett had retorted that he was no more a gambler than his father.) "And then, too, there isn't a fellow in London that has a higher respect for his father than I have, nor yet a warmer affection (!). But it is hard to be driven in that way. Gambler is a nasty word."

And, accordingly, although Mr. Wharton, Senior, had at once discharged his son's debt, Everett, living as usual upon his father's allowance, does not return for months to the paternal house.

It may interest the reader to see how this warmly affectionate son, after reconciliation with his father, informs the latter that he has engaged himself to his cousin Mary, daughter of Sir Alured Wharton, of Wharton Hall, the present holder of the family estate.

"MY DEAR FATHER,

"I have proposed to my cousin Mary, and she has accepted me. Everybody here seems to like the idea. I hope it will not displease you. Of course you and Emily [Everett's sister] will come down. I will tell you when the day is fixed.

"Your affectionate Son,

"EVERETT WHARTON."

When the above missive has been received and read, the father comments upon it as follows to his daughter Emily:—

"He'll want a house of his own, of course," said Mr. Wharton, in a somewhat lachrymose tone.

"I suppose he'll spend a good deal of his time at Wharton."

"He won't be content to live in another man's house altogether, my dear, and Sir Alured can allow him nothing. It means, of course, that I must give him £1,000 a year. It seems very natural to him, I dare say, but he might have asked the question before he took a wife to himself."

* "The Prime Minister."

The following letter of Lord Chiltern to his father, the Earl of Brentford, is too characteristic to be omitted. It must be premised that Lord Chiltern has been a very wild young man. He began his career by being expelled from Oxford; he lost his fortune on the turf before he was twenty-five; he killed a ruffian with his fists at Newmarket; and was brought, for violent doings, before a magistrate in Paris. His father had tried more than once to settle his son's affairs, but had failed, and finally Chiltern's sister, Lady Laura, had sacrificed her dower, £40,000, to meet her brother's obligations. Lord Chiltern, however, considered that his father had been "hard" upon him, and consequently kept entirely aloof. It was only when Violet Effingham finally accepted him that this red-haired, violent-tempered lord was prevailed upon to take a step towards reconciliation. He did so as follows* :—

"MY LORD,

"I am now on my way from Loughlinter to London, and write this letter to you in compliance with a promise made by me to my sister and to Miss Effingham. I have asked Violet to be my wife, and she has accepted me, and they think that you will be pleased to hear that this has been done. I shall be, of course, obliged if you will instruct Mr. Edwards to let me know what you would propose to do in regard to settlements. Laura thinks that you will wish to see both Violet and myself at Saulsby. For myself, I can only say that, should you desire me to come, I will do so on receiving your assurance that I shall be treated neither with fatted calves nor with reproaches. I am not aware that I have deserved either.

"I am, my lord, yours affect.,

"CHILTERN."

The last words of this letter were written, as Trollope tells us, only after painful hesitation. Lord Chiltern would have been equally ready to sign himself "yours with profound indifference" as "yours with affection," if only he could have known beforehand in what mood his overture would be received. He was willing to take exactly that step towards his father which his father would be disposed to take towards him, but not one iota beyond. We may add that the Earl of Brentford answered cordially, and that the proposed meeting took place—Chiltern accosting his father by holding out his hand and saying, "My lord, I am glad to come back to Saulsby"—but, in spite of the Earl's efforts, the visit was unsatisfactory.

Money difficulties play an enormous part in the family relations exhibited by Trollope, and the dissensions, rancours, hatreds, arising therefrom are numberless. Money is, no doubt, a bone of contention all the world over, and every true novelist

: * "Phineas Finn."

must exhibit it as such, but here the wrangle is carried on without any of those social amenities and decencies which are usually supposed to mitigate, at least outwardly, its brutality. We find in Trollope hardly an heir to any great estate who lives on cordial terms with its possessor. Dolly Longestaffe, who is in all other respects a careless, rather good-natured, easy-going fellow, will have no business dealing with his father except through the medium of his attorney, Squercum; the two brothers, Gregory and Ralph Newton, had not spoken to each other for years because they could not agree as to the cutting of some timber; Lord Porlock is at declared war with his father, Earl de Courcy, and takes legal proceedings against him; Lord Grex denounces his son and heir, Lord Percival, as the greatest scoundrel in all England. Assuming the evil to be as great as Trollope depicts it, we think that it must be due, in a considerable measure, to the detestable system of entail, and the consequent practice, where no entail exists, of favouring the eldest son at the expense of the others. A new-born babe will be looked upon either as a beggarly brat, or as the future head and magnate of the family, according as it happens to be male or female. A death will change the social status of an entire branch. *If anything should happen to George, Harry will be next to the estate.* The father stands in the way of his heir, the heir stands in the way of his father and his brothers. The property belonging both to its present and its future occupant, both being self-indulgent and extravagant, both requiring the sanction of each other to raise money for pressing emergencies, it may easily be conceived what bargains have to be driven between them, and how each may come to hate the other for advantages extorted under the operation of distressing circumstances. Such a situation would be trying as between any two men; as between father and son it is unspeakably odious.

We have now to consider Trollope's personages in the character of lovers, and, as novels are in a great measure love-tales, it might be expected that this part of our review would be the most interesting. But, although our author takes us through a great deal of love-making—or let us rather say, a good many offers of marriage—he does not regale us with much sentiment, still less with sentiment of an exalted kind. To his mind, the poetry with which elderly people are apt to invest the memories of early wooing is simply a product of the imagination; the reality was prosaic enough. He tells us of an actual declaration which he chanced to overhear. The couple—a handsome couple, no way below the proper standard of high bearing and high breeding—were walking together by the seashore.*

“ Doctor Thorne.”

Gentleman.—"Well, Miss, the long and the short of it is this: here I am, you can take me or leave me."

Lady (scratching a gutter in the sand with her parasol, so as to allow a little salt water to run out of one hole into another).—"Of course I know that's all nonsense."

Gentleman.—"Nonsense! By Jove, it isn't nonsense at all: come, Jane; here I am; come, at any rate you can say something."

Lady.—"Yes, I suppose I can say something."

Gentleman.—"Well, which is it to be—take me or leave me?"

Lady (very slowly, and with a voice perhaps hardly articulate, carrying on, at the same time, her engineering works on a wider scale).—"Well, I don't exactly want to leave you."

And so the matter was settled—settled with much propriety and satisfaction; and both the lady and gentleman would have thought, had they ever thought about the matter at all, that this, the sweetest moment of their lives, had been graced by all the poetry by which such moments ought to be hallowed.

We remarked, when first speaking of the hunting-field, that a proper description of this sport might easily be made to embrace all the principal traits of Trollope's Englishmen. Their love-making comes pre-eminently within the limits there referred to. The ardour of the pursuit is mainly dependent on its difficulty: nay, the difficulty is sometimes the principal attraction. An extreme case will illustrate our meaning. When Sir Griffin Tewett (the gentleman referred to on a previous page as having made his first proposal at a moment when the lady, having fallen into a stream, is riding, dripping, to the nearest inn)—when Sir Griffin Tewett has finally obtained a favourable reply, his courtship of Lucinda Roanoke is enlivened by a series of quarrels which necessitate the frequent intervention of Mrs. Carbuncle (Lucinda's aunt), Lord Carruthers, and Lady Eustace, at whose house the whole party are then staying.

"I don't see why Carruthers should have it all his own way," Sir Griffin said one hunting morning to Lucinda.

"I don't care twopence who has their way," said Lucinda; "I mean to have mine; that's all."

"I'm not speaking about you. I call it downright interference on his part. And I do think you give way to him. You never do anything that I suggest."

"You never suggest anything that I like to do," said Lucinda.

"That's a pity," said Sir Griffin, "considering that I shall have to suggest so many things that you will have to do."

"I don't know that at all," said Lucinda.

Mrs. Carbuncle came up during the quarrel, meaning to throw oil upon the waters. "What children you are," she said, laughing, "as if each of you won't have to do what the other suggests."

"Mrs. Carbuncle," began Sir Griffin, "if you will have the great

kindness not to endeavour to teach me what my conduct should be, now or at any future time, I shall take it as a kindness."

"Sir Griffin, pray don't quarrel with Mrs. Carbuncle," said Lady Eustace.

"Lady Eustace, if Mrs. Carbuncle interferes with me, I shall quarrel with her. I have borne a great deal more of this sort of thing than I like. I am not going to be told this or told that because Mrs. Carbuncle happens to be the aunt of the future Lady Tewett—if it should come to that. I'm not going to marry a whole family, and the less I hear of this kind of thing, the more likely it is that I shall come up to scratch when the time is up."

Then Lucinda rose and spoke. "Sir Griffin Tewett," she said, "there is not the slightest necessity that you should come up—'to scratch.' I wonder that I have not yet been able to make you understand that, if it will suit your convenience to break off our match, it will not in the least interfere with mine. And let me tell you this, Sir Griffin, that any repetition of your unkindness to my aunt will make me utterly refuse to see you again."

"Of course you like her better than you do me."

"A great deal better," said Lucinda.

"If I stand that, I'll be d——d!" said Sir Griffin, leaving the room.

Nevertheless, the matter was smoothed over, and the engagement carried on for months, up to the very eve of the wedding. There are men, as Trollope says, who love a woman as they love a fox—for the pleasure of hunting it to death. Sir Griffin was one of these.

He must have known that the woman despised him and hated him. In the very bottom of his heart he feared her. He had no idea of other pleasure from her society than what might arise to him from the pride of having married a beautiful woman. Had she shown the slightest fondness for him, the slightest fear that she might lose him, the slightest feeling that she had won a valuable prize in getting him, he would have scorned her, and jilted her without the slightest remorse. But the scorn came from her, and it beat him down. "Yes, you hate me, and would fain get rid of me, but you have said that you will be my wife, and you cannot now escape me." Sir Griffin did not exactly speak such words as these, but he acted them. Lucinda would bear his presence—sitting apart from him, silent, imperious, but very beautiful.

This is an extreme case, as we stated at the outset. But it is the extremity of a series, and there are many others leading up to it. When Clara Amedroz commits the imprudence of acknowledging to Captain Aylmer the full extent of her love for him as soon as he has made his first proposal to her, he becomes forthwith so frigid and disagreeable that the very next morning she releases him from his engagement. This action brings back a little

warmth on his part, and by the time she has refused him twice he is really quite unhappy. Frank Greystock, having obtained too full and facile an assurance of love from Lucy Morris (to whom he has betrothed himself), neglects her shamefully, neither seeing her nor writing to her for months, and, indeed, is on the verge of deserting her for his cousin Lizzie Eustace. Harry Clavering takes a step further, and actually does stand engaged to two ladies at the same time. Mr. Crosbie . . . but we will say nothing of him, lest we be accused of selecting the most unworthy characters. Henry Grantly does not make up his mind about Grace Crawley until his father expresses his strong disapproval of the match, but then he instantly decides against his father. Lord Lufton is not seriously enamoured of Lucy Roberts until she has refused him, and even then he does not anticipate sufficient difficulty to make him forget his other irons in the fire—his horses, his hunting, his fishing trip to Norway. Frank Gresham, who is somewhat in a similar predicament with respect to Mary Thorne, finds it quite practicable to spend a year abroad, on a grand tour, without once writing to her. In short, the staunch and ardent lovers—Johnny Eames, Larry Twentiman, John Grey, Lord Chiltern, Arthur Fletcher, Gregory Newton, Roger Carbury, and many others—are those who are being constantly defeated. Their mettle rises before a five-barred gate. They will go at it twice, thrice . . . half-a-dozen times if need be, until they either get over it, or come entirely to grief. “Stick to ’em like wax; there’s nothing like it!” is the usual advice to repulsed suitors. And so they do “stick to ’em.” Again and again they return, not varying their tale, but repeating it each time a little better by the effect of practice. When their case proves hopeless, they will sometimes threaten to take to drinking, or to leading a wild life. Some special hunting or fishing is then prescribed for them, and not without effect. But in the great majority of instances, their perseverance is finally rewarded.

“It is the old story, Violet, and I am so bad at words.”

“I must have been bad at words, too, as I have not been able to make you understand.”

“I think I have understood. But while you are single there must be yet hope;—unless, indeed, you will tell me that you have already given yourself to another man.”

“I have not done that.”

“Then how can I not hope? Violet, I would I could tell you all my feelings plainly. Once, twice, thrice, I have said to myself that I would think of you no more. I have tried to persuade myself that I am better single than married.”

“But I am not the only woman.”

"To me you are—absolutely, as though there were none other on the face of God's earth. I live much alone, but you are always with me. Should you marry any other man, it will be the same with me still. If you refuse me now, I shall go away and live wildly."

"Oswald, what do you mean?"

"I mean that I will go to some distant part of the world, where I may be killed or live a life of adventure. But I shall do so simply in despair. It will not be that I do not know how much better and greater should be the life at home of a man in my position."

"Then do not talk of going."

"I cannot stay. You will acknowledge, Violet, that I have never lied to you. I am thinking of you day and night. The more indifferent you show yourself to me, the more I love you. Violet, try to love me." He came up to her and took her by both her hands, and tears were in his eyes. "Say you will try to love me."

She paused, and looked down, but without withdrawing her hands.

"You used to love me—a little," he said.

"Indeed—indeed I did."

"And now? Is it all changed now?"

"No," she said, retreating from him.

"How is it, then? Violet, speak to me honestly. Will you be my wife?" She did not answer him, and he stood for a moment looking at her. Then he rushed at her, and, seizing her in his arms, kissed her all over—her forehead, her lips, her cheeks, then both her hands, and then her lips again. "By G——, she is my own!" he said. Then he went back to the rug before the fire, and stood there, with his back turned to her.

For the sake of contrast, and to show that our scissors are impartial, we will now recount what took place in the breakfast-room at Ullathorne on the morning after Mr. Arabin had been accepted by Mrs. Bold. It was the first moment since their engagement that the lovers had found themselves alone together.

He came up to her, and taking both her hands in his, he said: "So, Eleanor, you and I are to be man and wife. Is it so?"

She looked up into his face, and her lips formed themselves into a single syllable. She uttered no sound, but he could read the affirmative plainly in her face.

"It is a great trust," said he; "a very great trust."

"It is, it is," said Eleanor, not exactly taking what he had said in the sense that he had meant. "It is a very, very great trust, and I will do my utmost to deserve it."

"And I also will do my utmost to deserve it," said Mr. Arabin, very solemnly. And then, winding his arm round her waist, he stood there gazing at the fire.

Love-making, however, is not the only road to matrimony, and, accordingly, Trollope shows us also a great deal of purely

mercenary matches. Our space will not allow us to dilate upon this portion of our subject; a single extract is all that we can offer. Mr. Melmotte, an unscrupulous adventurer, whose name, at present, stands at the head of great financial enterprises, has promised his daughter to young Lord Nidderdale, the eldest son of the Marquis of Auld Reekie. The negotiations had not been without their difficulties. The Auld Reekie faction had demanded not only half a million, down, in exchange for their nobility, but had insisted upon having the disposal of the money. Melmotte raised no objection to the sum, but proposed to tie it up. "You don't suppose," he had said to the adverse lawyer, "that I am going to entrust half a million of money to such a man as that?" "You are willing to trust your only child to him," replied the lawyer. Melmotte had scowled at the man for a few seconds from under his bushy eyebrows, and then, telling him that his answer had nothing in it, had marched out of the room. The engagement was broken off, but the necessities of Lord Nidderdale were great, and, after a while, the match was set on foot again. The following is an account of Lord Nidderdale's renewed overtures to Marie, after conclusion of the bargain with her father* :—

"Well, Miss Melmotte," he said, "governors are stern beings, are they not?"

"Is yours stern?"

"What I mean is, that sons and daughters must obey them. I think you understand what I mean. I was awfully spooney on you that time before; I was indeed."

"I hope it didn't hurt you much, Lord Nidderdale."

"That's so like a woman, that is. You know well enough that you and I can't marry without leave from our governors."

"Nor with it," said Marie, nodding her head.

"I don't know how that may be. There was some little hitch somewhere, I don't quite know where. But it is all right now. The old fellows are agreed. Can't we make a match of it, Miss Melmotte?"

"No, Lord Nidderdale, I don't think we can."

"Do you mean that?"

"I do mean it. When that was going on before, I knew nothing about it. I have seen more of things since then."

"And you've seen somebody you like better than me?"

"I say nothing about that, Lord Nidderdale. I don't think you ought to blame me, my lord."

"Oh dear no."

"There was something before, but it was you that was off first, wasn't it, now?"

"The governors were off, I think."

* "The Way we Live Now."

"The governors have a right to be off, I suppose. But I don't think any governor has a right to make anybody marry any one."

"I agree with you there, I do indeed," said Lord Nidderdale.

"And no governor shall make me marry. I've thought a great deal about it since that other time, and that is what I have come to determine."

"But I don't know why you shouldn't—just marry me—because—you like me."

"Only—just because I don't. Well, I do like you, Lord Nidderdale."

"Thanks—so much."

"I like you ever so—only marrying a person is different."

"There's something in that, to be sure."

"And I don't mind telling you," said Marie, with an almost solemn expression in her countenance, "because you are good-natured, and won't get me into a scrape if you can help it, that I like somebody else—oh, so much!"

"I supposed that was it."

"That is it."

"It's a deuced pity. The governors had settled everything, and we should have been awfully jolly. I'd have gone in for all the things you go in for, and, though your governor was screwing us up a bit, there would have been plenty of tin to go on with. You couldn't think of it again?"

"I tell you, my lord, I'm in love."

"Oh, ah, yes, so you were saying. It's an awful bore, that's all. I shall come to the party all the same if you send me a ticket."

Now for the sequel. Marie attempts to elope with the man she loves—a heartless, drunken wretch—and is stopped by the police at Liverpool. The story gets abroad—just what poor Marie tried to do—and, although Melmotte treats it as a mere childish freak, it causes some delay in the renewal of Lord Nidderdale's advances. Meanwhile, Melmotte's ruin is approaching fast; there are rumours that he has committed forgery and is about to be arrested. It is under these circumstances that Lord Nidderdale breakfasts with the Marquis of Auld Reekie.

When Lord Nidderdale entered the breakfast-room, he found his father already buttering his toast.

"I don't believe you'd get out of bed a moment sooner than you liked if you could save the whole property by it."

"You show me how I can earn a guinea by it, sir, and see if I don't earn the money." Then he sat down and poured himself out a cup of tea, and looked at the kidneys and looked at the fish.

"I suppose you were drinking last night," said the old lord.

"Not particular." The old lord turned round and gnashed his teeth at him. "The fact is, sir, I don't drink; everybody knows that."

"I know when you're in the country you can't live without champagne. Well, what have you got to say about all this?"

"What have you got to say?"

"You've made a pretty kettle of fish of it."

"I've been guided by you in everything. Come, now, you ought to own that. I suppose the whole thing is over?"

"I don't see why it should be over. I'm told she has got her own money." Then Lord Nidderdale described to his father Melmotte's behaviour in the House on the preceding evening. (He had come there perfectly drunk.) "What the devil does that matter?" said the old man. "You're not going to marry the man himself."

"I shouldn't wonder if he's in gaol now."

"And what does that matter? She's not in gaol. And if the money is hers, she can't lose it because he goes to prison. Beggars mustn't be choosers. How do you mean to live, if you don't marry this girl?"

"I shall scrape on, I suppose; I must look for somebody else." The Marquis showed very plainly by his countenance that he did not give his son much credit either for diligence or ingenuity in making such a search. "At any rate, sir, I can't marry the daughter of a man who is to be put upon his trial for forgery."

"I can't see what that has to do with you."

"I couldn't do it, sir. I'd do anything else to oblige you, but I couldn't do that. And, moreover, I don't believe in the money."

"Then you may just go to the devil," said the old Marquis, turning round in his chair and lighting a cigar as he took up the newspaper.

Nidderdale went on with his breakfast with perfect equanimity, and, when he had finished, lighted his cigar.

"They tell me," said the old man, "that one of those Goldheimer girls will have a lot of money."

"A Jewess," suggested Nidderdale.

"What difference does that make?"

"Oh, no, not in the least—if the money's really there. Have you heard any sum named, sir?" The old man only grunted. "There are two sisters and two brothers. I don't suppose the girls would have a hundred thousand each."

"They say the widow of the brewer who died the other day has about £20,000 a year."

"It's only for her life, sir."

"She could insure her life. D—— me, sir, we must do something. If you turn up your nose at one woman after another, how do you mean to live?"

"I don't think that a woman of forty with only a life interest would be a good speculation. Of course, I'll think of it if you press it." The old man growled again. "You see, sir, I've been so much in earnest about this girl that I haven't thought about inquiring about any one else. There always is some one up with a lot of money. It's a pity there shouldn't be a regular statement published with the amount

of money and what is expected in return. It would save a great deal of trouble."

"If you can't talk more seriously than that you had better go away," said the old Marquis.

At that moment a footman came into the room and told Lord Nidderdale that a man particularly wished to see him in the hall. "I believe, my lord, he's one of the domestics from Mr. Melmotte, in Bruton Street," said the footman.

"You'd better go and see," said the old Marquis.

"Go and see Melmotte?"

"Why should you be afraid to see him? Tell him that you are ready to marry the girl if you can see the money down, but that you won't stir a step until it has been actually paid over."

"He knows that already," said Lord Nidderdale as he left the room.

Melmotte was at that time lying dead in his own house (having taken poison in the early morning), and the man had brought a note from Marie, begging Lord Nidderdale to come over.

The Marquis thought that his son had better not go over to Bruton Street. "What's the use? What good can you do? She'll only be falling into your arms, and that's what you've got to avoid—at any rate till you know how things are."

Lord Nidderdale, however, declared that he must go.

"Don't you go and make a fool of yourself," his father said to him when they were alone. "This is just one of those times when a man may ruin himself by being soft-hearted."

If Trollopé's observation may be trusted as to the way in which money marriages are negotiated, and haggled over, in England, it must be conceded, we think, that England in this respect stands behind her civilized neighbours. Doubtless, the same things are done in other countries, but they are better *managed*. The *modus operandi* is not so crude, so gross; the outward decencies of social life are not so violated. "More hypocrisy," you will say. Well, be it so; hypocrisy is at least the tribute paid by vice unto virtue. One is tempted to think that Trollope, who speaks so complacently on various occasions of the lesson which, like a snake in the grass, lies concealed within his tales, was disposed to stretch a point in order to make these mercenary marriages as repulsive as possible. We believe, however, after due consideration, that this hypothesis would be erroneous, and that Trollope, on this point, as perhaps on many others, was better than his theory. The grossness with which the matrimonial barter is conducted is, after all, in perfect keeping with the rest of the play. None of Trollope's characters are distinguished by any great delicacy of feeling; none of his male characters are *gentlemen* in a high sense of the word. Mr. Palliser, for instance, whose portrait is very fully drawn, and who is certainly intended by Trollope to represent a thorough

gentleman, does not scruple for a moment to behave rudely to a lady in his own house when that lady, as he thinks, has given him reason for displeasure. Self-restraint is a very different thing from reserve, and, while there is abundance of the latter in Trollope's characters, there is next to nothing of the former. Almost all the men we have been passing in review are self-willed, persistent in desire, unsocial, and indifferent at bottom to feelings which do not consort with their own, impatient of trammels, and brutal when resisted. To borrow again an illustration from the hunting-field, they will jostle each other rudely at a gate, and care little how a neighbour's thigh is jammed against a post providing that they themselves can "get well off." No wonder that such men, when once they have set their minds upon the capture of a lady's money-bag, set about their work squarely, untutored in (perhaps disdainful of) those little graces which would help to disguise the real nature of the operation.

"I don't pretend to be very much in love with her," says Bernard Dale to Crosbie, speaking of his cousin Bella.* "It's not my way, you know. But some of these days I shall ask her to have me, and I suppose it will all go right. The governor has distinctly promised to allow me £800 a year off the estate, and to take us in for three months every year if we wish it. I told him simply that I couldn't do it for less, and he agreed with me."

We cannot refrain from quoting this other fragment, which is one of the best in all Trollope. Captain Archie Clavering is desirous of wooing Lady Ongar (just left a widow, with a beautiful house and £7,000 a year), and he seeks advice from his friend Captain Boodle (familiarily called Doodles) as to the best way of setting about it:†—

"Well, now, Clavvy, I'll tell you what my ideas are. When a man's trying a young filly, his hand can't be too light. A touch too much will bring her on her haunches, or throw her out of her step. She should hardly feel the iron in her mouth. But when I've got to do with a trained mare, I always choose that she shall know that I'm there. D'ye hear me, Clavvy?"

"Yes, Doodles, I understand you."

"I always choose that she shall know that I'm there." And Captain Boodle, as he repeated these manly words with a firm voice, put out his hands as though he were handling the horse's rein. "Their mouths are never so fine then, and they generally want to be brought up to the bit, d'ye see?—up to the bit. When a mare has been trained to her work, and knows what she's at in her running, she's all the better for feeling a fellow's hands as she's going. She likes it

* "The Small House at Allington."

† "The Claverings."

rather. It gives her confidence, and makes her know where she is. And look here, Clavvy, when she comes to her fences, give her her head, but steady her first and make her know that you're there. Damme, whatever you do, make her know that you're there. There's nothing like it. She'll think all the more of the fellow who's piloting her. And look here, Clavvy, always ride a trained mare with spurs. Let her know that they're on, and, if she tries to get her head, give them to her. Yes, by George, give them to her." And Captain Boodle in his energy twisted himself in his chair, and brought his heel round so that it could be seen by Archie. Then he produced a sharp click with his tongue, and made the peculiar jerk with the muscles of his legs whereby he was accustomed to evoke the agility of his horses. After that, he looked triumphantly at his friend. "Give 'em her, Clavvy, and she'll like you the better for it. She'll know then that you mean it."

We have but little more to say, for all the essential traits of Trollope's characters may be discerned in the preceding extracts. Nevertheless, as we have found ample occasion hitherto for criticism of a somewhat adverse kind, we are unwilling to bring this paper to its close without some recognition of what we consider to be the good points in Trollope's Englishmen. That they are conscientious—*i.e.*, observant of the moral law as far as it comes within the narrow limits of their cognizance—is undeniable. Their conscience is neither elevated nor refined; still less is it reasoned and consistent. The Rev. Josiah Crawley—who seems to be the nearest approach to a religious clergyman that Trollope's genius would permit—is incapable of using a cheque that he does not consider honestly his own, but he does not scruple to buy meat for which he knows he cannot pay. Archdeacon Grantly is quite content to defend Church property by legal quibbles, and considers it as mere senile weakness in his brother clergyman, Mr. Harding, that the latter should question the moral propriety of a position which the lawyers declare to be practically unassailable.* Lord Cantrip, who seems to be intended for a man of the highest standing in all respects, seriously advises Phineas Finn to break a pledge publicly given, rather than sacrifice his position in the Government; and Barrington Earle, speaking on the same subject, declares emphatically that of all men most unfit for parliamentary

* Mr. Harding, as warden of Hiram's Hospital, receives £800 a year for superintending the maintenance of twelve old paupers on one shilling and fourpence a day. It is characteristic of the level of morality in Trollope's novels that Mr. Harding, who stands in this respect so exceptionally high, relinquishes his wardenship much more in consequence of newspaper attacks than in consequence of any scruples of his own. It is intolerable to him that such articles as those of the *Jupiter* should be diffused throughout the country.

usefulness, the man who has a conscience is the worst. "Vote with your party, and don't strain at what other men swallow," such is the general sentiment. "What are you that you should set up to be purer and wiser than others?" Trollope himself feels so strongly on this subject that he casts impersonality to the winds, and steps forward on the stage with his own puppets. He is clearly of opinion that a great deal too much fuss may be made about purity in political campaigns, and that the Members of Parliament who insisted upon recalling Mr. Romer * from a Government mission because that gentleman had been convicted of bribing at elections, were little better than whited sepulchres. And so, indeed, they probably were, if Trollope's estimate of political honesty in England may be trusted. He looks upon reformers generally as one of the most distressing pestilences with which society is visited, and loses no opportunity of pointing to their indiscreetness, their presumption and their vanity. His morality—by which we mean of course the lesson developed out of the action of his principal characters—is entirely of that average matter-of-fact kind which looks first and last to consequences. Pay your debts, or you will get into trouble with the bailiffs; put your name to no bills; keep yourself from the money-lenders; consort not with gamblers and with blacklegs, or you may wake up, on the morning of a race, to find that a nail has been driven into your horse's foot; be moderate in your cups, or your nose will become red and your face bloated; sell not your hand in marriage for a title or the hope of an old man's inheritance, for you will either miss your object or find that it was not worth the cost; and remember that when you have behaved like a scoundrel for the sake of "bettering" yourself, you run the risk of being assaulted by a stranger on a railway platform, or belaboured with a riding-whip as you sally forth unsuspectingly from your club. But Anthony Trollope as a moralist is a subject of itself, a subject far too interesting and deserving to be disposed of summarily, and we beg therefore to reserve it for a more convenient season.

The atmosphere of his novels is certainly healthy, and the defects it favours are at least not those of a nation in decline. His characters, as a rule, are manly and straightforward: candid in their speech, open in their dealings, faithful to their engagements. But their prime virtue—the virtue which redeems the grosser parts, and enables us to understand that a nation so constituted should, after all, rank high among the nations of the earth—is their indomitable perseverance and tenacity. This is a quality which Trollope excels in exhibiting, and very few of

* "Dr. Thorne."

his characters will be found without it. It shines forth alike in the women and the men, in the old and in the young, in the good and in the bad; its manifestations are generally unamiable, frequently irrational, sometimes morbid and verging on insanity; but however you may judge it, *there it is*, and its grip is like that of the military ant.* Opposition serves but to rivet the purpose; indeed, it is one of the best lessons taught by Trollope that if a father wants to bind his son irrevocably to a young woman, he has no safer course than to warn his boy affectionately against the match, and perhaps throw in a hint of disinheritance in case the warning should be disregarded. If this will not bring it about, then nothing will. And the women are even more determined than the men. They will not move first in the matter; they will maintain their maidenly reserve, unflinchingly, until the suitor, in distinct and businesslike terms, has made his offer of legal matrimony; but when this has been effected, and when once their little hand has touched the palm outstretched for its reception, not all the king's horses will drag them from their fealty. They do not deny their "duty" to their parents, but this duty is evidently a very circumscribed and second-rate affair as compared with their "duty" to their lover.† "No consideration on earth shall make me say that I give him up," says Emily Hotspur to her mother. "If you and papa tell me not to see him or write to him—much less to marry him—of course I shall obey you. But I shall not give him up a bit the more, and he must not be told that I will give him up."

In a great majority of cases this tenacity is finally successful. Indeed, it would seem as though Trollope found it impossible to be hard-hearted, as a novelist, towards those who excelled in this

* It is said that in certain parts of South America, the natives use ants to sew up wounds. The lips of the wound having been brought together, an ant is applied, which immediately drives in its mandibles on either side. The ant is then beheaded, but the jaws remain closed and thus fulfil the function of a stitch.

† It is amusing to observe how constantly this phraseology recurs, and how necessary the idea of moral *compulsion* is to these strong-willed characters. When John Grey makes his final declaration to Alice Vavasor (in "Can You Forgive Her") he tells her that if she loves him, it is her *duty* to say so. His happiness requires it and he has a *right to demand* her compliance. If she refuse, she will be unable to reconcile it to her conscience before God!

When the Marquis of Brotherton (in "Is he Popenjoy") returns to his country-seat in England after many years' residence abroad, he not only ousts his mother and sisters from the house they have inhabited so long, but wants to drive them entirely out of his neighbourhood. Lady Sarah remonstrates with her brother as to the inhumanity of an act which would sever all their social ties, and put an end to all their wonted occupations. "*Where shall we find new duties?*" she exclaims. "Trash, d——d nonsense!" replies the courtly marquis.

darling quality of his. He had always some sugarplum in his pocket for those who would hold out long enough. When poor Mr. Crawley,* at the height of his misfortune, is about to be brought before the Assizes to account for the stolen cheque which has been found in his possession—when misery has settled on his family; when privation and illness have destroyed the balance of his mind, and terrible disgrace now stares him in the face—he wanders forth among the poorest of his Hogglesstock parishioners to seek for some spark of consolation and advice. He meets with an old brickmaker of the name of Hoggett, who administers as follows the necessary cordial:—

“Tell ‘ee what, Master Crawley—and your reverence mustn’t think as I means to be preaching; there ain’t nowt a man can’t bear if he’ll only be dogged. It’s dogged as does it. It ain’t thinking about it.” Then Giles Hoggett withdrew his hand from the clergyman’s, and walked away towards his own home at Hoggles End.

“*It’s dogged as does it.*” Mr. Crawley took the maxim to heart and acted on it. It is not stated that he took any other measures, besides being dogged, to relieve his position; indeed we know positively that he took none, but he was dogged and that was sufficient. The wheel of fortune came round; his innocence was made manifest; sympathies poured in upon him from all sides; an excellent living was bestowed upon him, and he and his family lived happy ever afterwards. It was dogged that did it. He had been faithful to this one great English quality, and lo! all other things were added unto him.

In thinking over the many pleasant remembrances for which he is indebted to Anthony Trollope, the present writer has often been reminded of a remark once made to him by one of the greatest chess-players of this age, a man remarkable for acuteness and subtlety of intellect. It was in 1878, during the International Chess Tournament in Paris; the conversation had turned upon chess, and the present writer had remarked that England held an honourable rank among the votaries of that noble game. “Yes,” said Mr. * * * * “the English have fine minds.” And then, instantly correcting himself: “No,” he added, “NOT FINE (with an emphasis on this last word), BUT STRONG.” Whether this criticism be correct, or not, of Englishmen in general, we think that it is at least signally true of those Englishmen whom Trollope has portrayed. It applies to their moral no less than to their intellectual qualities. Not fine, but strong. There is certainly no fineness in their intellectual organization; they are heavy and disinclined to any

* “The Last Chronicle of Barset.”

mental activity outside of the task which they have allotted to themselves ; averse to speculation or discussion ; distrustful of generalities, and "hugging the coast" of practical detail ; tenacious of their convictions, but unwilling to account for them ; slow of perception and rejoinder, unskilful in argument, irascible in controversy, bitter and cutting in their retorts. They are essentially matter-of-fact, unimaginative, and blunt of æsthetic sensibility ; their minds lack playfulness and spring, they have to work even at their pleasures, and nothing seems to come easily to them. They are company neither to themselves nor to others : moody when alone, unsociable when together, guarded in manner and in speech. Nor is there any fineness in their moral nature ; they have neither cheerfulness of disposition nor serenity of temper ; they frequently incline to crossness as they grow old, and will become surly—nay, savage—on slight provocation. They are not remarkable for benevolence, and they lack signally that quality which may often serve in lieu of benevolence—the desire to please. They entertain largely, but in a measured, calculating way ; they tax themselves heavily for the sake of society, but do so rather because it is expected of them than from any pleasure they derive from it, and their hospitality lacks that genial heartiness which constitutes its chief value and its greatest charm. They are cold in their family relations, divided in interest from their next of kin ; unimpulsive and reserved ; ashamed of any display of emotion as of a weakness, and careful to preserve an even demeanour both in sorrow and in joy. Jealous of their independence, resentful of the slightest interference with their liberty, conservative of their habits and their comforts, they look distrustfully upon any approach that may become a claim, and ponder every sacrifice before they make it. They are proud and sensitive, thinking much of their own rights and not unmindful of the rights of others ; respectful of legality, exacting of their dues ; conventional and sticklers for observances ; unforgiving and prone to brood over their grievances. Duty is a call to which they all respond, but their conception of duty is as of a taskmaster, and though they do not flinch from its burdens, they feel them to be heavy. Altogether their life is a material one, and such justification as it can claim must evidently be that of *works*. They are not sensual, and are much more addicted to horses than to women ; so that, for the many who place morality almost exclusively in the relations between the sexes, Trollope's Englishmen may deserve much commendation ; but for us who believe that morality consists in acting uniformly by the highest motive, the status exhibited in Trollope's novels is anything but satisfactory.

On the other hand, if we find little that is fine, we recognize much that we acknowledge to be strong. These characters are strong in their desires, strong in practical sense and the energy of their pursuits; strong above all in undaunted perseverance and tenacity. They are *game* to the backbone. They are not only *capable* of work, both physically and mentally, but *impelled* to it, *riveted* to it by their constitution. Activity is as the breath of their nostrils; they are sick and disconsolate without it. They are an embodiment of the saying—"Whatever thy hand findeth to do, do it with all thy might." They carry it into their amusements no less than into their business. Their very deficiencies serve them, for they lose no time in reveries and abstractions, and are not drawn away from practice into theory. They go right on with the work in hand, instead of sitting down with the philosopher under a hedge, and listening to the melodious thrush, or watching the shadows that chase each other over the hills. Such qualities go far to constitute a nation great in practical achievements. And they are strong also in their sense of duty, their respect of law, their recognition of established usages. Their formalism, their conventionality, is a useful corrective of their unsociability and keeps their independence within bounds. Even their worldliness and snobbishness have a valuable side, inasmuch as they strengthen the hands of society and counteract the separatist tendencies. Finally, they are strong in manliness, in truthfulness, in respect of the given word. Such qualities as these constitute so excellent a foundation for the moral character that any deficiencies in the superstructure may be considered as secondary and as remediable.

We must close here our review of Trollope's Englishmen. It was intended, originally, to include in this paper some mention of Trollope's female characters, but the work has so grown beneath our pen that this portion of it must be reserved for some future occasion. Neither can we stay to examine into our author's personal bias, as disclosed in his writings, and inquire how far the accuracy of his descriptions, or perhaps, rather the selection of the characters he has described, may have been influenced by his own predilections and deficiencies. Just as, in astronomical observations, corrections are always made for the imperfections of the instrument, the aberration of the visual rays, so, in observations upon human character, it is indispensable to make allowance for the idiosyncrasies of the observer. We stated at the beginning of this paper—and we beg leave to repeat it now—that we should greatly regret if Trollope's delineation of English society were to be accepted unreservedly. We believe that he depicted truly what he saw, but we believe

also that he had no eye for certain of the higher, finer elements of human nature. His observations need to be extended and completed by being taken in conjunction with those of greater novelists, such as Thackeray, George Eliot, Mrs. Gaskell. Trollope, of course, was utterly unconscious of any colour-blindness on his part: he stoutly believed that Englishmen, such as he portrayed, are in all respects the finest fellows on the face of the earth, and would have scorned, as idealism, the suggestion of anything remiss. It was this confidence which saved him. Thackeray—dear old Thackeray—was denounced in his life-time as a cynic (!), and there are even nowadays many readers who declare that his view of human nature is distressingly gloomy. We have never heard a like reproach addressed to Trollope, and yet, to our mind, Trollope's pictures of English character are far more unfavourable than Thackeray's. But we have already exceeded so far the ordinary limits of articles in this REVIEW that all such corrections must be left to our readers.



ART. IV.—THE MATERIALS OF EARLY RUSSIAN HISTORY.

1. *Chronique, dite de Nestor, traduite sur le texte Slavon-Russe, avec Introduction et Commentaire Critique.* Par LOUIS LEGER, Professeur à l'École des Langues Orientales Vivantes. Paris: 1884.
2. *Polnoe Sobranie Rousskikh Lietopisei* (Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles). St. Petersburg: 1846.
3. *K. Bestuzhev-Rioumin Rousskaia Istoria* (Russian History). Vol. I. St. Petersburg: 1872.

IN publishing his translation of the Chronicle commonly attributed to the monk Nestor, M. Louis Leger has conferred a signal benefit upon all students in the western parts of Europe. We say *western* advisedly, because two excellent translations already exist in Cech and Polish, quite up to the level of the most recent scholarship; these, however, are languages almost unknown to Englishmen and Frenchmen, and such versions are to them merely *ignotum per ignotiora*. Up to the present time no English translation of this interesting work has been published, and we are afraid there is but little encouragement for the undertaking of anything of the kind! Of the version into French made by M. Louis Paris (Paris, 1834), M. Leger speaks very contemptuously; we have not seen it, but from his remarks

we can see that his depreciation is well-founded. It was probably made from the German of Scherer, now antiquated, as well as the other versions in that language by Müller and Schlözer. The latter work, however, we are inclined to think M. Leger speaks too severely of; it has long enjoyed considerable reputation, and has some merit. The Russians themselves always cite it with praise. Mention must also be made of the edition of Miklosich, whose name alone is a guarantee of its thoroughness. Besides his critical edition Miklosich has also published a very valuable paper on the language of Nestor ("Die Sprache der Aeltesten Russischen Chronisten, vorzüglich Nestors"). Lastly, there is an excellent Danish edition, with a translation, published at Copenhagen in 1869 by the late Professor Smith, a scholar presumably of English origin, who, although but little known to the literary world, was a sound Slavist and the author of some valuable works. Unfortunately the Danish language is but little studied in this country, so that M. Leger has the field all to himself. Let us now inquire into (1) What is known of Nestor? (2) On what authority this Chronicle has been assigned to him. Of Nestor but little is known with certainty. He is supposed to have been a monk of the Pestcherskaia Lavra at Kiev, in the time of the Igoumen Theodosius, whose life he has written. He was born about 1056 and died about 1114. They still profess to show his embalmed remains in the catacombs of the monastery to which he belonged, and an engraving of them will be found in Polevoi's "History of Russian Literature," a useful book, written in a popular style, and containing a great deal of information. But the city in which he lies buried is of too interesting a character to be lightly passed over. Perhaps few persons, except those who have busied themselves with the details of Russian history, have realized with what reverence the Slavs look upon Kiev as the cradle of their race and religion. It is an exceedingly picturesque city, rising on several lofty hills above the Dnieper, and is annually visited by a great number of pilgrims. The feelings with which this city is regarded by Russians are not inelegantly expressed in a little piece by Koslov, one of the minor Russian poets, whose works are now but little read but are not without merit:*

O! Kiev where religion ever seemeth
To light existence in our native land,

* I have taken the verses from the translation made by the late Thomas Shaw, who, about forty years ago, published in *Blackwood's Magazine* some very meritorious versions from Poushkin and other poets, at a time when Russian literature was absolutely ignored in this country. And indeed matters are not much better now.

Where o'er Pestcherski's dome the bright sun gleameth
 Like some fair star that still in heaven doth stand.
 Where, like a golden sheet around thee streameth.
 Thy plain and meeds, that-far away expand,¹
 And by thy hoary wall with ceaseless motion
 Old Dnieper's foaming swell sweeps on to ocean.

How oft to thee in spirit have I panted
 O holy city! country of my heart;
 How oft in visions have I gazed enchanted
 On thy fair towers—a sainted thing thou art.
 By Lavra's walls, or Dnieper's waves, nor wanted
 A spell to draw me from this life apart,
 In thee my country I behold victorious
 Holy and beautiful and great and glorious.

With Kiev are associated the deeds of Vladimir, the "bright sun" of the *bilini*. We shall shortly see how prominently it figures in the Chronicles.

(2). We now come to the second point in the question relating to Nestor; on what authority has this Chronicle been assigned to him? Till quite recently there was no dispute in the matter, and even now nothing further seems to be shown than that, perhaps, the Chronicle was written by a monk whose name was not Nestor, but, whoever that monk may have been, we know nothing about him. The chief reason for thinking that it cannot be by Nestor is that it contains contradictions to statements in the lives of the Igoumen Theodosius and those of Boris and Gleb, the martyrs, which are known to have been written by Nestor. These are quoted by M. Leger in his interesting preface. The author of the life of Theodosius says distinctly that he came to the Pestcherski monastery after the death of Theodosius in the time of his successor Stephen, but the author of the Chronicle states that when he came there he found Theodosius still alive. Perhaps, however, minutiae of this sort must not be insisted upon in a book which is essentially a kind of patchwork, and in many other places inconsistent, as will be afterwards shown. Writers of the calibre of Bouslaev still adhere to the view that Nestor was the author of the Chronicle called after his name.* On the other hand Professor Bestouzhnev-Rioumin in his "History of Russia," cited at the beginning of our article, seems to think it at least doubtful, and M. Leger has evidently made himself familiar with his pages. The chronicle was certainly written about the end of the eleventh and the beginning of the twelfth century. Unfortunately none of the manuscripts are contemporary, but the invasions of the Tatars must have caused many valuable docu-

* "Rousskaia Khristomatia" (Russian Chrestomathy), p. 22.

ments to have been destroyed, just as the Turks have done with the libraries in the cloisters of Servia and Bulgaria. The earliest manuscripts of this interesting Chronicle are (1) the Laurentian (*Lavrentievski*), so called after the monk Lavrentii, Laurence, who wrote it in the year 1370, as is to be seen from the introduction prefixed, and (2) the Ipatievski, so called after the Ipatievski Monastery at Kostroma, where it was preserved. Scholars assign this last manuscript to the end of the fourteenth and the beginning of the fifteenth century.

The writer could describe, as an eye-witness, the reigns of Vsevolod and Sviatopolk (1078-1112), but he learned many interesting stories from a merchant Giorata Rogovich, and an old man named Jan, grandson of Ostromir, the *Posadnik* of Novgorod, for whom the celebrated Codex was written. The style of our Chronicle is very confused, and many of the statements inconsistent; it is altogether in the *λέξις ειρομένη*. In fact it is a chronicle only, and a chronicle in a rude form. Many passages are difficult to render intelligible, and ingenious emendations have been suggested by previous editors, especially the Bohemian Erben. M. Leger courageously pieces together some of these *dissecta membra*, and reduces order from the chaos. Whatever may be the faults in a literary point of view, the Chronicle must always be of great value to the historian and ethnologist, and is important not only for Russian history, but for that of the surrounding peoples. Nor is it a dull or tedious production, except in a few parts, where, perhaps, we have too much sermonizing. There is an Herodotean flavour about many of the stories. If Froissart has been called the mediæval Herodotus, we may call Nestor the Slavonic, it must be confessed, however, *magno intervallo*. The rich humour frequently found in the Father of History is here wholly wanting. The narrative is often very picturesque and dramatic, and there can be little doubt that many *bilini*, or legendary poems, with which Russia abounds, have been incorporated, such as the story of Oleg and his horse, and the vengeance of Olga on the Drevlians and the burning of their city. Parallels are found to these tales in the old Norse Sagas, as will be shortly shown.

In order to give our readers some idea of the contents of this curious book, let us take some of the earlier chapters, which either contain salient historical details or amusing stories. The first chapter is occupied with an account of the distributions of peoples according to the sons of Shem, Ham, and Japhet. We are told, when we come to the descendants of the last of the three brothers, "The Chouds, (Finns) are settled on the Varangian Sea (probably the Baltic). By this sea are settled the Varangians in the direction of the east, towards the heritage of Shem; by the

same sea, in the direction of the west, they extend to the land of the English and the Vlakhs." By the Vlakhs are here meant Italians, of the German *Welschland*. Upon this word M. Leger has a learned note, showing the wide extent of its use. We may compare also the name of Wales. In fact, the large index appended to his translation is full of valuable information both on ethnological and philological subjects. The interesting name Varangian has been fully discussed by Professor Thomsen in his "Relations between Ancient Russia and Scandinavia" (Oxford, 1877), a most suggestive work. He holds them to have been Scandinavians; others, however, including Mr. Hyde Clarke, take them to have been Anglo-Saxons, relying upon the connection between Angli and Varini in Tacitus. The third chapter of the Chronicle contains a valuable enumeration of the various Slavonic peoples, and here again the notes of M. Leger will be found full of interest. But it would be impossible to discuss these in the pages of a review, where our space is limited. An attempt at grouping the Slavs, as existing at the present day, will be found in the work entitled "Early Slavonic Literature," published about a year ago by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Explanations are also given of the chief names by which the families are distinguished.

The fifth chapter gives the strange legend of the Apostle Andrew, and how he visited Kiev, where a church now stands founded in his honour. A curious description is then given of the baths in use among the Russians, and how St. Andrew was astonished thereat. The tenth chapter gives a variety of details concerning the customs of the Poliani, the Drevliani, the Radimichi and other Slavonic tribes, now lost in the general appellation of Russians, or at best only having left their names here and there in some town or village. We are told: "the Poliani have the gentle and modest manners of their ancestors: they have respect for their nieces, sisters, mothers and parents." On the other hand, many bad things are said of the Drevlians and others, who play diabolical games and burn their dead, celebrating the ceremony by a great *trizna*, or funeral feast. That some of the ancient Slavs burnt their dead we know from the stories of Arabian travellers,* some of whose most important narrations have been collected by Bielowski, in the first volume of his great work, "Monumenta Poloniæ Historica."

The text of Nestor, contained in this book, has been used by us for the present article: as previously mentioned, a Polish

* We may mention *en passant* that M. Pipin, in a very interesting article in the *European Messenger* (Nov. 1884, p. 261), is inclined to think that the words "Rous" and Russian were used very loosely in early times, and that by some of these people North-Eastern Finns may be meant.

translation has also been published by this author. The *trizna* may be compared with the "wakes" and other funeral feasts customary among early people: we shall soon have a very dramatic story on the subject in connection with Olga.

The eleventh chapter is a translation from the chronicle of George Hamartolus (the Sinner), a version of whose writings forms a valuable part of old Bulgarian literature. Allusions to these sources, from which many of the chroniclers drew, will be made in a latter portion of this article. It will suffice to say here that Nestor, or whoever was the author of the present chronicle, must have been well acquainted with Byzantine writers. He also makes use of the works of John Malalas.

In the twelfth chapter the description of the battles between the Polianes and Kozars is curious. The latter appear to have been of the same race as the Bulgarians, who lived on the Volga. The capital of this latter people, Bolgari, is still shown, and it is they who, by a subsequent immigration, have given their name to the modern Bulgarians, now dwelling south of the Danube. M. Leger, says: "From the commencement of the tenth century their power begins to diminish: they settle in the Crimea and Caucasus, and finally disappear." Many of them seem to have been converted to Judaism.

The fifteenth chapter is one of the most important in the whole volume. It gives an account of the arrival of the three brothers, Rourik, Sineous and Truvor—the Varangians who founded the Russian Empire. It is probably well known to the majority of our readers, that the most plausible derivation which has been given of the name Russia, Rouse, is from the Finnish name for the Swedes, Ruotsi, which Professor Thomsen believes to be a modification of the first syllable of the Swedish word *rothsmenn* or *rothskarlar*, sea-farers. In all the old books the word for Russia is Rous, the form Rossia seems to have been introduced late, having been formed on Greek analogy. M. Leger has here a note of great value, in which the subject is discussed with much minuteness.

In the sixteenth chapter we are told how two Varangian princes, who had established themselves at Kiev, went on an expedition against Constantinople, but their fleet was miraculously dispersed by the aid of the cloak of the Virgin Mary. Rourik now dies and commits the care of the kingdom to Oleg, who is first mentioned in a very indefinite manner, for we are merely told that he was of the family of Rourik (*Ot roda yemou*). He afterwards, however, becomes a great hero, as we shall see. According to Thomsen this is the Norse name Helgi. To Oleg Rourik commits the guardianship of his young son Igor. Some think that he took the sceptre according to Slavonic custom, by

which the chief's brother succeeded, before the son,* as is still the case with the Turks, and was so long practised in England, thus it was, no doubt, upon some such rule that John, in English history, ventured to thrust himself upon the English crown in the place of his nephew Arthur. The chief performs his trust excellently, as we shall see further on, contrary to what we should have expected, and what would have been more in keeping with the manners of the times—that he would have caused him to be put to death. Soon afterwards Oleg goes to Kiev, and there kills Askold and Dir, declaring that Kiev shall be the mother of Russian cities, and as such we know that it is regarded even at the present day. We now have a digression in the chronicle in which the well-worn story of the conversion of the Slavs by Cyril and Methodius is told. This is too tedious a question to enter upon here, and probably could not be made interesting to the general reader. Who these missionaries were, what was the field of their labours, and what is the proper name for the language in which they executed their celebrated version of the Bible, are points still forming matters of controversy. We are now told (chap. xxi.) how Igor reached man's estate, and married a woman of Pskov, named Olga. Pskov, probably meaning "the Sandy," as M. Leger asserts with great probability, is an interesting city in the north of Russia, near which is buried Poushkin, the national poet. Oleg leaves Igor at Kiev and goes on an expedition against Constantinople. The chronicler is very diffuse in the accounts which he gives of the cruelties inflicted by the Russian chief and his companions. Oleg signed a treaty with the Greek Emperor Leo, and in derision fixed his shield on the gates of the city, an omen of the constant attacks which his successors were to make upon it. This event has formed the subject of a pretty poem by Poushkin.

The terms of the treaty are preserved in the Chronicle of Nestor: there seems to be no reason to doubt the genuineness of the document, for at that time, as Miklosich observes, it would have been impossible to forge the Norse names which are found in abundance, and furnish another proof of the truth of the Scandinavian theory which Gedeonov, Zabelin, Ilovaiski and others have in vain attempted to upset. We are told that the Russians swore by Peroun, (the god of thunder), and Volos (the god of battle), the latter of whom has become St. Blasius among the modern Slavs. Of Peroun we shall have something to say afterwards. Oleg enjoys the surname of Viestchi, which M.

* See Ralston, "Early Russian History," p. 15. † We take the opportunity of recommending this excellent little book, in which much information is conveyed in a very interesting manner.

Leger in one passage translates the magician, and in another the great ; the former of these two translations is certainly the most correct.

With the death of this bold warrior is connected a fine legend, which we will here give in a literal translation, imitating as far as possible the antique style of the original :

And Oleg lived, having peace on all sides, ruling in Kiev. And Oleg remembered his horse, whom he had entrusted to others to feed, himself never seeing him. For a long time ago he had asked the wizards and magicians, "From whom is it fated that I should die?" And one of the magicians said to him, "Prince, the horse which thou lovest and upon which thou ridest shall be the cause of thy death." Oleg receiving this into his mind said, "I will never ride the horse nor see him more." And he ordered them to take care of the horse, but never to bring it to him again ; and many years passed, and he rode him no more, and he went among the Greeks. And he returned to Kiev, and stayed there four years, and in the fifth he remembered his horse, by whom the soothsayers had predicted that Oleg would die, and having called the oldest of his grooms he said, "Where is my horse which I enjoined you to feed and take care of?" And they said, "He is dead." And Oleg laughed and found fault with the soothsayer and said, "The wizard spoke falsely and it is all a lie ; the horse is dead, and I am alive." And he ordered them to saddle his steed for he wished to see the bones of the horse. And he came to the place where the bones and the skull lay unburied. And he leaped from his steed and said with a smile, "How can a skull be the cause of my death?" And he planted his foot on the skull, and out darted a snake and bit him on the foot, and from the wound he fell sick and died. And all the people lamented with great lamentation, and carried him and buried him on the mountain called Stchekovitza. There is his grave to this day, and it is called "The Grave of Oleg." And all the years of his reigning were thirty-three.

We have here a Scandinavian saga, as has been shown by Bielowski and Rafn. According to the saga it had been predicted to Oerwar Odde, the son of Grim, that he should be slain by his horse. He came after a long absence, found his horse buried in a marsh, and was killed by a lizard that sprang out of the horse's head. We might mention that the story is also found in the traditions of our own country—we believe relating to the Isle of Thanet, or Sheppey ; a reference to it will be found in so well-known a book as the "Ingoldsby Legends." We may here say that many of the Russian tales show a great affinity to the Norse. Sviatogor, who hardly feels a mountain when it falls upon him, reminds us of Jack the Giant-Killer's adventures, which are known to be from a Scandinavian legend, and in other respects the genial Russian giant resembles Loki. There was great communication between the countries from the earliest

times, and there are many Scandinavian words in the Russian language.

In the succeeding chapter of the Chronicle, a long list is given of the miracles wrought by several magicians, such as Apollonius of Tyana, Manetho, Simon Magus, &c. The chapter possesses no interest from a Slavonic point of view, because it is patched in *verbatim* from the Byzantine Chronicler, George Harmatolus. This circumstance will give us an idea of the very mixed nature of its contents, and the various sources from which Nestor drew. It seems absurd to stipulate for much accuracy in such a medley. We then learn how Igor began to reign after Oleg, an arrangement which looks strange, but we must take the account from the Chronicle, such as it is. The chronicler speaks of the invasion of the Turkish tribe, the Petchenegians, called by Constantine Porphyrogenitus, Πατζινακίται. There is a great confusion as to the time when these barbarians first invaded Russia, and this seems to be an additional proof that the Chronicle has only reached us in a patchwork state. Moreover, as we have already shown, only late manuscripts have come down to us. Igor makes two expeditions against the Greeks: on the first occasion he is defeated, his ships being consumed by the Greek fire. His land forces with difficulty get back to Kiev. In the account given of the rout by the chronicler, the Slavs are represented as saying: "The Greeks have a fire like lightning, and this is the reason why they have conquered us." This year we are told a son was born to Igor, named Sviatoslav. Igor is a Slavonic form of the old Norse Ingvar, but Sviatoslav (= holy glory) is purely Slavonic, and thus we see that the Scandinavians are gradually being commuted into Slavs. The name, however, as M. Leger tells us, was borne by two princes as late as the thirteenth century. A second attempt against Constantinople is more successful: the Emperor consents to buy off the invaders and a treaty is again made. This document is given in full in chapter twenty-seven. It shows a large array of names which can only be explained from Scandinavian sources. The heathen Slavs swear by Peroun, the god of thunder; the Christians by the gospels in their church of St. Ilya the Prophet.

Soon after this we have the description of the death of Igor, who is slain at Iskorosten. The town is still to be found in Volhynia under the name of Iskorost. Onstrialov, in the maps attached to this history, gives the old form of the word as Korosten. Olga, the widow of Igor—the name is a Slavonic form of the Norse, Helga—makes up her mind to take vengeance upon the Drevlians, in whose town her husband was murdered. She first by a stratagem massacres the inhabitants, causing them

to be shut in a vapour bath, as Livy tells us the unfortunate Romans who were sojourning in Capua during the second Punic war were treated. The town Iskorosten is afterwards set on fire by tying matches to the tails of sparrows and pigeons and letting them fly on the roofs of the houses, when the matches had been set on fire. Here we clearly have a piece of a regular *bilina*. M. Leger, in a note, tells us that, according to tradition, Gurmund, at the head of the Saxons, gained possession of Chichester in this way.* These stories recall many similar legends in the histories of Poland and Bohemia, faithfully narrated by the chroniclers, who never seem so happy as when dealing with the marvellous.

We now come to the baptism of Olga, who is such a prominent figure in early Slavonic history. She went to Constantinople in A.D. 957 to be instructed in the Christian faith. The imperial throne was then filled by the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus, who has left us so many interesting records of the Slavs, and has, among other things, described the admission of Olga into the church. The patriarch said to her, "Thou art blessed among Russian women, for thou hast loved light and rejected darkness;" and we are told that she received his instructions "like a sponge absorbing water." Olga, however, on her return, found it impossible to procure the conversion of her son, Sviatoslav, and was obliged to content herself with pious wishes for his spiritual change.

In chapter thirty-five we have an account of the death of Olga. She had given orders previous to her decease that there should be no *trina* or funeral feast in her honour. The old Russian chronicler waxes very eloquent in writing about her. We may compare the language of the Anglo-Saxon chronicle on Edward the Confessor. The writer says of her, "She was the forerunner of Christianity in Russia as the morning-star is the precursor of the sun, and the dawn the precursor of the day. As the moon shines in the middle of the night, she shone in the middle of a pagan people. She was like a pearl in the midst of dirt, for the people were in the mire of their sins, and not yet purified by baptism. She purified herself in a holy bath, and removed the garb of sin of the old man Adam," &c. &c.

Chapter thirty-six describes how the Pecheuegians laid an ambush for Sviatoslav, and cut off his head. These are some of the most important stories in the early part of this curious work. We feel ourselves so carried away by it that we are unconsciously

* It should, however, be Cirencester, as Professor Earle of Oxford has kindly pointed out to me. He has also supplied me with the references to Geoffrey of Monmouth, xi. 8, for the statement that the City was taken, and to Layamon (ed. Madden) iii. 170, where the story of the sparrows is given.

almost writing an analysis. It would be impossible to give anything like a *résumé* of the rest. The tale of the Christian Varangian who lived at Kiev, and whose son was demanded by Vladímir to be offered to his idols at Kiev, is very curious; for, as M. Leger truly remarks in his note, we have traces of lacustrine dwellings such as those described by Herodotus in his fifth book as belonging to the Pæonians of Macedonia. The account of the conversion to Christianity and baptism of Vladímir is given at great length. One of the chief instruments in this pious work was a painting which represented the Last Judgment. Readers of Slavonic history will remember that it was by a similar picture that Bogoris of Bulgaria was converted. When Vladímir had become disturbed in mind he called a meeting of his boyars, and resolved to send ambassadors to various nations, so as to ascertain who had the best religion. The envoys visited the Bulgarians, Germans, and Greeks, and brought back the most favourable account of the religion of the last people. The word *boyars* seems to demand some explanation. This term was used among the Russians and Bulgarians alone of Slavonic peoples; it was also in vogue among the Roumans, but has long become obsolete in all these countries. Many derivations of it have been suggested. In Byzantine writers we get the form *βοιλάδαι*. Some have thought that it was connected with the word *boi*, war, an opinion to which Dahl, in his large dictionary, seems to lean. Others connected it with the root *bol*, great, from which is derived the Russian comparative *bolie*, more, and this is the view of M. Leger. Miklosich; in his new work, "Die Türkischen Elemente in den Südost-undost-Europäischen Sprachen," says that the word is probably connected with the Turkish *boj*, stature, *bojlu*, high, and hence the word would mean the "nobles, exalted personages."

After a long ecclesiastical digression, the forty-third chapter gives us an account of the destruction of the idols, and the baptism of Vladímir. These representations of gods among Slavonic peoples appear to have been always of wood: hence their destruction was not difficult.* The statue of Peroun—in Lithuanian Perkunas—the god of thunder, was dragged from its pedestal and thrown into the Dnieper. The god, however, has continued to live in the popular traditions under a new name—that of the prophet Elijah (St. Ilya), who is the saint connected with thunder. There is also some connection with the hero of so many *bilini*, or popular legends, Ilya (Elias) Murometz.

The last event described in the chronicle has reference to the year 1113. Attached to it, or rather, incorporated with it, is the

* It is to be regretted that the whole subject of Slavonic mythology is still in such a confused state, which has been increased by the lately discovered forgeries in the Codex of the "Mater Verborum" at Prague.

instruction given by Vladimir Monomakh or Monomachus to his sons. This must be an interpolation, for Vladimir, prince of Kiev, reigned from 1093 to 1125. His famous cap (*shapka*) is still preserved among the treasures of the *Ourezhennaya Palata* at Moscow. This curious piece has also been translated by M. Leger.*

From the extracts already given, the reader will be able to see what position the work of Nestor occupies. In some respects it reminds us of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle—poetical passages alternating with dry records, and events of national importance with trifling details. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, however, is rigidly historical, and lacks all the fresh, charming sagas which make the Slavonic work so amusing.

The great point to notice is that there is a regular *catena* of these annals, extending from this attributed to Nestor, called by the Russians *Pervonachalnaia Lietopis*, or first chronicle, till the reign of Alexis Mikhailovich (1645–1676), the father of Peter the Great. There are, however, two breaks, one in the time of Basil, son of Dmitri Donskoi, the second in that of Ivan the Terrible. According to Karamzin, upwards of a thousand of these chronicles have come down; they are, however, of very varying interest and merit. Some of them still remain in manuscript, among others, we believe, the white Russian Chronicle, so frequently cited in the notes to Karamzin. A large collection of them was made by the monk Nikon in the reign of Alexis. The name of this ecclesiastic is perhaps known to some of our readers by the writings of Dean Stanley. The Greek chroniclers undoubtedly served as models to the authors of these compilations. We must remember that Byzantium was the great source of Russian culture. It is a pity that they had not a more healthy literature to draw from than productions full of tawdry rhetoric and bombast. The noble old Greek culture was dead. Constantinople only exhibited at that time the corpse of antiquity laid out in state. If the Russian writers could not read Greek, they could read old Bulgarian translations of the works. We have already spoken of some of the Greek sources of Nestor; he has transferred whole chapters from Byzantine historians. Professor Bestouzhev-Rioumin, in the introduction to his valuable Russian history, of which, unfortunately, only one volume has appeared, has given a carefully prepared list of most of these materials, and we shall largely avail ourselves of his labours, with additions from other sources. Very important after the so-called Chronicle of Nestor are the annals of Pskov, which treat of the quarrels of the Republic with the Germans,

* See "Slavonic Literature," by W. R. Morfill, London, p. 77.

and disputes with the rival republic of Novgorod. Basil, the son of Ivan III., destroyed the independence of the city in 1510, and united it with the growing principality of Moscow. The loss of their liberty is very pathetically mentioned in the Chronicle of Pskov, in a piece which seems interpolated.*

Then disappeared the glory of Pskov and our city was taken, not by those of another faith, but by those of our own faith. Who would not weep and groan about this! O glorious and great city of Pskov for what dost thou lament and weep? And the beautiful city of Pskov answered, How can I help weeping and grieving about the desolation which has befallen me. A many-winged eagle has flown to me with lion's claws and has taken from me all my beauty and wealth, and carried off my children.

The bell which had summoned the citizens of Pskov to their *veche*, or popular assembly, was now removed to Moscow. There seems to have been some kind of superstition about these bells, as if they were half living things, and by summoning the citizens to their rebellious assemblies were responsible for their mutinies—

Keeping time, time, time
In a sort of Runic rhyme.

There is a touch of drollery in the circumstance that in consequence of the sin of the people of Ouglich in allowing the young Demetrius, the son of Ivan the Terrible, to be assassinated their bell was banished to Siberia. Of a similar character to the Chronicle of Pskov is that of Novgorod, most of the occurrences, however, mentioned in it are trivial. In the Chronicle of Novgorod, however, is to be found the *Rousskaya Pravda*, (*Jus Russicum*), which is of the highest importance as containing the first code of Russian law. We are told that Jaroslav, who gave the code, said, "Walk according to this Decree of mine: as I have written it for you, so keep it." The date is given as 1016. This body of laws was, however, greatly extended by his sons Iziaslav, Sviatoslav and Vsevolod. Thus we have a short recension, and also one much more developed. There was a further recension in the days of Vladimir Monomakh. We may mention, *en passant*, that there is also another interesting legal document connected with Novgorod, a kind of treaty between the people and the Germans, of the date 1189-1199.†

In the times of the Ivans (III. and IV.), and Basil, the son of the former, the Chronicles contain many interesting notices.

* "Slavonic Literature," p. 75.

† It is printed in the valuable work of Hermenegild Jireček, edited in Cesh, entitled "Svod Zakonuv Slovanskych" (Collection of Slavonic laws), Prague, 1880.

As in a short account like the present it would be impossible, even if it were desirable, to give anything like an analysis of even two or three of these works, we shall allow ourselves the license of making extracts at random, such as may, perhaps, prove interesting to our readers. We must remember, also, that all the Chronicles are of a character more or less fragmentary. Events are jotted down quite at random, the only basis of their insertion being chronological. The writers of these later works cannot boast of any style, and rarely of any power of description. In the year 1488, when the principality of Moscow was already the powerful one, and gradually drawing to itself the outlying dependencies, so as to form the kernel of the vast Russian empire, we find the use of the knout coming into prominence, that shameful vestige of Asiatic barbarism which has only disappeared at the commencement of the present century. That it should have been employed so frequently in Russia must always be a reproach to the people, or rather their Government, but if an Englishman remembers the Draconian severity of our own laws till quite recently, he will do well to hesitate before throwing a stone at Slavonic institutions. The blood-stained annals of the reign of Henry VIII., and the brutal executions which took place in England till within the last fifty years, will make a thoughtful Englishman chary of the cheap abuse which ignorant men are so fond of lavishing on other countries. In the year 1488, as previously mentioned, a prince, a nobleman, and an archimandrite, are mentioned as having been publicly knouted for forging of a will. In 1490 Ivan, eldest son of the reigning Tzar Ivan III. fell ill of gout in his feet, called in Russian *Kamchouga*; one of the Palæologi had brought into Russia a Jew physician, who was called Master Leo. The unhappy man was induced to undertake the cure of the young prince, and to stake his head upon its certainty. The treatment, however, was unsuccessful. The prince, who had probably brought himself into this condition by his intemperance, after acute suffering, expired at the age of thirty-two. According to the account given of the system of therapeutics adopted by the Jew, cauterizing played an important part. Master Leo, however, in six weeks time was publicly executed "on the Bolvanovo, the other side of the river Moskva." The same fate befel, in 1485, another surgeon, a German, named Anthony, whose surname, if he had one, is not given. This unfortunate man had not been successful in treating a Tatar prince at the Court, he was accordingly given up to the angry relatives. To quote the exact words of the Chronicle—

A German physician, Anthony, came to the Grand Duke: the Great Duke treated him with great honour. He practised upon Prince
[Vol. CXXIII. No. CCXLV.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LXVII. No. I. H

Karakach, the son of Daniel, but with such results that he killed him by a deadly mess of herbs. Whereupon the Grand Duke gave him up to the son of Karakach. He, after he had tortured him, wished to let him go on his paying a ransom. This the Grand Duke would not permit . . . accordingly they took him to the river Moskva under the bridge in winter and cut him to pieces with a knife like a sheep ?

This terrible application of the doctrine, that a physician is responsible for the life of his patient, and must pay a severe penalty, if unsuccessful, seems to have lingered a long time in Russia, to judge by the curious article in the last number of the *European Messenger* (*Viestnik Yevropi*), in which a Madame Thitov gives an account of her recollections in early youth of the mother of the great novelist Tourghéniev. This lady, who was very despotic in the management of her household, had educated one of her serfs as a medical man. He had acquired such skill that his services were in great request in the families of the district ; when Madame Tourghéniev, his mistress, was willing to lend them. The writer of the memoir was an adopted child of this lady, and when about ten years of age fell ill of a fever. The serf doctor was employed to attend the patient, but as the little girl grew no better, Madame made up her mind to send to some doctors in the adjoining town. But the serf, whose name was Porphyry, would not agree to this. The rest shall be told in the words of Madame Zhitov.

With his air of imperturbable quiet and heavy step he entered the room of his mistress at the very moment when she was writing a letter to invite the physician to attend.

“Do not trouble yourself, madam, to write to any one : I am attending the young lady and I will cure her.”

Madame Tourghéniev cast her eyes upon him, put her letter aside looked closely at the audacious speaker and said—

“Remember, if you don't cure her, a journey to Siberia awaits you.”*

But this did not trouble our good doctor. He went out of the room as slowly and quietly as he came, sat behind my bedstead, and never left me day or night till the disease had taken a favourable turn. Then in the same phlegmatic manner, expressing neither triumph nor joy (although he was very fond of me) he went into the same room where he had been threatened with Siberia and said—

“The young lady is now alive and safe, only it will be some time before she is convalescent.”

This digression may perhaps be pardoned by our readers, as so thoroughly representing Russian manners of old time, and also on account of the connection of the story with the great writer whose loss all Europe now deplores.

* Thither refractory slaves were frequently sent in old times for punishment.

In early times a surgeon in Russia was considered little better than a wizard, and was constantly in extreme peril, as we know by the stories told in Olearius and other writers. The Russian word sometimes used for barber (*tzîrioulnik*) is itself a strange corruption of the Greek *χειρουργός*, the functions of barber and surgeon being united, as is well known, in early times. During the reign of Ivan the Terrible foreign physicians began to make their appearance in Russia, one of the earliest being a Dutchman named Bomelius, who was executed for having been caught intriguing with Stephen Batory, King of Poland. The terrible tortures he underwent have been graphically described by Sir Jerome Horsey in his diary, to which allusion has been already made. One of the most intelligent of these medical men was Collins, the physician of the Tzar Alexis, who has left a very interesting account of the country.

To return, however, to Ivan III., Karamzin tells us that the celebrated Aristotle of Bologna, the Italian architect, who erected so many buildings for Ivan, became alarmed on hearing of these punishments, and meditated leaving Russia. There are also many stories in these annalists of the burning of Jews and Christians who had been converted to Judaism.

The Chronicles of Novgorod have come down to us in copies not later than the fourteenth century, for to that period belongs the so-called Synodal copy (*Sinodalski Spisok*); there are, however, says Professor Bestouzhév-Rioumin, traces of a compilation made in the thirteenth century. In the chronicle of Sophia (*Sophiiski Vremennik*), and other contemporaneous collections we find a preface concluding with a promise to tell "all in order from the Emperor Michael to Alexander, *i.e.*, Alexis and Isaac." Now Alexis and Isaac Angelus ruled in 1204, when the Latins took Constantinople. The story of the capture of the city is found in many chronicles of the time. Again, in the description of the baptism of the people of Novgorod traces are seen of the narrative of a contemporary. We also get such an announcement as the following:—"Akim, the Archbishop of Novgorod died and Ephraim was his pupil who taught us."* Some of these chronicles are carried even further than the date of the fall of Novgorod, which yielded to Ivan III. in the year 1478. One of them actually extends to the year 1716. We are thus reminded of the quantity of manuscript literature which circulated till quite recently in Bulgaria and Serbia during the time of the Turkish oppression. Such printed books as were used in those countries were issued at Vienna or Kiev, and later at Bolgrad in Bessarabia or Bucharest. Finally, speaking sum-

* Bestouzhév-Rioumin, p. 25.

marily, of these Chronicles of Novgorod, we may say that they are written in an everyday and laconic manner, as if time was very valuable, and perhaps, as Bestouzhnev-Rioumin adds, parchment also.

Comparing the Chronicles of Pskov with those of Novgorod, we shall find that they begin somewhat later; they commence in the thirteenth century, and one of their first records is the story of a certain Dogmont, Prince of Lithuania, of whom more will be said shortly. They are as a rule more interesting and lively than those of Novgorod. As regards the city of Viatka, which, it will be remembered, was a colony of Novgorod, and also lost its independence owing to the centralizing measures of Ivan III.,* we hear but little of it. There are no chronicles professedly connected with it, but there is a story (*poviest*) about Viatka, found in connection with the annals of Novgorod.

The chronicles of Kiev are preserved in many copies, which all much resemble each other, and form a sort of continuation of the so-called Chronicle of Nestor or Pervonachalnaia Lietopis. The collection (*Svod*) is carried as far as the year 1199. There are also accounts of other parts of Russian territory included in it—*e.g.*, Smolensk, Chernîgov and Souzdal. The style of these Chronicles in parts very much resembles the curious prose-poem, "Story of the Expedition of Prince Igor,"† and furnishes another reason for believing it to be genuine. The affairs of Kiev, later than the year 1199, are found in other collections, especially those of North-Eastern Russia. With the Chronicles of Kiev are closely bound up those of Volhynia, or, as Professor Kostomonov prefers to call them, Galicio-Volhynia. According to Bestouzhnev-Rioumin they are even more full of poetical colouring than those of Kiev.‡ Scholars, however, assert that the events are set down in a random manner, the dates having been added afterwards. Hence these chronicles have a very confused style. One of the copies begins with some remarks on the exploits of Roman Mstislavich, probably containing some fragments of lays concerning him.§ It ends with the commencement of the fourteenth century, and does not extend as far as the loss of the independence of Galicia (*Galich*). It is strange that this territory, so thoroughly Russian, one might say, should at the present time, by the whimsicality of fate, be subject to the Germanic Empire of Austria. The bulk of the people speak the interesting Malo-Russian language, and the

* It followed the fate of the mother-city, the year after its fall (1479).

† "Slavonic Literature," p. 78.

‡ Unfortunately our own acquaintance with these Chronicles is confined to the extracts in Karamzin's notes.

§ Bestouzhnev-Rioumin.

Polish Pans and Jesuits have not succeeded in eradicating it. The chronicles of North-Eastern Russia began probably, somewhat early, thus we hear of the old Chronicles of Rostov at the beginning of the thirteenth century—perhaps even sooner. The Chronicles treat of many other parts of the country, *e.g.*, Pereiaslavl, Vladímir, &c., but the centre of the intellectual activity was undoubtedly Rostov. After the invasions of the Tatars the annals are concerned almost entirely with Rostov. We may also incidentally mention the Chronicles of Ivor and Riazan and Nizhni-Novgorod. All these smaller records were afterwards collected into compilations, which were made at Moscow. The North-Eastern Chronicles are unfortunately lacking in the poetical element.

From the first half of the fourteenth century Moscow takes the lead in the collection of chronicles. This was the natural result of the great importance it was about to assume. The origin of this celebrated city is not accurately known, nor is the derivation of the name satisfactorily explained. It is probably from some Finnish root. Its foundations are said to have been laid by Prince George Dolgorouki, but it did not become an important place till the days of Ivan Kalita (1328-1340), through whose agency the Metropolitan of Russia came to reside at Moscow.* The compilation of the chronicles by Nikon extends to the year 1558, the very middle of the time when Ivan IV. was at the height of his power and practising his cruelties. Of one of the Moscow chronicles luckily published by Lvov at St. Petersburg in 1792, the original has been lost. Bestouzhev-Rioumin speaks of it as a very important one. Valuable also is the so-called Alexandro-Nevski manuscript, which describes two years of the rule of Ivan the Terrible. The historian just cited says that many of the chronicles of this period are full of inaccuracies, and that their statements must be received with a great deal of caution. No doubt they were tampered with by the agents of the Tzar. We need not go back so far to find examples of cooked-up histories.

It will be observed that most of the chronicles of which we have been speaking are full of digressions, many of which are taken from foreign sources. Universal histories borrowed from the Greek—the only other language with which the Eastern Slav were likely to be familiar—were beginning to circulate among the Russians, and we must remember that the language in which they were written, which we will call the Church-Slavonic, so as not to open here the question of its origin, made them easily

* The name Kalita, or the purse, is explained in two different ways, some thinking that he acquired it because he carried a bag to distribute alms, others because the bag was used to carry whatever the avaricious prince could pick up.

accessible to the Russians, whose own productions are composed in the same language with occasional Russisms. We have already alluded to the Slavonic version of John Malalas, supposed to have been executed by the Presbyter Gregory. We have also mentioned the Chronicle of George Harmatolus, of which two versions exist. To these may be added the Chronicles of Constantine Manassias and Simeon Metaphrastes. The *Stepennaia Kniga*, or Book of Degrees (i.e., Pedigrees) is a work the object of which appears to have been to arrange the more important parts of the Chronicles in systematic order. In this production the events are grouped under the reigns of the Grand Dukes, whose pedigrees are given at the same time. The completion of this work took place in the sixteenth century, in the days of Ivan the Terrible. To the same century belongs the Chronograph, as it is termed, of Sergius Koubasov, of Tobolsk. We must not forget that it was in the days of Ivan that the Russians began to colonize Siberia, which was opened up to them by the enterprise of the Cossack Yermak, a strange picturesque figure of those barbarous times, who, after having been a notorious robber, earned pardon and honour from the Tzar by this timely addition to the Russian Empire.* Koubasov wrote at the beginning of the seventeenth century, and has left us what he called a history of the world from the creation to the election of Mikhail Romanov to the Imperial throne. In the latter part of his work he ceases to be a mere compiler and gives us many fresh personal details, of which not the least curious are his portraits of various members of the imperial family. His description of Ivan is not so favourable as that of Sir Jerome Horsey, who has left us the vigorously drawn portrait of the tyrant in his diary:—

Thus much to conclude with this Emperor Ivan Vasiliwich. He was a goodlie man of person and presence, well favoured, high forehead, shrill voice, a right Sithian, full of readie wisdom, cruell, bloudye, merciless; his own experience mannaged by direction both his State and commonwealth affaires; was sumptuously intombed in Michell Archangell Church, where he, though guarded daye and night, remains a fearfull spectacle to the memorie of such as pass by or hear his name spoken of, [who] are contented to cross and bless themselves from his resurrection againe.

Horsey, in this same Diary, still preserved in the British Museum, tells us that when he was in Russia (in the time of Ivan IV., Prince Mstislavski showed him a curious chronicle of events which he had kept. How much it is to be regretted that this manuscript cannot be discovered somewhere by a Bezsonov or

* See the curious song about him, "Slavonic Literature," p. 54.

Bouslaev and edited, just as the curious political work on Russia by the Serb Krizhanich was unearthed and published a little while ago.* To the seventeenth century belong the Chronicle of Theodosius Saphonovich, Igoumen of the Mikhailovski monastery of Kiev. This chronicle has unfortunately remained in manuscript up to the present time. It was one of the main sources of the compilation of Innokentii Gizel, which he entitled, "Synopsis, or Short Account of the Commencement of the Slavonic People," &c., was printed for the first time in the year 1674, and afterwards went through many editions. It was used extensively by Mankeyev, the secretary of Prince Khilkov, who wrote the "Kernel of Russian history" (*Yadro Rossiisko Istorii*). This Prince Khilkov was the Russian ambassador to the Court of Sweden. His work goes down to the battle of Poltava. There is also the Goustinski Chronicle, and several connected with Siberia, the first of which is assigned to Cyprian, the Metropolitan of Tobolsk. There is great similarity between many of them, but whatever may be their dulness, they all contain valuable facts for the historian.

Lithuania, so intimately connected with Russian and Polish history, has also its chronicles, but of course they are in Russian. It is true we hear much about the grandeur of the Lithuanian principality stretching to the Black Sea, and reaching eastward almost to Moscow, yet we must remember that no political documents whatsoever have come down to us in the Lithuanian language. It may well be questioned whether it was ever at any time anything more than a language of barbarians and peasants. Of this Lithuanian chronicle there are two copies, one is a short production beginning with the death of Gedymin in 1340, and ending in the year 1446; the other, from the earliest times, when the history is very much mixed up with fables, and reaching to the year 1566. The chronicle last mentioned was one of the most important authorities used by Strykowski, the Polish historian of the end of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth centuries, of whom we are told that he learned Russian for the special purpose of writing his work. The Chronicle of which we have just been speaking was undoubtedly compiled from contemporary narratiyes. Thus writing of the death of Skirgailo (1594) the author says: "I did not know that, because I was then büt little."† We must also mention here the curious history of Lithuania, in two

* See "Rousskoe Gosouidarstvo v polovinê XVII. vicka." *The Russian Empire in the Middle of the Seventeenth Century*, edited by P. Bezsonov. Moscow: 1866.

† Bestouzhév-Rioumin, p. 36.

volumes, written by the Jewish Koialowicz in the seventeenth century.

The great collection of Russian Chronicles edited by Nikon has been already alluded to. It was printed at St. Petersburg in 1767. Nikon in this respect reminds us of Laud; both were very strenuous advocates of the rights of the church and ecclesiastical authority, and both favoured learning. The most determined opponent of the English archbishop cannot forget the oriental manuscript in the Bodleian.

Of the Little Russian* Chronicles there is not much to say. The most important is that written by the man who styles himself *Samowidetz* or the Eye-witness. Those of Samuel Velichki and Gregory Grabianko are full of fables.

Closely connected with the Slavonic Chronicles are the many *skazania* or *poviesti* (narrations, tales) as they are called, which are found separately or attached to the Chronicles, being prose-poems, more or less, of the same sort as many of those found in old Irish literature.† Many of these stories are, as might be imagined, lives of the saints. They are often accounts given by eye-witnesses. Such are the narratives of the murder of Andrew Bogolioulski, of the quarrel of his brothers with their nephew, of the expedition of Igor against the Polovtzes, of the battle of Lipetz,‡ of the battle of Kalka and the invasion of the Tatar Batz. We have also stories of the holy martyr Michael, of Alexander Nevski, one might almost say the saint *par excellence* of Russia, the life of the Lithuanian Prince Dogmont, who preserved Pskov from the Germans, &c. This hero, Dogmont, appears as Danmandus in the Latin history of Koialowicz. Among the narrations of this epoch is the curious account of the principality of Koursk, which enable us to form a good idea of the relations of the Russian princes to the Tatar tax-collectors and the terror felt by them on the approach of these barbarous enemies. For upwards of two centuries Russia groaned under their yoke and the traces of their dominion lasted long after their departure. From a thorough European power they almost succeeded in turning Russia into an Asiatic.

In the midst of the Chronicle of Volhynia is inserted an account of the death of Prince Vladimir Vasilievich written for his cousin Mstislav Danilovich, concerning whom the compiler says, "Virtue is a great testimony, thy brother Mstislav, him

* Our readers will remember that the Malo, or Little Russians, occupy Galicia and South Russia, and amount to more than sixteen millions.

† Thus compare "The Wars of the Gaedhil and the Gael," edited by Dr. Todd. "The Battle of Magh Rath," &c.

‡ Here the troops of Souzdal, under the son of Vsevolod, were defeated by the forces of Novgorod and Smolensk.

God made the successor after thee in thy government, not destroying thy institutions, but confirming them." The Battle of the Field of Woodcocks (Koulikovo Pole) which was gained by Dmitri Donskoi over the Tatars in 1380—the year in which in our country the capitation tax was levied, which led to Wat Tyler's rebellion—has come down in three important versions. The first bears the title of "Story of the Fight of the Prince Dmitri Ivanovich with Mamai." This version does not contain many facts, but is not without reflexions full of dignity and patriotism. The second has many interesting details, but is disfigured by anachronisms. The third is altogether a poetical production, and seems modelled on the story of the "Expedition of Prince Igor." This piece is also sometimes called the *Zadonstchina*. Here we are reminded very much of the old Irish battle-pieces. The fight is described in a poetical and somewhat florid manner. It was from the animated description of the ancient chronicle that Karamzin has taken his picture of the battle.*

Mamai was driven back, but his successor, Tokhtamish, succeeded in taking Moscow in 1382. The city was laid in ashes, and the Tatars, on this, as on other occasions, slowly evacuated the country, driving hordes of prisoners before them, tied by the ropes with which, we are told, they always plentifully provided themselves on these occasions. We learn that it was at this time that they destroyed a quantity of valuable Slavonic manuscripts, as the Turks, who so much resemble them, have done since. Before leaving these Tatar invasions we may say that Russia was not altogether free from them till 1591. In a very quaint passage of a book full of quaint stories ("Hakluyt's Voyages"†) we get an account of an invasion of 1571. One of the members of the English factory, for our countrymen had established themselves in Moscow since the reign of Edward VI., writes that

The Mosco is burned every sticke by the Crimme the 24th day of May last, and an innumerable number of people: and in the English house was smothered Thomas Southam, Tosild, Waverley, Green's wife and children, two children of Rafe, and more to the number of twenty-five persons were stifeled in oure beere seller, and yet in the same seller was Rafe, his wife, John Browne, and John Clarke preserved, which was wonderfull. And there went to that seller Master Glover and Master Rowley also; but because the heat was so great they came foorth again with much perrill, so that a boy at their heeles was taken with the fire, yet they escaped blindfold into

* Ralston gives a very good description of it, see his "Early Russian History," p. 99.

† Vol. i. p. 402.

another seller, and there as God's will was they were preserved. The emperor fled out of the field, and many of his people were carried away by the Crimme Tartar. And so with exceeding much spoile and infinite prisoners, they returned home againe. What with the Crimme on the one side and his crueltie on the other, he hath but few people left.

The invasions of the Tatars form the subject of many separate narratives,—*e.g.*, those of Tokhtamish, mentioned a little before, of Tamerlane till his capture by Bayazet, &c.

The taking of Kazan in the reign of Ivan the Terrible is described, together with the history of that kingdom by the priest Ivan Glazati. The punishment of the revolted city Novgorod is told in one of these narratives, and also the siege of Pskov by the Polish King Stephen Batory—the latter being written by a certain Serapion. There are also stories about the “Dismal Time,” (*Smoutnoe Vremya*) as it is called—*viz.*, that which includes the adventures of the false Demetrius and all the troubles of Muscovy till the settlement of the crown under Michael Romanov. To the patriarch Job, an individual who showed much political dishonesty, and experienced great varieties of fortune, is assigned “The Life of the Tzar Feodor Ivanovich,” the weak, superstitious prince, son and successor of the cruel Ivan (1584—1598). Bestouzhnev-Rioumin describes it as a rhetorical work without any literary value, but affording useful materials. Irodion Sergeyev has something to tell us about the siege of the monastery of Tikhvin, near Novgorod. To the times of the first Romanovs belong the stories of the siege of Azov, and the taking of Astrakhan by the bold robber Stenka Razin, who was afterwards quartered at Moscow. The siege of Azov is a very quaint prose-poem, and narrates in bombastic and exaggerated phraseology how in 1637 a body of Cossacks triumphantly beat off the assaults of the Turks. Bouslaev says of it,* that it reminds us very much of the *bilni* and the “story of Igor’s expedition.” Indeed, one of the best proofs for genuineness of the latter, which has been denied by some scholars, among others Senkovski, the original having perished in the conflagration of Moscow in 1812, after having been seen by only a few scholars, is that it so greatly resembles many of these prose-poems, the originals of which have been preserved. Stenka Razin has formed the subject of many a lay and legend still remembered in Russia.

The lives of the saints, which naturally contain a great deal of historical matter, as might be supposed would be the case in Russia, where the clergy have played such an important part, are too numerous to be recapitulated here. Many of these lives are

* “*Khrestomatia*,” p. 271.

included in the "Chetii-Minei," or monthly readings of the saints.*

We do not get any Zapiski or Memoirs (in the strict sense of the word) till we come to the writings of Prince Kourbski. He entitles his work, "History of the Principality of Moscow, and of the deeds which we have heard from trustworthy men, and have seen with our eyes." Kourbski was descended from the princes of Yaroslavl, and had done honourable service in the field. He was born about the year 1528, and was present at the taking of Kazan. He fled to Lithuania in 1563, when Ivan began to persecute the followers of Sylvester and Adashev. From his safe retreat he commenced his correspondence with Ivan, in which he told the tyrant some disagreeable truths, and fiercely upbraided him with his atrocities. While living in Lithuania he appeared as the defender of the Greek faith, which was being slowly undermined by the Polish Jesuits. He never returned to his native country, but died in exile in 1583. Kourbski writes powerfully and fluently; in fact, his style is wonderful for the period, but Professor Bestouzhnev-Rioumin regrets that Karamzin should have followed him so closely in his history, as he considers him to write in a very exaggerated and prejudiced manner. But Ivan could not be painted too black: the annals of few countries can show such a monster.

A valuable narrative, also, is the account of the siege of the Troitza monastery by the Poles, written by Abraham Palitzin, who died in 1626. This record has been printed many times—first in 1784. It is a spirited production, if not always trustworthy. Important is the work of Philaret Romanov, which begins with the election of the Tzar Michael, in 1606. There are also the memoirs of Semën Shakovski, extending from 1601 to 1649.

But all these are surpassed by the work on Russia of Gregory Karpov Kotoshikhin. This man served in the ambassadors' office (*Posolski Prikaz*), or, as we should say now, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He was employed in diplomatic business with the vozerodes Prince Cherkaski and Prince Prozorovski. Prince Dolgorouki required him to give information against them. This he refused to do, and fled to Poland about the year 1664. From thence he passed to Sweden, where, at the request of the chancellor of that country, Count Delagarde, he wrote his book, which was doubtless intended to be of use to enable foreigners, the Swedes especially, to study that *terra incognita*, Muscovy. He was executed about 1669 for the murder, in a quarrel, of

† Many of these are included in the "Memorials of Ancient Russian Literature" ("Pamatniki Starinnoi Rousskoi Literaturi"), edited by Count Bezborodko. St. Petersburg: 1862.

the master of the house in which he lived. The manuscript was found by Professor Soloviev (not the eminent historian recently deceased) in Sweden, and published in 1840.* This book, as a picture of the manners of Russia at the time, is of the highest importance. It is well written, but the extreme bitterness of the author has led him to distort facts; the picture he draws of the country is, in every way, a most melancholy one. Cruelty, ignorance, and superstition were everywhere rampant. The account of the Serb Krizhanich is not a whit better. It is impossible to adopt the opinion of those who say that, with such materials, Russia could have civilized herself.

*οὐ πρὸς ἰατρ.οὐ σοφοῦ
θρηνεῖν ἐπιφθὰς πρὸς τομῶντι πῆγματι.*

The regeneration required violent means, and it was lucky for Russia that a man of such genius appeared as Peter the Great. Our last books shall be the "Life of Nikon," written by his lay-brother Shousherin, and also the life of his great enemy, the protopope Avvakonin, written by himself. With these works the native materials for what may be called the early history of Russia end. We shall allow ourselves a few words on the foreigners who have told us interesting things about Russia. No attempt will be made to give a complete list of these, but only the most prominent will be mentioned. And first we will take Sigismund Herberstein, Ambassador from the Emperor of Germany to Muscovy, who visited the country in 1517, and has left a very curious account of it in his "Rerum Muscovitarum Commentarii." This book went through many editions in the sixteenth century. Not the least interesting of its features are the wonderful woodcuts and the plan of Moscow. Our own copy has always been a source of great pleasure to us. Next in importance after Herberstein must be placed the work of Fletcher "Of the Russe Commonwealth," London, 1591. Giles Fletcher was Elizabeth's ambassador in Russia, and has left us a very accurate sketch of the country and its inhabitants. The first edition of this work is of the utmost rarity; it was rigorously suppressed by order of Elizabeth, on account of some offensive remarks on Ivan and his cruelties, with whom the English queen was anxious to be on good terms. A second edition did not appear till the middle of the seventeenth century. The Russians have acknowledged the fidelity of the pictures of Fletcher, and have translated his work. The original manuscript of this book is said to be still preserved at Pembroke College, Cambridge. Of Hersey's Diary we have already spoken. It is full of striking

* "O Rossii, v' Tzarstvovanie Aleksiya Mikhailovicha" ("Concerning Russia in the Reign of Alexis Mikhailovich"). St. Petersburg: 1840.

incidents, and has found an able editor in Mr. E. A. Bond, the present head of the British Museum, in which the manuscript is preserved. Oderborn, Taube, and Kruse have left us only too faithful pictures of the cruelties of Ivan. The Swede Petreius, and the Frenchman Margeret, are our authorities for many of the striking incidents in the career of the False Demetrius. Second only to Herberstein and Fletcher in importance is Adam Olearius, whose travels were first published in 1647 in German, but appeared in an English dress in 1662.* This is quite a delightful book, and full of piquant stories; but to enjoy it thoroughly, we must read it with the original cuts, which have been reproduced in the excellent life of Peter the Great (in Russian), published a couple of years ago by Professor Brückner. In Olearius we get the capital account of the *Pravezhe*, or public flagellation of insolvent debtors in the chief square at Moscow. Here also is a quaint account of the manner in which the Tzar, according to Russian custom, used to lead the ass upon which the Patriarch rode on Palm Sunday. Two books with which Englishmen are concerned also claim our attention. The account of the embassy of Lord Carlisle in 1672, written by his secretary, Guy de Mige, and the work of Collins, the physician of Alexis.†

The earliest period of Russian history (in common with that of other Slavonic races) may be studied in the Byzantine historians, especially Procopius and Constantine Porphyrogenitus. Besides these are Helmold and Thietmar, the Bishop of Merseburg. Many of these writers will be found in the admirable "Monumenta Poloniæ Historica," edited by Bielowski and others (Lemberg, 3 vols.).

With the reign of Peter a new era in every way begins in Russia: books were now more frequently printed: we must remember, however, that printing began in Russia in the middle of the sixteenth century, a tolerably early time for so remote a country.

The learned books of the west now became models for authors, and history written on scientific principles, as opposed to the mere chronicle and memoir, made its appearance. Thus we have the history of Tatistchev, which, however, is poorly written, and rather resembles a Russian chronicle than a history. It deserves praise, however, for the conscientious labour bestowed upon it. Not much better was the history of Russia produced by Lomonosov, the indefatigable man of letters, who did so much for the literature of his country.

* "The Voyages and Travels of the Ambassadors sent by Frederiok, Duke of Holstein, to the Great Duke of Muscovy and the king of Persia, fully rendered into English by John Davies of Kidwelly." London: 1662.

† "The Present State of Russia," 1671.

Karamzin followed in the earlier part of the present century; his first volume appearing in 1818. He had modelled his prose upon the best western styles: never had the Russian language appeared to such advantage. Karamzin had already shown what he could do, by his "Letters of a Traveller." Although more critical histories of Russia have appeared since, yet his work can never become obsolete. It is full of romantic and interesting episodes, told in the most fascinating style. Perhaps he glosses over too much the barbarism of the early periods of his country's history: he is like Sir Walter Scott treating of his barons and crusaders. But Karamzin was more than a mere stylist: he had read immensely, as the notes to his work show, which are full of curious matter. Unfortunately Karamzin did not live to finish his work, which goes no farther than the election of Michael Romanov.

Karamzin was followed by Nicholas Polevoi, son of a Siberian merchant, who wrote, not the "History of the Russian Empire," but of the "Russian People." His work, however, has fallen into oblivion, and is now neither read nor cited. In 1879, died Sergius Soloviev, the author of a very important history of Russia, in which all the latest ethnological and philological views are introduced. This elaborate work extends to twenty-eight volumes.* The author did not live to carry it further than the beginning of the reign of Catherine II.

Oustrálov published a very handy history of Russia in two volumes. This is a capital storehouse of facts, and it contains some excellent historical maps. The tone of the author is, however, too adulatory. It is rather droll to think that some of the most fulsome passages of the work were struck out by the pen of the Emperor Nicholas himself, to whom it had been submitted for criticism.†

By his "History of the Reign of Peter the Great," Oustrálov also did good service to Russian literature. Many important documents were in this work published for the first time. Kostomarov has also written some valuable works on Russian history: unfortunately, with the ruthless vigour of a consummate critic, he tears to pieces many legends which had taken deep root in the popular mind.

We thus see there is abundance of material for Russian history. The early Muscovites, although, comparatively speaking, a barbarous people, have had a long chain of chroniclers, whose writings, although lacking (for the most part) style, are important to the historian and antiquarian. If we examine our

* Fragments of the twenty-ninth were published after the author's death.

† The passages are given in a former number of the excellent review *Drevnaia i novaiia Rossia*, which unfortunately has now ceased to appear.

own early writers of history—Matthew Paris, Roger of Wendover, Ordericus Vitalis and others, we shall find little but dry details, quite as poor, speaking from a literary point of view, as the Slavonic chronicles. Even the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, although it has occasionally fine outbursts, as in some of the lyric pieces, the Battle of Brunanburh, the Lamentation over Edward the Confessor, and others, is full of the driest details. Again, how superior in picturesque power is the Pervonachalnaia Lietopis to the dull platitudes of Geoffrey of Monmouth.

It is much to be regretted that no really good history of Russia has yet appeared in England, with the exception of a translation of the work of M. Rambaud, which was brought out at too high a price, considering that the French edition may be had for five francs. We are still content in the main with miserable compilations, in which the names of men and places are spelled in the most ludicrous way, and facts grotesquely distorted, frequently for political purposes.

In conclusion, as we have said at the beginning of our article, we must congratulate M. Leger on his work. It is a very solid contribution to Slavonic scholarship. It will remove much ignorance, and will probably attract the attention of many readers who cannot be induced to open a Slavonic book. The object of our article will have been amply attained if we shall have succeeded in proving to those unacquainted with the subject that there are many interesting fields for the historian and ethnologist to be found among the early Russian chronicles.

ART. V.—FRANCE AND COCHIN-CHINA.

1. *La Cochin-Chine et le Tonquin. Le Pays, l'Histoire et les Missions.* Par EUGÈNE VEUILLOT. Paris: 1859.
2. *Lettres Edifiantes écrites des Missions Etrangères, &c.* Paris: 1825.
3. *Histoire de l'Intervention Française au Tongking, de 1872 à 1874.* Par F. ROMANET DU CAILLAUD. Paris: 1880.
4. *A General Collection of the Best and Most Interesting Voyages and Travels, &c.* By JOHN PINKERTON. London: 1811.
5. *The Truth about Tonquin.* By ARCHIBALD R. COLQUHOUN, F.R.G.S. London: 1884.

AT a moment when French proceedings in the Far East are attracting general attention, when intervention in Tongking has led to annexation, and the idea of a protectorate over

Annam has expanded into a dream of Indo-Chinese Empire, it may not be uninteresting to glance back at an earlier episode in the story, and to read afresh the story of ecclesiastical intrigue and military adventure involved in the career of the missionary bishop who laid the foundation of French interests in the country. The facts are instructive, as evincing the continuity of national policy despite governmental changes, and have, besides, a dash of romantic interest which may help to relieve the painfully commonplace details of annexation and exaction that have characterized more recent proceedings. The date is the close of the last century. The curtain rises upon a scene of rebellion and anarchy, such as Oriental histories too frequently offer. The prominent actors are a French missionary and a fugitive king. A single page of prologue is necessary to explain the situation.

About the years 1765-70, the reigning king of Cochin-China nominated as his successor the son of a concubine, in supersession of his legitimate heir. At his death, a minister whom he had interested in the design carried it into execution, but grasped for himself the substance of power, and made himself so obnoxious that an influential party invited the king of Tongking to deliver the country from his oppression. The latter assented, and, marching south at the head of a formidable army, overawed the prince into surrendering the culprit. Not satisfied, however, with having achieved this object, the Tongkingese set about overrunning the country, and the Cochin-Chinese prince fled before them. A tax-collector named Nhac hereupon incited the people to resistance, and succeeded in driving out the invaders. Extracting, then, from his retirement, a prince of the blood royal named Hwang-tung, Nhac placed him temporarily on the throne; but soon quarrelled with and put him to death, and declared himself king. The (illegitimate) prince whose usurpation and weakness had caused all the trouble, had in the meantime been captured and killed also; and one Nguyen-anh, brother of the defunct Hwang-tung, remained sole legitimate pretender to the throne. His efforts to make head against Nhac met with some success at first, in the southern provinces; but the success was ephemeral. An offer of assistance by the king of Siam was accepted; but the Siamese troops committed such excesses that the natives welcomed Nhac's assistance to drive them out, and Nguyen-anh had to seek safety in flight.

A somewhat similar drama had in the meantime been played in Tongking, which was to give an opening for the future subjugation of that country to Annam. A king of Tongking who died in 1782 had also nominated as his successor the son of a concubine, whom the leading mandarins, however, combined to set aside in favour of the legitimate heir. Events followed the usual

course. The new king recompensed his supporters with places and dignities, which they abused to oppress the people; and a state of anarchy ensued, which led to an appeal for help to Cochin-China. Nhac, who was now supreme in the south, willingly obeyed the summons, overran the country; and of course, in his turn, refused to quit. It would be tedious and useless to prolong the narrative: our object is only to expose the political position which encouraged French intervention. It will be readily understood that the Catholic missionaries, who had gained a firm footing in the country, found their position jeopardized in the prevailing anarchy. Among these was one Pigneau de Behaine, bishop of Adran, who seems to have been in high credit with the (legitimate) royal family of Cochin-China, and is said even to have saved the life of Nguyen-anh, by concealing him in his house when hard pressed by the rebels. His is the central figure in the following story, which we open by quoting a letter written by him, from Pondichéry, to the College of Foreign Missions at Paris:—

In the month of March 1782, obliged to abandon Cochin-China, I withdrew to Cambodia with the College. The famine was very severe, and if I had not taken the precaution to send provisions, we could not have subsisted there. Hardly had we arrived when the rebel chief despatched troops thither. I went and hid myself with my scholars and the rest of our people in the most frightful deserts, where I remained two months. Then, the king of Cochin-China having re-entered his States, I returned near him with my people; but it was only, alas! to prepare for a fresh flight. This time we had no other refuge, to seek but the islands of the Gulf of Siam. I made all necessary preparations, and at the first news of the approach of the rebels we set out. Never, since my arrival from India, had I enjoyed such tranquillity as I found in the island where we stayed. We occupied ourselves there solely with our salvation and that of our people, who were perfectly resigned to endure the trials which Divine Providence seemed to have in store. In effect, we soon heard that the king was at not more than half a day's distance, and that the rebels were pursuing him. The king gave battle, which he lost, together with nearly all the naval force which remained to him.*

Seeing all hope of return to Cochin-China cut off by this fresh disaster, the bishop fled with his neophytes to the capital of Siam, where he found means to bestow them in safety; and seems to have been trying to make his way to Pondichéry, when he came again in contact with the fugitive prince. Having missed the monsoon, he (the bishop) had, with his followers, been spending

* Lettre (extrait) de Mgr. d'Adran à MM. du Séminaire des Missions Etrangères, dated March 20, 1785.

some months at the island of Pulo-way; and at this point we will again take up his narrative :

After having repaired our little barque, we quitted our solitude with the greatest regret, and sailed for Pulo-punjan, with the intention of traversing from that point the Gulf of Siam. Here we met, for the second time, the king of Cochin-China, who told me how he had been carried off to Siam, and dwelt especially on the duplicity of the Siamese, who, under pretext of replacing him on the throne, had only made use of his name to pillage the people. It was there that he confided to me his son, aged six, whom I have brought hither.

After describing his voyage, and lauding the devotion of his Cochin-Chinese attendants, the bishop continues :—

Another matter in which I want your help, is to procure the education of the young prince with whom I am charged. I should like, whichever way things may turn, to have him brought up in the Christian religion, and to compensate him for the temporal crown he has lost, by the hope of another much more precious and more durable. It is only you who can render me this service. . . . If, eventually, the king should turn to the English or the Dutch, who will not fail to re-establish him in his States, you perceive how useful it will be to have done at least what one could for his child. He is only six years old, and already knows his prayers. He is full of intelligence and of ardour for all that concerns religion. A thing which seems inconceivable to many people is that he should have attached himself to me without regretting his father, mother, grandmother, nurses, and more than five hundred men who all burst into tears when he left them. The Christians attributed it to the special grace of God, and drew from it conjectures very favourable to our religion. The gentiles, who were less well-informed, said I had bewitched him. The two mandarins, his governors, and six soldiers, who constitute his guard, are already well instructed, and will be baptized at Pentecost.

The meeting here described took place in 1784; and, without venturing to promise, Mgr. d'Adran is said to have led Nguyen-anh to hope for help from France. However this may be, the answer from his superiors to the letter we have quoted, seems to have been an order to come in person with his pupil to Europe; and we next find them, in 1787, at the Court of Versailles, appealing to Louis XVI. for help to place Nguyen-anh on the throne he had never yet been able to occupy. The thought may suggest itself, that the negotiations which ensued were slightly one-sided. On the one hand, a child of eight with his (French) guardian; on the other, the royal ministers, in a position to exact what terms they chose for their assistance. Such as they were, however, they seem to have marched merrily. The good bishop evidently lost no time, after his arrival, in pressing his views; and it must be confessed that the following memoran-

dum,* in which he embodied them, contains a great deal of worldly wisdom, for one who had been so long isolated from the world and devoted to religious enterprise :—

The political scale in India appears so heavily inclined to the side of England that it must seem very difficult to redress the balance. Perhaps an establishment in Cochin-China would be the most certain and efficacious method that could be employed. In effect, if you glance at the productions of Cochin-China and the situation of its ports, it is easy to conceive the great advantage that would arise from establishing ourselves there, both in peace and war.

1. We may assume that the most certain means of combating the English in Asia is to ruin or weaken their commerce. In time of peace we should much diminish the profit they derive from their trade with China, by carrying it on at less cost and with greater facility than they.

2. In time of war it would be easy to interdict this commerce to any hostile nation ; for by cruising about the exit from the Straits, or more surely still at the Bocca Tigris which is at the entry of the Canton river, we should be sure of hindering all coming out or going in, whenever we chose.

3. We should find, in Cochin-China, easy and inexpensive means of repairing and careening ships, and even of building new ones.

4. We should find everything needed for revictualling our squadron, and supplying other colonies with necessaries.

5. We might, in case of need, find there help in men, troops, seamen, &c.

6. We should be able easily to check the English in the projects they seem to entertain, of spreading themselves towards the East (*s'étendre à la côte de l'Est*).

The document is interesting, as showing the spirit of hostility to England in which the negotiations were conducted, and especially interesting at the present moment, when French ambition is again striving to create a rival† empire in the East. The force of the bishop's arguments appears to have quickly approved itself to Louis XVI. and his advisers ; for we find his projects exactly embodied in a convention signed at Versailles, on Novem-

* *Vide* "La Cochin-Chine et le Tonquin," Introduction, p. vi.

† M. Veillot is frankness itself on this score : "La France n'accepte qu'avec peine et provisoirement la suprématie maritime de l'Angleterre. Cependant nous venons, dans les mers de l'Indo-Chine, au sixième rang—après le Portugal (Introduction, p. iii.). . . . Nous ne sortirons de cette position humiliante que le jour on le pavillon français flottera dans l'Asie orientale sur une terre Française. . . . L'empire d'Anam nous est ouvert, et c'est là que nous devons nous établir. [The Indian mutiny was in progress at the time, and M. Veillot goes on to say, p. xiv.] La France n'a point à craindre un malheur semblable à celui de l'Angleterre, et ne veut point le mériter. Le motif déterminant de son entreprise est puisé dans les profondeurs du sentiment général, il est généreux et chrétien !"

ber 28, 1787, by the Comte de Vergennes and the Comte de Montmorin on behalf of the French king, and by the little prince Canh-dzué on behalf of his father. This document is sufficiently curious to deserve translation, both as an evidence of the political schemes of the day, and because it is frequently appealed to by the French as a basis of their rights in Cochin-China. If it is difficult, for outsiders, to regard as serious a treaty composed under such conditions, it is evident that the French negotiators were very clearly alive to the advantages which might be extracted from it :—

1. There shall be an offensive and defensive alliance between the two kings of France and Cochin-China; they shall be bound to lend each other, mutually, succour and assistance against the enemies of one or the other of the contracting parties.

2. In consequence, there shall be equipped and placed under the orders of the king of Cochin-China, a squadron of twenty French ships of war, of such a standard as the requirements of his service may exact.

3. Five European regiments, and two regiments of colonial native troops, shall be embarked without delay for Cochin-China.

4. His Majesty Louis XVI. undertakes to furnish, within a few months, the sum of one million dollars, of which 500,000 shall be in specie, and the rest in saltpetre, cannons, muskets, and other military armament.

5. From the moment the French troops enter on Cochin-Chinese territory, they and their generals will receive the orders of the king of Cochin-China.

On the other hand :—

1. The king of Cochin-China undertakes to furnish, as soon as tranquillity shall be restored in his States, and on the simple requisition of the French ambassador, everything necessary in the shape of equipment, rigging, and provisions, to put on the sea without any delay, fourteen ships of the line; and for the perfect execution of this article, there shall be sent from Europe a corps of naval officers and warrant officers, who shall form a permanent establishment in Cochin-China.

2. H.M. Louis XVI. shall have resident consuls on all parts of the coast of Cochin-China, wherever he shall judge fit. These consuls shall be authorized to construct, or cause to be constructed, vessels, frigates, and other ships, without interference, on any pretext, from the Government of Cochin-China.

3. The ambassador of H.M. Louis XVI. at the Court of Cochin-China shall have the right to cut wood for the construction of vessels, frigates, and other ships, in all the forests wherever he may find any suitable.

4. The king of Cochin-China and his Council shall cede in perpetuity to His Most Christian Majesty, his heirs and successors, the

port and territory of Hansan (bay and peninsula of Turon), and the adjacent islands of Fai-fo on the south and Hai-wen on the north.

5. The king of Cochin-China engages to furnish the necessary men and materials for the construction of forts, bridges, roads, wells, &c., which shall be considered necessary for the safety and defence of the concessions made to his faithful ally the king of France.

[Article 6 merely regulates the conditions of government in the ceded districts.]

7. In case His Most Christian Majesty determine to make war in any part of India, it shall be permitted to the commander-in-chief of the French troops to make a levy of 14,000 men, whom he shall drill in the same manner as in France, and who shall be instructed according to French discipline.

8. In case any Powers should attack the French on Cochin-Chinese territory, the king of Cochin-China shall furnish at least 60,000 soldiers, whom he will equip and maintain at his cost, &c.

This remarkable treaty, in which the infant son of a fugitive prince is made to grant such immense concessions, has two grave defects. It was never ratified, and never executed. The revolution which broke out in France two years later effaced, for the moment, all thought of such distant projects; though sufficient help was actually afforded the Cochin-Chinese prince, to give a semblance of justification to the claim that it found practical acceptance. And this brings us to the second phase of Mgr. d'Adran's curious adventure.

When the bishop—who had been named plenipotentiary, and charged with the execution of the treaty he had brought about,—arrived at Pondichéry, he found the governor inclined to look askance at the projects he was desired to forward.* M. de Conway had been ordered to provide, as vanguard of the expeditionary force, four frigates, 1,600 men, and some field artillery. He seems, however, to have hesitated and delayed till the French residents at Pondichéry themselves took up the project, and equipped two ships, besides providing arms and ammunition. Certain volunteers accompanied this expedition, and the governor himself, some months later, consented to place a frigate and several officers at the bishop's disposal.

In the meantime, Nguyen-anh had been able, of his own accord, to regain a footing in the south; and the French contingent—however inadequate to carry out the actual terms of the treaty—was sufficient to give useful help. Frequent reference is made to the presence of French officers, in the course of the long

* M. Veuillot's disgust (p. 220) at the failure to carry out such an advantageous treaty, by "men who sacrificed our maritime power and our commercial interests, while crying with unctuous folly 'Périssent les colonies plutôt qu'un prince!'"—may remind us of a similar exclamation, à propos of British India, which recently attracted some attention.

campaign ; and the fortifications of Hué and Hanoi, the capitals respectively of Annam and Tongking, bear evidence of European design. Lord Macartney,* calling at Turon in 1792-3, on his way to China, found that district, "with a considerable part of the kingdom of Cochin-China," still in possession of the usurper, whose antagonist (*i.e.*, Nguyen-anh) "the descendant of the former sovereigns of the country, was still in possession of some of the southern districts of the kingdom, and was in daily hope of such succour from Europe as might enable him to recover all the possessions of his ancestors. . . . Some individuals from France" had already joined him, and given hope of further assistance ; of which the party in power at Turon were fully cognisant, as they at first feared that the English fleet represented the threatened expedition.

It is, however, beyond our purpose to follow the incidents of the civil war, with which we are concerned only so far as it involves the action of Mgr. d'Adran and its consequences. The gradual recovery by Nguyen-anh of authority over his hereditary States, his conquest of Tongking, and his recognition (in 1804) by the Court of Peking are matters of historical notoriety. The bishop did not live to see the complete triumph of his protégé, but he reached as it were the threshold of the final scene ; and the occasional glimpses we catch of his career show him in a position of high regard and influence at the Annamese Court. It was natural that the services he had rendered should gain for him this place in the king's esteem, and equally natural that it should excite the jealousy and envy of the native mandarins. A letter † written by him, some years after his return, will serve to illustrate both his position and the assaults to which it was obnoxious :—

Nineteen notables (*grands du royaume*) joined in representing to the king that prudence forbade my being left any longer charged with the education of the young prince ; that, being a foreigner and of a different religion, it was impossible but that I should imbue him with my principles. They besought his Majesty accordingly to place him in the hands of *litterati* (mandarins *lettrés*) who would give him an education similar to that of his ancestors. The king, indignant, threw the memorial on the ground, recalled all the services which I had rendered to the State, to himself, to his son and his family, and added : "It is astounding that, after having done so little in recognition of so many benefits, you should dare to urge me to the most monstrous ingratitude."

The bishop seems, however, to have deemed it wise to bow to

* V. "Macartney's Embassy to China." By Sir George Staunton, Bart. Vol. i. p. 328.

† Lettre (extrait) de Mgr. d'Adran, dated Mai 30, 1795.

the storm ; and affirms that he not only dissuaded the king from punishing the intriguers, but persuaded him that it would be wiser to let him partially efface himself, than to excite the enmity of his Court. Some fear of his Majesty's conversion, if we may trust Mgr. d'Adran's narrative, seems to have been at the bottom of the movement. One of the principal mandarins had shown a strong proclivity towards the new doctrine, and people argued—If so able and erudite a man could not hold out against the reasoning of the foreign bishop, how would it be with the king and the prince ? The influence of the prelate, however, and the intrigues of the mandarins, were soon to be terminated by the action of a greater power. Mgr. d'Adran died four years later (in 1799), while travelling with his pupil ; and—making all allowance for the enthusiasm of his colleagues—we cannot but infer from the description* of his obsequies, that it was felt, even at Court, a great figure had passed away.

The light of Cochin-China [writes M. Lelabousse] is extinguished ; the pillar of the kingdom is overthrown ; desolation is everywhere ; mourning is general. Mgr. d'Adran fell ill early in August, in the province of Qui-nhon, whither he had gone with his royal pupil, who never moved without his wise mentor. The king sent his physicians, and employed all possible means to save the life of one who had so often saved his. He even came in person with his son to visit him, and shed many tears on perceiving the uselessness of his endeavours.

The bishop died on October 9, 1799, in his fifty-eighth year, and was buried on December 16, at a spot of his own selection, in the environs of Saigon, which may still be discovered by the curious visitor. It was, at the period in question, "a pleasant country garden, which he had himself been in the habit of cultivating, some three miles from the town." But the garden has disappeared, and the tomb is now smothered amid the brushwood which has overgrown the locality.

Thither (we are told) the prelate had been in the habit of retiring from time to time, with his royal pupil, for relaxation from the worry of the Court and the fatigue of study ; thither he went with the missionaries, to refresh them by a little repose from their toil ; and there he found a remedy for his own troubles, declaring that he forgot them directly he arrived.

And there, with almost royal pomp, the king caused his remains to be interred.

We pass over the description of the religious ceremonies with which the Roman Church so well knows how to exalt the memory of the dead, while appealing to the imagination of the living.

* Lettre (extrait) de M. Lelabousse, dated Mai 1, 1800.

The reader will easily conceive the crowd of converts, the blaze of tapers, the display of images, ornaments and tapestry. It is more to our present purpose to describe the Annamese share in the procession :—

All the king's guards, comprising more than 12,000 men, without counting those of the prince his son, were under arms, and drawn up in two lines, the field guns in front; 120 elephants with their escort and their officers marched on either side. Drums, trumpets, military music, both Cochin-Chinese and Cambodian, fuses, fireworks—nothing was lacking. More than two hundred lanterns of different shapes, besides a prodigious number of torches and tapers, illuminated the mournful procession. At least 40,000 people, both Christians and pagans, followed the funeral. The king was there with all the mandarins of the different corps; and, strange to say, even his mother, his sister, the queen, his concubines, his children, all the ladies of the Court considered that, for a man so above the common, everyday customs should be set aside; all came, and went the whole way to the tomb.

It would require a literal translation of M. Lelabousse's letter, to enumerate all the marks of esteem and regret which the king showered on the memory of the deceased prelate. The identical flags which his Majesty was in the habit of having carried alongside him in battle, were carried alongside the coffin on its way to the grave. A handsome tomb (in native style) was erected to his memory; and, in pursuance of native custom, the king issued an edict eulogizing his services and his abilities, and expressing sorrow at his loss.

The young prince with whose fortunes he had been so intimately associated, survived him only two years, and it is easy to conceive that his death was a severe blow for the Missions. Still, the goodwill which Mgr. d'Adran's services had gained seems to have endured after his death; for though we find occasional complaints of the king's lukewarmness—resulting probably from the fact that he had to consider the prejudices of his people, while the missionaries would have liked him to exalt Christianity by edict—we find also instances in which he supports them and their cause. An attempt by Louis XVIII. to revive the dormant treaty of Versailles seems to have caused both alarm and irritation in the closing years of Nguyen-anh, and to this introduction of the political spectre may perhaps be traced the persecution which broke out during the following reign. No effort seems, however, to have been made to press the claim, and the treaty remained a dead-letter.

Nguyen-anh died in 1820, and with his death terminates the episode we had set ourselves to relate. A few lines will bridge

over the interval between his decease, and the capture and annexation of Saigon with which the second chapter of French intervention opens. The tranquillity which the Mission had so long enjoyed was drawing to a close, and intermittent persecution, leading to fitful visits from French war-ships, chequers the story of the ensuing years. Most of the officers who had served during the civil war appear to have left soon after its termination; but two, MM. Chaigneau and Vannier, settled down in the land; and we find M. Chaigneau, who visited France in 1820, returning the following year with the rank of consul, and with a number of presents from Louis XVIII. to the reigning king. Nguyen-anh, as we have seen, had died in the interval, but his successor appears to have received the French king's letter and presents with fitting honour and display.* The truce was, however, of short duration. He refused altogether to receive a fresh letter brought soon after by Captain Bougainville, who was accredited as envoy to the Annamese Court; and in 1825 MM. Chaigneau and Vannier judged it wise to withdraw from a country where they felt themselves objects of distrust. It was not, however, till five years later that the growing dislike of the new king to the foreigners and their converts, broke out into open violence. The native Christians were the first to suffer; but in 1833 the persecution extended to the missionaries also; and from that year to 1840 thirteen French and Spanish priests were executed or died in prison. For a moment, then, the king seems to have been alarmed at what he had done. His father had recommended him to diplomatise—to discourage Christianity, but not to persecute; to keep the missionaries at a distance, but not to kill them, as that might lead to French intervention, which was to be avoided at all cost. In 1839, accordingly, he sent a mission to France, which Louis Philippe declined to receive; but the report which the members brought back seems to have convinced him that he had nothing to apprehend. His death, about the time of their return, was followed by renewed persecution under his successor. An opportune visit of a French corvette in 1843 secured the release of five priests who were in imminent danger. A similar visit, next year, procured the surrender of another who was under sentence of death; and Admiral Lapierre, who visited Turon in 1847, found occasion to destroy the Annamese fleet, by which he believed himself menaced. The persecution continued under Tu-duc, who came to the throne a year later; a visit by M. de Montigny, in 1857, only aggravating the evil. These casual visitations, indeed, seem only to have increased the

* Lettre (extrait) de M. Gagelin, dated Octobre 4, 1821.

irritation of the Anamese sovereigns against the class to whose presence they attributed the annoyance. M. de Montigny had been commissioned to negotiate a treaty, having for its leading features—free exercise of the Catholic religion; freedom of commerce; the residence of a consul at the capital, and the cession of Turon or of a neighbouring island for the establishment of a French factory. He found himself unable to open serious negotiations; and soon after his return, *re infectâ*, the Emperor Napoleon resolved on the expedition under Admiral Rigault de Genouilly, at the close of the China war, which resulted in the acquisition of Saigon, and has entailed the annexation of the whole kingdom.

Undertaken in concert with Spain, for the avowed purpose of sustaining the Catholic Missions and their converts, this expedition quickly changed its character to one of conquest. The treaty which, in June 1862, the King was eventually compelled to sign, certainly promised protection and freedom of worship to Christians, but it also ceded to France the three provinces of Mytho, Saigon, and Bienhoa, which were erected into the colony of Saigon. The annexation of three more provinces in 1867, and the establishment over Cambodia of a protectorate which has since been amplified to the point of practical absorption, completed the subjection of Southern Cochin China to French rule.

The circumstances which induced French intervention in Tongking, and which have led on, step by step, to the annexation of that province, and to the declaration of a protectorate which is only veiled annexation, over the whole kingdom of Annam, are matters of recent history. The immediate impulse seems, if we may judge from the voluminous correspondence which M. du Caillaud appends as *pièces justificatives** to have come from Saigon; but it will be seen from the foregoing pages, that it was an impulse in consonance with a policy devised during the last century, and which has always had warm supporters in France. Accident seems as responsible as design for the precise conditions of its revival. A wish to develop the new colony led to the despatch, in 1866, of an expedition to explore the river Meikong, in the hope that it might be found practicable as a channel of commerce with western China. This surmise was doomed to early disappointment, the Meikong itself proving utterly unnavigable; but the members of the mission prosecuted their journey into China, and in the course of a deflection, caused by the presence of the Mahomedan rebellion, chanced upon the head-waters of the river Songkoi—which flows out of Yunnan, across Tongking, into the gulf of that

* "Histoire de l'Intervention Française au Tongking."

name—and which immediately suggested itself as an alternative route. The magnificent volumes* in which the incidents of this journey, the character of the country traversed, and the features of the inhabitants, were given to the world, are familiar to every one interested in the Far East: we are concerned, now, only to note the discovery which was the origin of French interest in Tongking. A Frenchman, named Dupuis, was the first to discern in it an opportunity for lucrative adventure. He went forthwith into Yunnan, and arranged with the imperial mandarins to convey to them, by way of the Songkoi, the munitions of war which they needed to carry on their campaign against the rebels, and for which they were to pay with the copper for which the province is renowned.† His project encountered strong opposition from the Annamese officials; and, though he carried it into partial execution, there resulted an embroglio which led to the famous expedition (1873) of Lieut. Garnier, who set to work with a few hundred men to conquer and garrison the whole delta. A perusal of the correspondence to which we have already referred, justifies the impression that, although his mission was ostensibly diplomatic, there was a perfect willingness at Saigon to create a "situation" which should lead to more vigorous intervention, and to the acquisition of a permanent foothold on the banks of the river which had become an object of interest. Dupuis had demonstrated the practicability of the route. The next thing was to force it open. The tale is exhaustively told, in M. du Caillaud's pages, of this first act of French intervention in Tongking. Garnier, after capturing Hanoi and all the principal cities of the delta, with ease, from the half-armed Annamese, fell in a sortie against their "Black Flag" Chinese auxiliaries, whose name has become familiar in the course of the recent struggle; and the troops he had led were shortly after withdrawn from the country. France was still gasping, after her death-struggle with Germany, and unprepared as yet for the colonial enterprises into which she has subsequently plunged. The expedition was, however, by no means fruitless. The Saigon Government exacted, as the price of evacuation, a treaty (dated March 15, 1874) which gave France a quasi-protectorate over the country, and stipulated for the opening of the Songkoi to foreign commerce along its whole length to Yunnan. Ports were opened, and consuls and customs officers appointed (1875) in accordance with the provisions of this docu-

* "Voyage d'Exploration en Indo-Chine, 1866-8," par Francis Garnier.

† Dupuis's own narrative of his journey will be found in the *Bulletin de la Société de Géographie*, July and August, 1877.

ment; but no determined effort appears to have been made to give effect to its provisions regarding the navigation of the stream; though complaints were frequent of piracy, Black Flags and other obstacles, for which the Annamese Government was held responsible; and eventually, in 1882, Commander Rivière was despatched, with a force as inadequate as Garnier's, to insist on, and effect, the suppression of these evils.* History repeated itself. Received with a coolness verging on repulsion, by the officials he came ostensibly to reinforce, Rivière, like Garnier, took umbrage, and took Hanoi, without apparently reflecting that he thereby more than justified the suspicions he deprecated. Again the remarkable spectacle was seen, of a handful of Frenchmen invading the delta; and again the Annamese appealed to the Black Flags for help. Again these redoubtable auxiliaries advanced; and again the French, repeating the mistake of rating them at the same value as the Annamese levies, incurred a severe repulse. Rivière was killed, under almost the same circumstances as his predecessor; and his death determined the fate of Tongking. France had recovered, by this time, from the exhaustion of her great war, and was ready to approve the cry that Rivière must be avenged and French prestige restored. Saigon did not fail to urge its favourite idea of political expansion. Financiers dwelt on the reports of metallic wealth, of which there had always been a tradition, and which Dupuis's adventure had fostered. It began to be recognized that French "interests" in Tongking required the virtual annexation of the country. Events marched rapidly. The colonial "idea" burst into full bloom. What was to have been merely an avenging expedition, grew into a war of conquest. China, alarmed at the prospect of a conterminous frontier with a militant and restless power, intervened on behalf of her vassal—at first by diplomatic protest, and eventually by armed resistance. What M. Challemeil Lacour had promised should be a military promenade, became a serious campaign. All pretence of merely avenging Rivière's death disappeared. Not only was the annexation of Tongking openly avowed, but Annam itself was reduced to subjection, on the plea that it was wickedly obstructing execution of the treaty of 1874—in other words, fostering resistance to the French invasion. Its capital, Hué, was attacked and taken. A treaty (1883) was dictated, by which the king recognized the protectorate of France over all his dominions; and the seal of office, which

* The story of Dupuis's adventure, and of Garnier's meteoric intervention was sketched by the present writer in the pages of the *Contemporary Review* (November, 1882), in the early days of the present campaign; and the approaching intervention of China, which has since become a serious reality, was foreshadowed.

he and his predecessors had held for centuries as vassals of China, was destroyed.

The authority asserted was, however, far from being consolidated. The French were still confronted by a host of Chinese, regulars and irregulars, in the hills of Tongking, and could expect no peace—still less any commerce with Yunnan—till terms had been agreed on with the huge power which had come, however tardily, into the field. The pen, therefore, kept pace in the contest with the sword. First one diplomatist and then another endeavoured to negotiate a settlement. For a moment it seemed that a solution had been reached, under the auspices of M. Bourréz, by which China was to retain control over the northern region, abandoning the districts south of the Songkoi to France. But this settlement was condemned as inadequate at Paris, and excessive at Peking, and the struggle still went on. Then Captain Fournier succeeded in negotiating, at Tientsin, a treaty (dated May 11, 1884) eminently favourable to France, by which China undertook to withdraw from Tongking, and to open her adjacent frontier to commerce, France agreeing on her side to hold that frontier inviolate, and to respect the fiction of a Chinese suzerainty.

It is no part of our design to examine in detail the series of mishaps—to use no stronger word—by which, first its representatives in the East, and subsequently the French Cabinet itself, contrived to upset this arrangement, and to reopen with China, on Chinese soil, the quarrel which had hitherto been confined to Tongking. Captain Fournier's presentation of a memorandum to the Chinese plenipotentiary, naming the dates on which he required the several fortresses to be handed over, commenced the difficulty. The curious controversy as to the authenticity of certain erasures, which the Chinese declare he made with his own hand at their protest, and which the French declare to be unblushing forgeries, may figure as an anecdote in some future biography, but has already passed practically into the domain of the insoluble. One thing clear is that the Chinese Minister neither signed nor assented to the document, which, however, Captain Fournier left on his table—mangled or intact as the case may be—and on which the French proceeded to take action. Colonel Dugenne was sent forward, on the date therein named, to occupy the city of Langson, not only with a force lamentably insufficient, but with means of interpreting so inadequate that he was unable to get translated a letter in which the Chinese commander responded to his summons. The whole embroglio, in fact, from this point became simply inconceivable. Colonel Dugenne's instructions were to halt and communicate with his superiors, if the Chinese showed signs of opposition. He was met,

as we have seen, by a letter which, when eventually translated (at Shanghai !), was found to acknowledge the Tientsin treaty, but to plead that the writer had not yet received instructions to withdraw, to deprecate precipitancy, and to suggest reference to Peking. We can, perhaps, not blame Colonel Dugenne for ignoring a communication he could not read, though we may stand aghast at the negligence which left him in that predicament. But he was clearly able to communicate in some degree, verbally ; for he understood that the Chinese commander subsequently asked ten days in which to complete the evacuation. And yet, in the face of that demand and of his own instructions, he responded by an order to quit at once, and an intimation that he would recommence his forward movement in an hour. He did so, was fired on, and forced to retreat with loss. These circumstances, which we find admitted in evidence taken before a recent Committee of the Chamber, and corroborated by Colonel Dugenne's recall, scarcely justify the assumption on which M. Ferry precipitately acted, and which he has, apparently, since deemed himself obliged to sustain—that there had been wilful treachery on the part of the Chinese, for which a heavy indemnity should be paid, or heavy reprisals inflicted. It is likely that no one regrets, now, more deeply than the French Premier, the precipitancy which led to the overthrow of a useful treaty and the commencement of a useless war. It has been suggested, indeed, that there was a willingness to keep up the quarrel, in order to exact an indemnity, if not to carry out a suggestion made by Rivière, that the three southern provinces of China should be added, to make Tongking a possession worth having. But we acquit M. Ferry of any such extravagant design. At any rate, if it ever seemed to him practical, he must have come to realize more clearly the degree of resistance to be expected. Certainly the French people are in no humour for the effort and sacrifice required for an enterprise of such magnitude. They are tired even of the present profitless struggle, and more anxious even than the Chinese—who are really angry and combative—to bring it to a close. The difficulty is to find a way out of the quarrel. Both nations desire peace, if only terms of accommodation can be found ; but neither will make concessions that could bear the semblance of acknowledging defeat. The exigencies of prestige in the Far East make it difficult for France to lower her tone, and the anger of the Chinese at what they consider her unwarrantable aggression, has roused a determined spirit of resistance. They are understood to refuse now to admit even the Tientsin treaty as a basis, and to renew their demand for the delimitation of a neutral zone.

It would, however, carry us far beyond our purpose to analyze the difficulties of the present situation. We have been concerned

rather to trace the consequences of Bishop Pigneau's predication, and to show how recent adventure has been the outcome of his ambitious conception. No one familiar with the far-reaching policy of the Roman Church will fail to apprehend that his design was twofold, and that the more intimate purpose was probably not that put most frankly forward. The extension of French influence and French dominion in the East meant the extension of her protectorate over Catholic missions, and increased opportunity for the extension of those missions themselves. What more likely to produce these results than a scheme of military adventure and eventual dominion, eminently consonant with French character and aspirations? Political exigencies delayed its execution. The downfall of the monarchy, and the Napoleonic wars, abruptly broke the threads; but, even with the accession of Louis XVIII., we see a tentative effort to reknit them; and the Abbé Huc is at hand to awake the attention of Napoleon III., when the close of the Anglo-French war with China left a powerful expedition available, in 1858, for driving home the wedge which Louis XVI. had pointed. The treaties of Saigon of 1862 and 1874, the treaty of Hué of 1883, and the treaties with Cambodia in 1863 and 1884, are the political offspring of the treaty (?) of Versailles of 1787. After the lapse of a century, the dream of the Bishop seems approaching realization. The flag of France has been planted along the whole eastern seaboard of Indo-China, and the foundation of the empire which was to compensate for the loss of India has been laid. It is true her hold is as yet slight. The subjugation of Cochin-China and Cambodia is complete; but her suzerainty over Annam is little more than nominal, while her power in Tongking is confined to the delta, and is challenged by constant attacks from the north. But she is so far committed that she must, for pride's sake, persevere; and we take it for granted that she will retain possession of the fruits of her costly enterprise. She is committed to a war with China, of which it is difficult to foresee the cost or the event; but sooner or later peace will be had, on terms which will involve recognition of French sovereignty, even if the nominal area be somewhat contracted by the creation of the neutral zone for which China is so anxious.

Already the Government is elaborating a scheme of administration for the whole region, and already there are rumours of threatened extension. Six months ago, when the Governor of Saigon seized a pretext to extort from King Norodom a treaty (d. 17 June '84) practically handing over Cambodia to French rule, the Saigonnais took occasion to predict that the whole trans-Gangetic peninsula was destined to come under the protectorate of France. The expression was sweeping, considering that large districts of the peninsula are already owned

by England; but it was well understood that Siam was proximately indicated. Already there exist materials for quarrel when the moment arrives—in the south, in the shape of two provinces adjoining Cambodia, which once belonged to that now French province, but which have passed under the rule of Siam; while in the north Dr. Néis is making scientific researches among the Laos tribes—and making treaties with them, it is said, as well, to bring them within the fold of the great protectorate. The very thought of further aggression is of course repudiated at Paris; but so were, once, the ideas of annexing Tunis and Tongking; and it may well be that the Court of Bangkok does well to be alarmed at the attitude of its new neighbour. We will not, however, attempt to forecast the political future. It is sufficient to note that, in the meantime, an identical Customs tariff has been devised for the whole eastern seaboard of the peninsula, and the title of Governor-General is indicated for the French Resident at Hué; the autonomy of the several provinces—Tongking, Annam, Cochin-China and Cambodia—being, however, preserved by separate provincial administrations.

We are naturally led on, then, to ask what will be the value of the new possession, and we find the question ably examined in a letter to the *Times* from its special correspondent, Mr. Colquhoun, which has been reprinted, with others, in a pamphlet giving a concise *aperçu* of the situation. Before quoting from this source, however, it may be worth while glancing back at some earlier, though probably little known, writings which are preserved for our delectation in Churchill's and Pinkerton's collections. For Tongking was not always the *terra incognita* it had become during the present century. Portuguese, Dutch, and English merchants had factories there during the seventeenth century; and even after these were abandoned, a desultory commerce appears to have been kept up till towards the close of the eighteenth. It was in 1637 the Dutch first landed in the country, and they found the Portuguese already established. The English seem to have arrived nearly about the same period; and a flourishing foreign settlement is said to have existed, at one period, at Hung-yen, which was then the centre of foreign commerce. We will let Captain Alexander Hamilton*, "who spent his time from 1688 to 1723 trading and travelling by sea and land," tell the story of their withdrawal:—

Tonquin is the next place I must steer to, of course, where the English and Dutch both had their factories; but the English Com-

* "A Description of the East Indies." By Captain Alexander Hamilton. Pinkerton's Collection, vol. viii. p. 483.

pany's affairs being a little out of order, they withdrew theirs in 1698; and the Dutch, finding but little advantage by their trade in Tonquin, withdrew theirs about six years after. However, the English had a private trade pretty good till the year 1719, that (*sic*) an English ship from Bengal ruined it by an act of violence. The ship, being laden and ready to sail, fell down the river to Catcheo, the capital city of Tongking; and in defiance of the known laws of the country, the supercargo got a Tonquin girl on board, in order to carry her with him; but her friends, missing her, informed the civil magistrate, who sent to demand her, but the supercargo would not resign his mistress; whereupon acts of hostility ensued, and some were killed on both sides, and Captain Wallace, who commanded the ship, had the fortune to be one of the slain. However, the English bravely carried off their prize; but I never heard anything more of the Tonquin trade since.

The depredators, however, or some others of their countrymen, must have subsequently made their peace, as we learn from Richard,* who wrote in Paris, in 1778, that English ships still traded to Tongking; though they were debarred from ascending the river, on account of another act of impropriety. Up to 1730, or thereabouts, they had been allowed to come up to the capital; but a certain ship was found smuggling some copper, and fought its way out to escape seizure. Trade was thereupon suspended till 1742, when the English again made their peace, though they were excluded from the river.

As to the articles of which the Tongking trade consisted, we are inclined to again rely on Captain Hamilton, who was evidently a man of much experience:—

The country is prodigiously fruitful in all things necessary for the conveniency and support of life. They have abundance of raw silk, and manufacture part of it in wrought silks, but none fine. Their baaz is the best, which they generally dye black. It wears very long, because it is soft and well spun, and the oftener it is washed, the colour looks brighter, if blacker may be so called. They make bowls, cups, and tables of rattans, and cover them very neatly with lack of various colours, and gild them. They have also some porcelain, but very coarse and ill-painted. And those are the commodities for exportation from Tonquin.

Earlier, however, than either of these writers, we have an exhaustive paper by one S. Baron,† who appears to have been born in Tongking, but to have been of English nationality. He bears somewhat similar testimony as to the articles of export, among which silk was evidently the most important; but adds

* *Vide* Pinkerton, vol. ix.

† "A Description of the Kingdom of Tonqueen." By S. Baron, a native thereof. Churchill's Collection, vol. vi.

[Vol. CXXIII. No. CCXLV.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LXVII. No. J. K

a remark discouraging to those who lay stress on the metallic wealth of the country :—

Neither have they any gold but what comes from China. Their silver is brought in by English, Dutch, and Chinese trading to Japan. They have iron and lead mines, which afford them just enough of those minerals to serve their occasions.

Great, however, as Baron's familiarity with the country clearly was, we are not disposed to accept his testimony implicitly, on this point. He is contradicted by Richard, who declares that gold is found in the sands of the rivers and the clefts of the rocks, and adds :—

There are besides (gold) mines that are open, but which are only worked by the Chinese. . . . Nevertheless, the natives of the country themselves work mines of copper, iron, and lead.

Besides, Baron, who wrote about 1685, seems to have been unsuccessful in his trade, and a little put out with Tongking. A prince by whom he had got himself adopted, went mad on the death of his grandfather, "which was," he says, "the overthrow of my business, by incapacitating him to protect me in my greatest trouble and necessity." His description of the country, government, institutions, &c., is, however, exhaustive; and the following paragraph has especial interest at the present moment :—

Though the Chova (Regent) values foreign trade so little, yet he receives from it, embarrassed as it is, considerable annual income into his coffers, as taxes, head-money, impositions, customs, &c. But though these amount to vast sums, yet very little remains in the treasury, by reason of the great army he maintains, together with several other unnecessary expenses. In fine, it is pity so many conveniences and opportunities to make the kingdom flourishing should be neglected; for if we consider how this kingdom borders on two of the richest provinces of China, it will appear that, with small difficulty, most commodities of that vast empire might be drawn hither; and great store of Indian and European commodities, especially woollen manufactures, might be vended there. Nay, would they permit strangers the freedom of this inland trade, it would be vastly advantageous to the kingdom; but the Chova (jealous that Europeans should discover too much of his frontiers, by which certainly he can receive no injury) has, and will probably in all times to come, impede this important affair.

Richard's remarks on the same subject bear a suspicious resemblance to Baron's, whose paper he has evidently had before him, when writing his own. He, too, opines that a considerable trade would be possible if greater facilities were allowed. "But the administration has not yet opened its eyes to these sources of public prosperity; they keep in a false dread of revolutions and

invasions from foreign forces, that they fear the pretence of commerce might favour;"—a remark which has a curious significance, at a moment when this "pretence of commerce" has led to the very real invasion of the French.

We turn now to Mr. Colquhoun's interesting pages, for information as to the modern commerce of the country, since its partial reopening in 1875. Going back to 1880, because the French invasion has since then exercised a disturbing influence, he finds the value of the total foreign trade in that year was £800,000, made up as follows:—Imports: English piece goods, 34 per cent.; opium, 21; Chinese medicines, 11; Chinese tobacco, 9; tea, 5; miscellaneous articles, 20. Exports: Rice, 39 per cent.; silk, 21; tin, 16; lac, 6; miscellaneous, 6. Of the imports, 97½ per cent. came from Hong-Kong; 2 per cent. from Annam, and ½ per cent. from Saigon! Of the exports, 79 per cent. went to Hong-Kong! 16 per cent. to Saigon, and 5 per cent. to the coast ports of Annam. While the proportion of tonnage under the different flags was: English 35 per cent.; Chinese (from Hong-Kong), 23·5; Germany, 11; Dutch, 5·5; and French, 5! The total, it will be seen, is not very great, and the share of France is inappreciable; but it is no doubt open to augmentation if the country settles down, and trade with Yunnan can be fostered.* Mr. Colquhoun does not, however, share the sanguine expectations of certain French writers on the subject:—

Opium from Yunnan and tea from the Shan country, are (he considers) the main articles which offer any serious development, except metals. The opium and tea trade cannot be largely developed, for China will not take them. They are locally consumed. The principal source of Yunnan wealth is mineral; but China must effectively open the Songkoi, and allow the mines to be worked, before any great afflux can come from this source. Most of the mines are far removed from the Songkoi, and the river is not navigable to a degree which can create any great carrying trade. For that purpose, according to the French themselves, a railway is needed. Finally, what is urged in regard to the mines of Tonquin—namely, the fact that mines far removed from the scene of industries do not pay—must be borne in mind.

The coal might perhaps compete with the Australia, China, and Japan coal, sold at Hong-Kong; analysis has shown its quality to be excellent. Iron, lead, zinc, tin, and gold, exist in different parts—

* It appears from the latest official report, that the imports into Tongking and Annam for the first half of the present year were about £175,000. The direct imports from France are almost *nil*, as all French goods pass through Saigon. The import of French goods from thence amounted to £43,200; but more than half of this sum represents wine, beer, and brandy, evidently intended for the Expeditionary Corps.

mainly in the Songkoi basin—but whether it will pay to exploit them, I cannot offer any opinion.

The latest information we have on the latter subject is a report presented to the Minister of Marine by a Commission lately appointed in Paris, under the presidency of the Inspector-General of Mines, to consider it. It would appear from their investigations, that the presence of gold and silver is indicated in the province of Thai-nguyen, gold and tin in Caobinh, and copper in Tuyen-Kwan and Hunghou. Official exploration, however, is advised, to gather more precise information; the chief sources, at present, apparently being Annamese documents and common report. Only “with regard to the coal measures on the coast of Tongking and the adjacent islands,” is it conceived that “information and investigation are so far advanced that work may be commenced at once. And it is understood, in fact, that a relative of M. Ferry’s has already secured a large concession, with a view to exploitation.”

Turning again to Mr. Colquhoun’s pages, we find he fully confirms the agricultural resources of the country. The principal staple is rice, of which there are two crops annually; other products being the castor-oil plant, mulberry, cotton, sugar-cane, plantain, and sweet potato. Silk is largely produced, but the quality is poor. The tobacco is condemned as insipid. Little tea is grown; but in Laos, bordering on Yunnan, a fine quality, known in China as Puerh tea, is produced, and the French hope to divert the export to Tongking—an expectation in which, however, Mr. Colquhoun appears to doubt their success, unless they make a rail along the whole course of the Songkoi! Inferior indigo and false gambier are also produced.

Sufficient has been said, to give a fair idea of the resources of the country which France is striving to conquer and annex. It will be seen that, judging from the past, her prospect of getting an adequate return for the blood and treasure she is expending do not seem brilliant. Military gratification she may find, and the satisfaction of possessing in the Far East a great territory, with prospects and possibilities of further extension. The interests will be served, too, of that propaganda whose spokesman Mgr. d’Adran constituted himself when putting forward his notable project, and whose views we find Mgr. Freppel defending at the present day, when supporting at the Tribune the policy of colonial extension. But of actual substantial recompense, in the sense in which Englishmen are apt to interpret the word, experience teaches us to be less hopeful. France seems to have lost—if we are to take the instance of Canada as proving that she once possessed—the knack of colonizing. She raises her flag in the hope that trade

will follow, but it does not. That the delta of Tongking is fertile, and may provide valuable material for export, is certain, as it is that a certain amount of foreign goods would find their way into consumption, under a settled and liberal régime. But experience tends to show that merchants other than French will be the principal instruments of that trade, if it be left unhampered, while the trade itself will be choked by the protective measures contemplated. It has been shown in how preponderant a degree the trade has hitherto tended to gravitate towards Hong-Kong, rather than to Saigon which the owners of Cochin-China would naturally wish to see the commercial centre of the region; and it seems decided to endeavour to change, by legislation,* percentages which show that French commercial interests in the country are really inappreciable. Saigon is a capable colony, but little has been done for its internal development, and what commerce exists is carried on chiefly by English, German, and Chinese firms. It is a Frenchman who recently remarked that there are, there, so many officials governing each other! Nor is there reason to anticipate that things will eventuate much otherwise in Tongking; while the imposition of differential duties in favour of French trade will retard and discourage its development by foreign agencies. Of the mines, on which so much stress has been laid by advocates of annexation, it would be premature to say more than that the existence of metals seems clearly indicated, but the possibility of exploiting them profitably is a problem as yet unsolved.

* The *Journal Officiel de la Cochin-Chine Française* of Nov. 3, '84 contained a full report of a meeting of the Colonial Council, at which the subject was debated. A new tariff was adopted, under pressure from Paris, imposing duties varying from 5 to 10 per cent., with a deduction not yet fixed, but indicated at from 50 to 70 per cent., in favour of French products. The scheme was opposed by certain non-official members, on the ground that Saigon did not require the additional revenue, and that the taxation would be injurious to her interests. We are not concerned, however, with the discussion; but a significant declaration by one of the official members, at the close of the debate, is worth quoting. "The principal motive, the deciding reason," for the re-establishment of Customs both in Cochin-China and in other colonies where they had been suppressed, was "the necessity of protecting French industry. . . . Oui, messieurs, il faut le dire, puisque malheureusement cela est, l'industrie française a besoin d'être protégée contre ses rivaux étrangers. Ici comme partout, les produits anglais et allemands prennent la place des produits français. Sans droits protecteurs, l'industrie française est vaincue d'avance, et c'est pour cela que, faisant appel au patriotisme de la Cochin-Chine, on lui demande un sacrifice à fin de venir en aide à l'industrie nationale, et de lui permettre de lutter à armes égales (!), au moins dans les colonies acquises par l'or et le sang français, avec l'industrie étrangère." It would seem that a lame attempt is to be made to encourage Saigon as a commercial *entrepôt*, by making the town itself free, though duties would be charged on goods leaving it.

There remain, of course, the elastic possibilities of commerce with China, which suggested themselves to Baron two hundred years ago, and which form a prominent feature in the French programme of to-day. That such commerce has existed in a certain measure is certain, and that it may be considerably augmented, Dupuis' experience would seem to show; though the singular conditions of his adventure forbid us to accept it as precisely indicative of what might be expected from sober commercial enterprise. The Songkoi is no doubt a valuable stream; but its capacity as a water-way seems to have been exaggerated, in the minds of those who first indicated the possibility of tapping South-western China by this route. It is certainly navigable for some distance—as far, according to Mr. Colquhoun, as Konence,—for steamers of light draught; but its upper waters “are impeded by sandbanks, rocks, and rapids,” and are “impracticable from November to March, except for boats under four tons,” while above Laokai (near the Chinese frontier), the river “is useless for trade.”

It is, however, premature to anticipate too closely results which must depend in great measure on conditions that have yet to be fulfilled. Peace has yet to be restored, and order and good government imposed; terms of commercial intercourse have yet to be arranged with the adjoining provinces of China, and trade routes opened. Annam proper seems to be comparatively poor and thinly populated; but we have the testimony of early visitors that Tongking was once a flourishing and populous kingdom. Populous it still is, if the estimate of 10,000,000 may be taken as approximately correct. Flourishing it may again become, if order and good government are restored to it under French auspices. But there is reason to apprehend that the very measures which are being taken to favour French trade will tend rather to hinder commercial progress.

ART. VI.—JOHN WILSON CROKER.

The Croker Papers. The Correspondence and Diaries of the late Right Honourable John Wilson Croker, LL.D., F.R.S., Secretary to the Admiralty from 1800 to 1830. Edited by LOUIS J. JENNINGS, author of “Republican Government in the United States.” In three volumes. London: John Murray. 1884.

WE must compliment and congratulate Mr. Jennings on the manner in which he has performed his task of editing “The Croker Papers.” “My first and greatest desire from the outset,” he says, “was to let the correspondence speak for itself,

a long and patient study of it having convinced me that it afforded a complete vindication of Mr. Croker from the injustice which one writer after another, each imitating the other, had treated him."* We cannot fully assent to this statement, but we are free to confess that a careful study of these volumes has in some respects modified the unfavourable opinion of Mr. Croker, which, in common with most people, we hitherto entertained. These papers, however, are not merely a personal vindication—they are a contribution of general interest and importance to the history of the period over which Mr. Croker's career extended, and we agree with the editor "that the literary and social interest of the collection is scarcely less original and attractive."†

Mr. Croker, it will be remembered, was an Irishman, born in Galway in 1780. If not of low, he was of humble origin, though his father claimed descent from the Crokers of Devon, named in the halting lines of the Devonshire distich.

Croker, Crewys, and Copleston,
When the Conqueror came were at home.

The father was for many years "Surveyor General of Customs and Excise" in Ireland.‡ His son was sent to Portarlington school, and while there, before he attained the age of nine, he illustrated the fact that the boy is father of the man by contributing to the election literature of a contest for county Cork. He composed a dialogue in favour of one of the candidates—a friend of his father's; he subsequently—deservedly or otherwise—gained a considerable reputation for election pasquinades. After brief sojourns at other schools, and before he was sixteen, he was entered at Trinity College, Dublin. In the first year of the present century he came to London. It is seldom we concur with Mr. Percy Fitzgerald in his judgments on men and things, but we agree with him "that Mr. Croker came to London as an Irish adventurer in the more becoming sense of the term."§ He entered himself a student of Lincoln's Inn, but, from the first, literature divided his attention with law. He began his literary career by writing letters on the French Revolution addressed to Tallien, and which appeared in the *Times*. The French Revolution had an overpowering fascination for him. "He probably knew more of the history of the Revolution in France," writes a friend of his early days, "and had written more on that subject than any man living." || At one time he

* Preface, p. v.

† Preface, p. iv.

‡ He appears to have been an active and useful official, *vide* Lord Colchester's "Diary," vol. i. p. 281.

§ "Life and Times of William IV.," vol. ii. p. 238.

|| The late Mr. Jesse, quoted vol. i. p. 8.

thought of writing the "History of the French Revolution," for the copyright of which Mr. Murray offered him 2,500 guineas, but were it ever begun he never found leisure to complete it. * This acquaintance with the history of the French Revolution is one of the proofs of the identity of Mr. Croker with the Mr. Rigby, of "Coningsby," who "bored his audience too much with history, especially with the French Revolution, which he fancied was his forte, so that the people at last, whenever he made any allusion to the subject, were almost as much terrified as if they had seen the guillotine." †

One of the very few of his many contributions to the *Quarterly Review*, which have been republished, is an article on the guillotine. ‡ When we read it we remember experiencing a feeling of sympathy with the interrupter at the nomination at Darford, where Mr. Rigby in his speech "brought in his crack theme the guillotine, and dilated so elaborately on its qualities, that one of the gentlemen below could not refrain from exclaiming: 'I wish you may get it.'" § We shall return hereafter to the question of the identity of Croker with Rigby. During Croker's official career, his literary labours seemed to have been mainly confined to the newspapers. At that time there was a mystery about contributors to the press, and the extent of Croker's connection with it is not known; but that it was extensive appears from a letter of the year 1829, in which he speaks of himself "as an old and, as some of the gentlemen of the press used to think, a good hand;" and adds, "I have conveyed to the public articles written by Prime and Cabinet Ministers, and sometimes have composed such articles under their eye, they supplied *the fact* and I *the tact*, and between us we used to produce a considerable effect." And then, after comparing the newspapers of England and France and the status of French and English journalists, in both cases to the disadvantage of England, he utters a prophecy which he lived to see partially fulfilled.||

The example of France will soon be contagious, and we shall see men of high hopes and attainments conducting journals, and obtaining at last, through their literary character, seats in the House of Commons. Depend upon it all this is coming, and the day is not far distant when you will (not *see* nor *hear*) but *know* that there is some one in the Cabinet entrusted with what will be thought one of

* Vol. i. 57-93.

† "Coningsby," book v. chap. iii.

‡ "Historical Essay on the Guillotine," by the Right Hon. J. W. Croker. London: John Murray.

§ "Coningsby," *ubi supra*.

|| Vol. ii. pp. 22, 23.

the most important duties of the State—the regulation of public opinion.*

To the *Quarterly Review*, from its foundation in 1809 to near the close of his life, he was a constant contributor. In its earlier years one and the same number of the Review not infrequently contained two or three articles from his pen.† He was neither a sound nor a genial critic. On the tone and style of his articles we are happy to find ourselves again in accord with Mr. Percy Fitzgerald. "Their tone was angry, hostile, and too often malicious." As to their style: "All these lucubrations were set out and emphasized by a series of arts now fallen out of use, and unknown to the present race of reviewers—a copious use of italics, in combination with capitals of various degrees and sizes, which lent a curious 'bill-poster' air, and certainly doubled the effect of his points."‡ We transcribe from Mr. Fitzgerald's pages a specimen of this bill-poster style, taken from Croker's once-notorious article on Lady Morgan's "France." After calling her "a bookseller's drudge," he continues:—

Our charges (to omit minor faults) fall readily under the heads of Bad Taste—Bombast and Nonsense—Blunders—Ignorance of the French Language and Manners—General Ignorance—Jacobinism—Falsehood—Licentiousness, and Impiety. We undertake to prove them from Lady Morgan's own mouth. **BAD TASTE.** The work is composed in the most confused manner and written in the worst style—if it be not an abuse of style to call that a *style* which is merely a jargon. There is neither order in the subjects nor connection between the parts. It is a huge aggregation of disjointed sentences, so jumbled together, that we seriously assert no injury will be done to the volume by beginning with the last chapter and reading backwards to the first, and yet it has all the affectation of order: it is divided into *parts*. We indeed have been obliged to labour through these tomes, because our duty imposes that task upon us; but we have not heard of any voluntary reader who has been able to contend against the narcotic influence of her *prating, prosing, and plagiarism*, and get through even the first volume.

"What," is Mr. Fitzgerald's comment on this passage, "must have been the gall and blackness of the man's heart that could pen such abuse!"§

Mr. Fitzgerald also gives a specimen of Croker's habitually unfair method of dealing with writers. On the first publica-

* Before Croker's death, Lord Sherbrooke, then Mr. Lowe, was a contributor to the *Times* and a Minister, though not in the Cabinet.

† At that time review articles were much shorter than they now are.

‡ "Life and Times of William IV.," vol. ii. pp. 239–242. *Conf.* opinions of Lords Beaconsfield and Macaulay on Croker's style, cited *post*.

§ *Ibid.*, pp. 240, 241.

tion of Sir Nathaniel Wraxall's curious and valuable memoirs, Croker in the *Quarterly Review* represented the writer as having described King Joseph of Portugal as "a drunken old Moor."

In vain the Baronet pleaded that his words were: "In his cheeks he had a high scorbutic humour, attributed commonly to excess of wine, though it might partly arise from violent exercise constantly taken under a rising sun. His face, indeed, was nearly as dusky as that of a Moor." The Reviewer returned to the charge, declaring that the writer had said that the King had a "face carbuncled by hard drinking."*

Impartial writers, notably Sir George Cornwall Lewis, have re-established the credibility of Sir Nathaniel Wraxall's Memoirs.

Miss Martineau, in her very acrid sketch of Croker, describes his *Quarterly* articles as "standing out as the disgrace of the periodical literature of our time," and she asserts that "he interpolated other people's articles with his own sarcasms and slanders so as to compel the real reviewers, in repeated instances, to demand the republication of their articles in a genuine state and a separate form." Miss Martineau does not specify any one of these repeated instances, and we cannot call to mind any such occurrence, we, therefore, hesitate to believe her unsupported assertion.†

Mr. Croker was more successful as an editor than an author. His edition of "The Suffolk Papers" and "Lord Hervey's Memoirs" are valuable contributions to historical literature. These and his edition of "Boswell's Johnson," notwithstanding all its faults, are the works which will longest preserve his name from oblivion.

Croker was called to the Bar and joined the Munster Circuit. In 1806 he married, and he made an unsuccessful attempt to enter Parliament. In 1807 he was elected member for Downpatrick. He continued a member of the House of Commons for twenty-five years without interruption, and might longer have so continued, but in 1832 he chose to commit political suicide. "He would not," he said, "sit in a Reformed House of Commons." The Duke of Wellington, with characteristic curt-ness, acknowledged Croker's announcement of his decision.

* "Life and Times of William IV.," p. 239. We wish Mr. Fitzgerald had given the volume of the *Quarterly* whence this extract is taken.

† See "Biographical Sketches," 1852-1868, by Harriet Martineau, Art. John William Croker, second edition, pp. 379, 380; and see her sketches of John Gibson Lockhart, p. 348 of the same volume, in which (p. 349) she reiterates this assertion, and accuses Lockhart (the editor of the *Quarterly*) of complicity with Croker in this indefensible practice.

I am very sorry that you do not intend again to be elected to serve in Parliament. I cannot conceive for what reason.

Ever yours most sincerely,

WELLINGTON.

The Duke afterwards gave Croker a caution which it would have been well for a late Secretary of the Treasury had some one given to him, "that if a man put himself on the *shelf* it might not be so easy to take him off the shelf when perhaps he would desire it." *

When he entered Parliament—says the biographer we have quoted—he was an admirable debater, ready, acute, bold, well furnished with information, and not yet so dangerously reckless as to make him feared by his own party. †

He spoke on the very night he took his seat, and ventured to break a lance with a veteran of debate—Henry Grattan. In after years, he frankly owns, he was not altogether flattered at hearing that his first speech was his best; but, he adds, "I suspect it was so." ‡ Describing him in his later years, Lord Beaconsfield speaks of "his harsh voice, his arrogant style, his saucy superficiality, which decided on everything, that contradicted everybody." § In politics he ever was, to use an Americanism, "A Tory dyed in the wool." His political creed shall be stated in his own words. His views on monarchy appear in a letter to Mr. Murray, containing a criticism on "Childe Harold," in which he censures Lord Byron "for a note or two which reflect on the Bourbon family."

I could not—he continues—bring myself to speak irreverently of the children of St. Louis; of assuredly the most ancient and splendid family of the civilized world, of a house which is connected with the literature, European refinement, and I will add European glory. My whole system of European policy, European love of realities comes in here again, and I say to myself, when I see Louis XVIII. overlooking all his personal qualities—here is the lineal descent of fifty kings. All famous, many illustrious, men who have held in their hands from age to age the destinies of millions; some of whom have been the benefactors of mankind, and others (and this part of the recollection is not the least *interesting*), who have astounded and afflicted the world by their crimes.

Clearly he was a believer in the "right divine of kings to govern wrong." Nor was he a less ardent admirer of "our glorious constitution in Church and State."

* Vol. ii. p. 162.

† Martineau, "Biographical Sketches," p. 380.

‡ Vol. i. p. 2.

§ "Coningsby," book iii. chap. xii. Lord Beaconsfield never sat in the house with Mr. Croker, but as a stranger had no doubt heard him take part in debate.

Do you remember—he writes to Southey—my once saying to you that Westminster Abbey was part of the British Constitution: that vague metaphor expresses more vividly than perhaps more distinct explanation could do my feelings on this subject, and, as I know they are in accordance with yours, you may judge how glad I am that you are inclined to contribute another tie to that union.* I do not mean the mere political *connection* of Church and State; but in that mixture of veneration and love, of enthusiasm and good taste, of public liberty and self-control, of pride of our ancestors, and hopes for our posterity, which affects every patriot and Christian mind, at the contemplation of that glorious system, which unites in such beautiful association, and such profitable combination our civil and ecclesiastical constitutions, our ambition, and our faith; the one thing needful and the all things ornamental, our well-being in this world and our salvation in the next.†

Of the defunct Irish establishment he speaks in even more extravagant terms of praise and admiration.

In all I have ever done or said, or ever shall do or say—he wrote in 1819 to the Provost of Dublin University, which he was ambitious to represent in Parliament—my first and greatest object is the Protestant Church, the most glorious combination, as I said last night‡ of the goodness of God, and the gratitude and admiration of man, of Divine wisdom and human expediency, that ever was exhibited upon earth.§

When Mr. Croker wrote this, he knew as well as Mr. Gladstone that, “from the days of Elizabeth downwards, with the rarest exceptions, the worldly element had entirely outweighed the religious one (whatever the intention may have been) in the actual working of the ecclesiastical institutions of Ireland,” || and not only in Ireland but also in England, as the following letter shows. Writing in 1846 to a friend, he says of Episcopal patronage:—

I speak not of the present bench, nor of individuals, but historically of man, and I think I may safely say that the disposal of Church preferment by the Bishops has always been, and must be, liable to great abuse and scandal. The first and often the *only* care of a Bishop is to provide for his own family, and there is not (at least there has not been to my knowledge) any single case in which promotion to the bench has not been preceded or followed by circumstances connected with patronage, which would look very unseemly to the public eye. I

* This letter refers to Southey's “Book of the Church,” which Mr. Croker highly praises, and to Southey's intention to write a “Book of the State,” which intention he did not fulfil.

† Vol. i. p. 277.

‡ Mr. Croker refers to his speech on the debate on Grattan's motion for Roman Catholic emancipation.

§ Vol. i. p. 184.

|| “Gleanings of Past Years,” vol. vii. p. 122.

remember to have heard that old Bishop Law of Elphin saluted a newly mitred brother with this congratulation: "My dear lord I give you joy, you will now be able to provide for your large family; you will unite all your sons to the Church, and the Church to all your daughters." Of the last Bishop who died, and of the last Bishop who has been made, I could tell you stories which would amuse you more than a farce; and I verily believe that Newmarket does not afford more, or more ludicrous instances of jockeyship than could be found in the secret history of Episcopal promotion and patronage. For my own part I am satisfied that of the two it would be infinitely better that they should have *no* patronage *than all*.*

Notwithstanding Mr. Croker's devotion to the Protestant Church, he was on one question in advance of his party. He always advocated Catholic emancipation—but, according to Mr. Percival, "on true no popery principles"—and he would have accompanied emancipation with some provision for the maintenance and support of the Romish priests.

I am a High Churchman—he writes in 1825, to an Irish bishop—and think the best assistance that can ever be given to the Church of Ireland, is the making a provision for the Catholic Clergy out of the general funds of the State.

I do not say that this will altogether quiet them and wholly tranquillize Ireland, but you may depend upon it that it will go a great way towards it, and what is of great importance, if they afterwards stir a finger we shall know their real object, and the universal and undivided voice of England will put them down.†

This was an unstatesmanlike error which Mr. Croker shared in common with such sound Whigs as Sydney Smith and Macaulay.‡ We see no reason to believe that such an endowment would have quieted the priests, but it would have offended the Protestant Tories and the opponents of all State religious endowments, and, like the Maynooth endowment, would, so long as it lasted, have been a constant and irritating sore. But the chief article in Mr. Croker's political creed was his firm conviction that "The only permanent government possible in this country must be founded on the landed interests," § and like the Duke of Wellington, he regarded the first Reform Act as a revolution. "That is to say," to quote the Duke's own words, "it transferred power from one class of society, the gentlemen of England, professing the faith of the Church of England, to another class of society, the shopkeepers, being dissenters

* Vol. iii. pp. 81, 82.

† Vol. i. p. 279.

‡ See Sydney Smith's "Fragment on the Irish Church" and Macaulay's "Gladstone on Church and State."

§ Vol. iii. p. 272.

from the Church, many of them Socinians, others Atheists."* We should have liked to ask the Duke to define Socinianism and have heard his reply. Probably, as Sydney Smith suggested in a similar case, the Duke thought Socinianism had something to do with poaching.

Twenty years after the passing of the first Reform Act, Mr. Croker wrote to the late Lord Derby, then for the first time Premier:—

You may postpone the catastrophe and save us from immediate revolution, but you cannot save us from the ultimate and irresistible effects of the Reform Bill . . . depend upon it, die this Constitution will and must. . . The Queen is already a puppet. The House of Commons is king, as the first attempt of any opposition to his popular majesty will show.†

This is written in the tone of calm despondency, which was one of Mr. Croker's characteristics. It is interesting to contrast his view of the Sovereign's position with Sir Robert Peel's. In a letter to Mr. Croker, written in the first year of the present reign, Sir Robert says:—

The theory of the Constitution is, that the King has no will—except in the choice of his Ministers—that he acts by their advice, that they are responsible, &c. But this, like a thousand other theories, is at variance with the fact. The personal character of the Sovereign, in this and all other Governments, has an immense practical effect. His opinions and natural prejudices are most probably in favour of the monarchical element in the Constitution—in favour of that which is established, of the old usages of that prescription to which in nine cases out of ten he owes his throne. There may not be violent collisions between the King and his Government, but his influence, though dormant and unseen, may be very powerful.

Respect for personal character will operate in some cases; in others the King will have all the authority which greater and more widely extended experience than that of any single minister will naturally give. A King, after a reign of ten years, ought to know much more of the working of the machine of government than any other man in the country. He is the centre towards which all business gravitates. The knowledge that the King holds firmly a certain opinion and will abide by it prevents in many cases an opposite opinion being offered to him. If offered it will be withdrawn.

After adducing historical proofs of this proposition, Sir Robert continues:—

The personal character of a really constitutional King, of mature age, of experience in public affairs and knowledge of men, manners and

* Letter to Croker, vol. ii. p. 206. The whole letter is a woful display of the Duke's political ignorance.

† Vol. iii. p. 256.

customs, is practically so much ballast keeping the vessel of the State steady in her course, counteracting the levity of popular ministers, of orators forced by oratory into public councils, the blast of democratic passion, the ground-swell of discontent, and the ignorant impatience for the relaxation of taxation.*

Nearly fifty years have elapsed since this was written, and the events of those years vindicate the truth and justice of Sir Robert's views.

Within two years of his entering Parliament, Mr. Croker took office as Secretary of the Admiralty. He held that office without interruption for the long period of twenty-one years. His industry, his great power of taking pains, his love of detail, and, not least, his masterful spirit, joined to his long experience, made him a great power at the Board. We do not wonder that, when on one occasion he referred to himself in the House of Commons as a "servant of the Board," a former Lord of the Admiralty promptly remarked that when he was at the Board "it was precisely the other way."† On Mr. Croker leaving office with the rest of the Wellington Ministry, Sir James Graham, who then became First Lord, expressed his regret that the Admiralty would no longer have "the benefit of his brilliant talents and faithful services."‡ Even Miss Martineau ungrudgingly admits that

His name stands honourably on our new maps and globes. He was Secretary to the Admiralty during the earlier of the Polar Expeditions of this century; and it is understood that the most active and efficient assistance was always given by him in the work of Polar discovery. Long after political rancour and unscrupulousness are forgotten, those higher landmarks of his voyage of life will remain, and tell a future generation, to whom he will be otherwise unknown, that there was one of his name to whom our great navigators felt grateful for assistance in the noble service they rendered to their country and to all future time.

Miss Martineau is wrong in saying "that the malignant ulcer of Croker's mind was produced by political disappointment."§ On the contrary, he says: "Twice I refused Privy Councillor's office. Mr. Canning offered me any that I should choose, but I peremptorily declined. I preferred remaining at the Admiralty, where I was master of my business, and not unacceptable to the public."|| Nor was he unduly tenacious of place, for more than once, in order to facilitate Ministerial arrangements, he offered to resign his office, though he did not conceal the fact

* Vol. ii. pp. 316, 317. Our readers will see the coincidence of Sir Robert's view of the Sovereign's influence with that of Lord Beaconsfield given in his celebrated Manchester speech.

† Vol. i. p. 20.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 75.

§ "Biographical Sketches," p. 385.

|| Vol. i. p. 376.

that he could not well afford to lose £3,200 per annum, with one of the best houses in London.* In 1828 he was made a Privy Councillor. "What an empty name is that," is his reflection, "but as long as public opinion designates it as an honourable step, public men must consider it so too." †

Although never in the Cabinet, Mr. Croker was in, perhaps intruded himself into, the secret councils of the Tory party. He was perhaps, through what has been called his "bustling officiousness," the adviser of every leader of the party, from Mr. Percival to the late Earl of Derby. His letters to his leaders, especially in his later years, were written in a very lecturing and censorious tone. He had also, by means which are not disclosed, wormed himself into the confidence of George IV., of Ernest Augustus King of Hanover, ‡ and of the third Marquis of Hertford.

On reading these volumes this passage in "Coningsby" is forcibly borne in upon our mind :—

What was the secret of the influence of this man, confided in by everybody, trusted by none? His counsels were not deep; his expedients were not felicitous; he had no feeling, and could create no sympathy. It is that in most of the transactions of life there is some portion which no one cares to accomplish, and which everybody wishes to be achieved. This was always the portion of Mr. Rigby.§

Mr. Croker, no doubt, to use the homely but expressive phrase of a contemporary, "loved to have a finger in every pie."|| He was often a visitor at Brighton and Windsor, and some of his notices of the private life and habits of George IV. may still be read with amusement.

"What an atmosphere," Mr. Croker notes in his Diary for 1822, "the King lives in! He never, since he has been in Brighton, has left his own room except to walk *across* at half-past three or four to Lady C.'s house,¶ and at six to walk back; he then dresses and comes down to dinner, and that is the whole of his air and exercise. By-the-bye, all the world if they choose might see this daily visit; for the King goes out at the south gate of the enclosure, and has a few yards of the common street to walk to reach the steps of Lady C.'s house."***

An earlier entry in the Diary alleges a reason for the royal seclusion—"To the presence of Mrs. Fitzherbert is at-

* Vol. i. p. 390.

† Vol. ii. p. 8.

‡ Better recollected in England as Duke of Cumberland.

§ "Coningsby," book viii. chap. vi.

|| *Saturday Review*, No. 1, p. 517, Nov. 22, 1884.

¶ That is, the then Marchioness of Conyngham, at that time first favourite at the Court.

*** Vol. i. p. 249.

tributed the Prince's* never going abroad at Brighton. I have known H.R.H. here seven or eight years, and never saw or heard of his being on foot out of the limits of the Pavilion, and in general he avoids riding through the principal streets."† Every one remembers Thackeray's description of George IV. "as nothing but a coat and a wig and a mask smiling below it, nothing but a great simulacrum."‡

The following entry shows the anxiety of the "first gentleman of Europe" at the mature age of sixty-two as to the fitting of his coats:—

Dinner to-day was half an hour later than usual; the King, it seemed afterwards, was trying on some new coats, and he had sent for Sir Edmund Nagle to give him one in which His Majesty did not feel uncomfortable. The King amused himself with Nagle's attributing this "*trouvaille*" to his *being a well-made man*. His Majesty laughed at Nagle's pretence—he took care to let us know how ridiculously ill the coat fitted Nagle, and Nagle, who blunders "*certa ratione modo que*," paid his court by sending the coat, which he said fitted him so well, to London to be altered §

There was some foundation, no doubt, for the King's assertion though it was not without some of his habitual bragging,

"that he was a great *reservoir* of anecdotes, for he had lived not only with all the eminent persons of the last fifty years, but he had an early acquaintance with several eminent persons of the last century."

Even at the age we have mentioned he practised some of the accomplishments of his youth.

On another evening we read—

The King never left the piano; he sang in "Glorious Apollo," "Mighty Conqueror," Lord Mornington's "Waterfall" (encored), "Non Nobis Domine," and several other glees and catches. His voice, a bass, is not good, and he does not sing so much from notes as from recollection. He is therefore, as a musician merely, far from good, but he gave, I think, the force, gaiety, and spirit of the glees in a style superior to the professional men.||

On occasion of Mr. Croker visiting Windsor in 1825 the King took occasion to give him, obviously for publication, his version of some of the political transactions in which he had taken part.

His Majesty narrated, or I might almost say dictated, to me, for some hours without interruption (except by a few interlocutory observations on my part and several anecdotal episodes on his), and with a clearness, grace, and vivacity of which my notes can

* At the date of this entry George III. was still alive.

† Vol. i. p. 123.

‡ "Four Georges," p. 90, edition 1879.

§ Vol. i. p. 249.

|| *Ibid.* p. 250.

supply but a very inadequate idea. The quotations of the sentiments of the several persons mentioned were generally enforced and illustrated by a slight degree of mimicry of their voices and manner, while His Majesty's own narration was at once fluent and precise in recollection and accurate in expression, to a degree which I had never before witnessed in any similar statement, and for which, notwithstanding my long acquaintance with His Majesty's readiness in conversation, I confess I was not entirely prepared.*

We have space only for one extract, which we select because it relates to a matter which will ever be of historical interest—His Majesty's then story, "which was not always the same story,"† of his relations with Mrs. Fitzherbert. It shows that what his father said of him in his youth was equally true of him to the close of his life : "A lie always ready when it was wanted."‡

"On the subject of my supposed marriage," said the King, "with Mrs. Fitzherbert, and the debate upon Mr. Rolle's observations, some false statements have been made. When Fox mentioned it to me, I contradicted the supposition at once, with 'pooh,' 'nonsense,' 'ridiculous,' &c., upon which Fox, in the heat of debate, and piqued by Rolle, was induced not merely to contradict the report, which was right enough, but to go a little further and to use some slighting expressions, which, when Mrs. Fitzherbert read them in the papers next morning, deeply afflicted her, and made her furious against Fox. Mr. Moore § states that I applied to Mr. Grey to set the matter right, and that when he refused, I said, 'Then we must bring Sheridan into play.' There is not a word of truth in this; I had no kind of communication with Mr. Grey on the subject, and Sheridan's interference was, so far as I was concerned, perfectly accidental. Calling that morning at Mrs. Fitzherbert's, he found her in an agony of tears. Her beauty, her deep affliction, affected him; he was also, as he afterwards said, afraid that the great power she had over me would be turned to make a breach between me and Fox, against whom she was exasperated, and he (Sheridan) therefore endeavoured to conciliate and console her, and amongst other topics he assured her Mr. Fox was misrepresented, and that he (Sheridan) would take the earliest opportunity of correcting any impression which might be made to her prejudice, by saying in his place what he, as well as Mr. Fox and every one else, must feel towards her. He accordingly made that celebrated eulogium on Mrs. Fitzherbert, in which, however, I never could discover what other folks fancied there—any confirmation of that absurd story of my supposed marriage. I looked upon it as gallantry to the lady, and as an effort to keep Fox and her on good terms, which no doubt was my feeling also." ||

* Vol. i. pp. 288, 289.

† *Ibid.* p. 54.

‡ Torrens' "Memoir of Viscount Melbourne," vol. i. p. 156.

§ The King here refers to Moore's "Life of Sheridan," then lately published.

|| Vol. i. pp. 292, 293.

Our readers will do well to compare this tissue of lies with the accurate and impartial summing up of the facts by Sir George Cornwall Lewis.*

The following letters of Lord Brougham on the Fitzherbert marriage have not been published, except in "The Croker Papers." Referring to a *Quarterly* article of Mr. Croker's, published in 1854, Lord Brougham writes :—

I lose no time in setting you right about a very important point of history—namely, the Fitzherbert marriage. I see you more than half lean to a belief in it, but you may at once change that into an entire belief. I could have proved it in 1820.† I had as my witness H. Errington, Mrs. F.'s uncle, who no doubt would have sheltered himself under the privilege of not committing himself, for he incurred præmunire by being present. Mrs. F. herself in like manner, and I had a communication from her in great alarm, and I rather think I quieted her with a promise not to call her; but of this I am not certain. H. Errington was enough for me, and his refusal would have been as good as his saying "Yes." It was this, and not at all recrimination, to which I alluded mysteriously, and in a way that has been much censured, when I spoke of throwing the country into confusion. Recrimination of adultery was the thing supposed to be threatened. Nothing could be more absurd. We had abundant proof of that, but it was of no kind of value, for whoever doubted that adultery? But the other meant a forfeiture of the Crown, or at least a disputed succession, and I am quite confident from some things Hutchinson (Lord) told me, that George IV. was aware of what the real trump was that I had in my hand. You know of course that the marriage was wholly illegal, and Mrs. F. knew it to be so, which explains her sayings on the subject; some too (not lawyers) held that illegality to make it immaterial. But lawyers well knew that a perfectly void act every day occasions a forfeiture—as in all entails, both English and Scotch.‡ T. Moore gives a discussion between C. Butler § and myself at Denman's table on this point, and his account is correct as to what Butler and I said. Butler agrees in the law as above stated. We had quite enough to raise the question, which of course was all we could want to do. . . . I had from Sam Johns the whole history of the F. marriage, but he would not tell me the parson's name. He said he had promised never to mention it. He was a man, I think he said, near Cheltenham. He, Johns, had promised the Prince to perform the ceremony, and recollected in walking home a previous promise he had given to Jack Payne (admiral), and went back next day to Carlton House, and got off his promise there. The Prince never forgave him, and never spoke to

* "Essays on Administrations," &c., pp. 103 *et seq.* *Conf.* Percy Fitzgerald's "Life of George IV.," vol. i. pp. 94 *et seq.*

† *Viz.*, at the Queen's trial.

‡ *Conf.* Brougham's "Sketches of Statesmen," title "George IV."

§ The eminent conveyancer.

him afterwards. Mr. F. quarrelled with him for some years, but made it up.*

A few days later, Lord Brougham again wrote to Mr. Croker:—

Sam Johns was a person in whose word and accuracy I could entirely confide. He had his memory so entire to the last, that when I went over to see him (he being a good deal above ninety) at Welwyn, he reminded me of dishes at table and persons present, and topics of conversation the last time we dined together. . . . Mrs. Fitzherbert was not aware of the invalidity [of the marriage] at the time. . . . She never forgave Fox for carrying down the message of denial, and always maintained that he knew the fact. I don't think Fox did forgive the former; I am sure Grey did not.†

Lord Brougham thus states on one page that Mrs. Fitzherbert was, and on the next that she was not, aware of the invalidity of the marriage. Lord Holland, in his "Memoirs of the Whig Party," narrates that "it was at the Prince's own and earnest 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."‡ Lord Holland, "nephew of Fox and friend of Grey," and the political connection of other members of what George IV. himself called his "kind of Cabinet,"§ was more likely to be informed as to the facts of this so-called marriage than Lord Brougham, who could only be informed by hearsay evidence long after the event occurred.

Mr. Percy Fitzgerald, in his "Life of William IV.,"|| relates this anecdote of Mr. Croker, George IV., and William IV.:—

Mr. Croker was one day at the Pavilion when the Duke of Clarence was there. The King was in the drawing-room; the Duke of Clarence and some others formed a group at a table conversing about the Navy. On some remarks made by Mr. Croker, the Duke said, "Croker, were I King, I'd be my own First Lord of the Admiralty,

* Vol. iii. pp. 335, 336.

† *Ibid.* pp. 337, 338. This statement as to Fox is obscure, but the extract is accurately copied. The "Sam Johns" mentioned by Lord Brougham, or "Parson Johns" as Lord Holland calls him, was the Rev. Samuel Johnes (as he spelt it), who afterwards took the additional surname of Knight, Rector of Dudley and also of All Hallows, Barking, Tower Street, from which alone he received £2,000 per annum. Of our own knowledge, we can state that his oldest parishioners of All Hallows never remembered seeing him in the parish. We read in Lord Colchester's "Diary," 1796, vol. i. p. 68:—"From Burton [an M.P., and, we think, a Welsh judge] I learnt that the Rev. Mr. Burt, near Twickenham, actually married the Prince of Wales to Mrs. Fitzherbert, and received £500 for doing it, as he himself declared to his family on his death-bed." It was no doubt Twickenham, not as Lord Brougham said "Cheltenham," as Mrs. Fitzherbert lived at Richmond-on-Thames.

‡ Quoted by Sir G. C. Lewis, "Essays," &c., p. 111.

§ *Vide* vol. i. p. 290.

|| Vol. i. pp. 198, 199.

and you should *not* be my Secretary ;” to which Croker answered, “ Then I must do the best I can now I am Secretary ; but does your Royal Highness recollect what King of England was his own First Lord of the Admiralty ?” The Duke replied in the negative. “ Why, it was James II.,” said Croker, in his pert manner. The King, hearing the laugh, said, “ What, Croker—what is that ? One of your good things, I suppose ? ” “ Nothing ; but your Royal brother is saying what he will do when your Majesty is no longer King.” The King walked away, making no reply. But Mr. Croker received a reprimand before he left the next morning.

Mr. Croker thus relates the story :—

“ Do you remember,” he writes to Sir B. Bloomfield in 1823, “ my little discussion with the Duke of Clarence at Brighton, eight years ago, when he told me that when *he* became King I should not be Secretary of the Admiralty ? I told him ‘ a bird in the hand was worth two in the bush.’ He had just told me before, he would in that event declare himself Lord High Admiral, and asked me ‘ what objection I could start to that.’ I replied, with a low bow, None ; that there was a case in point ; James II. had done the same. This,” adds Croker, “ was a little bold, to say no worse, on my part.” *

But he omits all mention of the King’s question, his own reply, and the consequent reproof. Mr. Percy Fitzgerald—as his manner is—does not give any authority for his addition to the anecdote. We see, however, no reason to doubt its truth. The remark was like Croker, who, as Lord Beaconsfield remarks, “ was tainted by an innate vulgarity, which in the long run, though seldom, yet surely developed itself,” † and it was natural for the King, to whom the remark was offensive, to reprove him for his rudeness. In the same letter Mr. Croker foretold that “ by the time the Duke of Clarence comes to be King he will be a good deal more reason able and quiet.” This prophecy was true ; for, although within two months before the Duke’s accession he said that his first act as King would be to send Croker and another Admiralty official “ to the right-about,” ‡ on his accession he took no step of the kind, and Mr. Croker remained in office until his final retirement in the November following.

Of all the Tory leaders, the Duke of Wellington was the one with whom Croker had the closest and most uninterrupted connection. Wellington, when Sir Arthur Wellesley and Irish Secretary, first brought him into public life.§ In 1808, when Croker had been but a year in Parliament, Wellesley entrusted him with the Irish business in the House of Commons when he was obliged to absent himself from Parliament during his campaign in Portugal.

* Vol. i. p. 265.

† Vol. ii. p. 63.

‡ “ Coningsby,” book i. chap. i.

§ Vol. i. p. 369.

Croker always spoke of the Duke as "his only political connection;" their friendship survived the trials of the Duke's successive changes of political position, and endured until his death. "The last words," so Croker writes to a friend, "the Duke of Wellington said to me in parting at Dover, just before his death (which we then thought less distant than mine), were, that it was a consolation to think that the course of Nature would spare us the experience of the terrible events which the course of politics was evidently preparing for this country." It is easy to imagine the rage and fury, as violent as powerless, with which they would have beheld the Conservative Reform Bill of 1867, and the capitulation of the Lords in 1884.*

Croker seems to have been ambitious of acting the part of Boswell to the Duke. These volumes contain copious notes of the Duke's conversations, and many letters between the two friends. They show that vanity was at all times a main feature of the Duke's character, which, considering he lived surrounded by flatterers and parasites, is no matter for wonder. His later conversations and letters exhibit much of the garrulity of old age. On the "internecine struggle"† (as Lord Beaconsfield calls it) between the Duke of Wellington and Mr. Canning these papers throw many side-lights.‡ Croker acted towards Canning the part of "the Candid Friend."‡ Croker's Letters contain references to Canning which illustrate his well-known lines—

CANDOUR—which spares its foes, nor e'er descends
With bigot zeal to combat for its friends.§

"Some one," Croker writes to Peel in 1818, "said that our *honest* friend [Huskisson] wanted *eloquence* and our *eloquent* friend [Canning] *honesty*, but that you, uniting both, would unite the confidence of the whole party."|| When Canning had been dead more than ten years, Croker wrote of him to Brougham—

Poor Canning's greatest defect was the jealous ingenuity of his mind. He, like an over-cautious general, was always thinking more of what might be in his flanks, or in his rear, than in his front. His acuteness discovered so many tortuous by-roads on the map of human life that he believed they were much more travelled than the broad highway. He preferred an ingenious device for doing anything, to

* Vol. iii. p. 313. This letter was written in 1854, two years after Wellington's death. *Conf.* another version given by Croker in a letter to Palmerston, written in 1856 (*ibid.* p. 361), where Wellington is made to speak of "the consummation of the ruin that is gathering around us." It is noteworthy that in the very full note of this conversation made by Croker in 1852 (*ibid.* pp. 270 *et seq.*) no mention is made of this opinion or prophecy of Wellington's.

† See the sketch of the Ministerial crises, 1826-7, in "Coningsby," book ii. chap. i.

‡ Vol. i. pp. 362 *et seq.*

§ See the "New Morality" in the *Anti-Jacobin*.

|| Vol. i. p. 114.

the ordinary process. In lifting a coal-scuttle to mend his fire, he would have preferred a screw or a pulley to his own arms. He could hardly "take his tea without a stratagem." I said of him that "his *mind's eye* squinted," but this was altogether a mode of his *mind*, of the busy and polyscopic (may I coin such a word?) activity of his intellect, for his heart and spirit were open, generous, and sincere.*

He adds, "What an unsatisfactory Tory was Canning." After writing this Croker could not have been surprised if, in the visions of the night, he had heard a voice from the tomb exclaim,

Of all the plagues, Good Heaven, thy wrath can send,
Save—save, oh save me, from the Candid Friend.†

Croker's true relation towards Canning appears to have been generally known or suspected. Macaulay notes that in one of the Reform debates of 1831 "Croker called Canning his right honorable friend. 'Your friend! damn your impudent face!' said the member who sat next to me."‡

In the Ministerial intrigues of 1827-8 Croker's great object was, in his own words, "to keep ourselves together," ourselves meaning the surviving members of the Liverpool Ministry. "If once we began," he says, "a general move, I agree with the Duke of Wellington that chaos is not far off." Of Mr. Rigby we are told that in "all his rigmarole dissertations the rogue had an eye all the while to quarter-day." He thus lectures Mr. Canning:—"Depend upon it, the aristocracy is the *unum necessarium*, or at least an *indispensable* ingredient; and that, in order to manage *it*, the union of the Duke, Peel, and yourself is absolutely necessary."§ This advice was probably not asked by Canning, but emanated from Croker's bustling officiousness. This is quite consistent with this passage in a letter from Peel to Croker:—"Canning declared to more than one person that there was no one to whom he was so much indebted for suggestions which he should pursue as to you."|| It will be remembered that on the death of Canning he was succeeded by Lord Goderich, whom Croker held in supreme contempt. Later on he described him as "Freddy," and as having been the "plaything and butt" of the Liverpool Ministry—said that he used to be derisively called the "Duke of Fuss and Bustle," and further avowed that Goderich "was made a Viscount for insulting Castlereagh's memory by his desertion to Canning, and an Earl for insulting Canning's by his desertion to Grey."¶ Croker

* Vol. ii. p. 352.

† Canning, *ubi supra*.

‡ "Life of Macaulay," vol. i. p. 239, *note*.

§ Vol. i. p. 370. *Conf.* Lord Beaconsfield's accounts of these times, *ubi supra*.

|| *Ibid.* p. 375.

¶ Croker to Lord Hertford, vol. ii. p. 208.

at this time (1827) desired to see Wellington at the head of the Ministry, with Peel leader of the Commons. Accordingly, he sought an interview with Goderich, the particulars of which he narrates at length.* He then gave the Premier his advice on the course for him to pursue. This advice, we conclude from Croker's own statement, had not been asked, probably was not wished for, and certainly could not have been palatable to the Premier. "I said I must plainly tell him," are Croker's own words, "that without a junction with the Duke and Mr. Peel he could never make a King's speech." How this unpleasant conference ended Croker also tells us:—"Remember," I added, "these my last warning words: without the accession of the Duke and Peel, you will never make the King's speech."†

Of Goderich's resignation he writes: "Goderich is gone down to Windsor to resign, and he will find the King, if not unprepared, at least unprovided."‡ This strengthens the suspicion that Lyndhurst, probably at Croker's suggestion, had prepared the King to send for Wellington.

In Wellington's abortive attempt to form a Ministry in May, 1832, he seems, at Peel's instance, to have consulted Croker, and to have expressed a hope he should have Croker's help "in this great emergency." Croker, however, when he left office in November, 1830, "resolutely, as has been said of him, took his stand on the traditions of the Regency," and determined never to return, and by that determination abided until the end. These papers contain a full narrative of the events of "the immortal month of May," 1832, and deserve, and no doubt will receive, the careful consideration of students of the history of that time. With Sir Robert Peel, Croker's intimacy was at one time as close, if not closer, than his intimacy with Wellington, but it was not so uninterrupted, and for nearly four years before Peel's death was entirely broken off. Peel entered Parliament in 1809, the same year in which Croker became Secretary to the Admiralty. It does not appear when their acquaintance began, but the first of the many letters between them printed in these Papers is dated "Dublin, Oct. 30, 1812. The conclusion, "Yours affectionately, Robert Peel" §—a stronger expression than is in general use amongst Englishmen—points to a very close friendship between them. The same conclusion to the letters appears for many years. When their friendship was about to be—if it was not already—broken off, Croker wrote to Lord Hardinge: "You know, I think, as well as any man, how I loved Peel, quite disinterestedly, for I was the greater man of

* Vol. i. pp. 384 *et seq.*

† *Ibid.* p. 401.

‡ *Ibid.* pp. 387-389.

§ Vol. i. pp. 46, 47.

the two when I began to love him ; and as we have gone on in life, I think I am almost the only early friend to whom he has not done a personal favour." * This extract shows Croker's arrogance and self-satisfaction in their strongest colours. Not to mention the intellectual superiority of Peel to Croker, Peel, with his double first-class at Oxford, the heir to a baronetcy and great wealth, and with office open to him so soon as he chose to take it, was at least as great a man as Croker, an adventurer who had just gained a minor Ministerial office. The not doing any personal favour to Croker may—perhaps unconsciously—have affected his friendly relations with Peel. We cannot refrain from quoting one of Peel's letters, written during the first year of his Irish Secretaryship, for the contrast it affords between what he thought the hardships of that office with those endured in these days by its holders.

I have survived the hospitality of Ireland hitherto. Contrary to my expectation, I have scarcely dined once at home since my arrival. I see no great prospect of it for some time to come, excepting with about twenty-five guests. I am just opening upon the campaign, and have visions of future feasts studded with Lord Mayors and Sheriffs elect. I fancy I see some who think that the Government of England have a strange notion of Ireland when they put a man here who drinks port, and as little of that as he can. The governor of the bank remarked with horror that I was not fully impressed with the necessity of toasting the glorious memory. †

And again, when just about to resign office, he wrote to Croker : " 'Night cometh when no man can work,' said one who could not have foreseen the fate of a man in office and the House of Commons"—the experience, we remark in passing, of many at all times, and in a much greater degree, of those on whom these latter days are come.

"A fortnight hence," continues Peel, "I shall be free as air . . . free from Orangemen, free from Ribbonmen, free from Dennis Browne, free from the Lord Mayor and Sheriffs, from men who pretend to be Protestants on principle, and sell Dundalk to —, the Papist of Cork ; free from Catholics who become Protestants to get into Parliament after the manner of —, and of Protestants who become Catholics after the manner of old — ; free from perpetual converse about the Harbour of Howth and Dublin Bay Haddock ; and lastly, free of the Company of Carvers and Gilders which I became this day in reward of my public services." ‡

When the private letters of Mr. Forster and Mr. Trevelyan come to be published, they will reveal a far more grievous yoke of bondage than that which Peel endured. His complaints in

* Vol. iii. p. 66.

† Vol. i. p. 47.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 117.

comparison with those of the ills which these his successors had to bear remind us of the old-story of the Sybarite and the rose-leaves. We find Peel, so early as 1820, writing Croker: "Can we resist—I mean not next session nor the session after that—but can we resist for seven years Reform in Parliament?"* It is remarkable that, with this foresight, Peel should after ten years' resistance not be prepared to yield Reform, but strenuously opposed it.

In the intrigues which arose on the fatal illness of Lord Liverpool, Peel would not believe that Croker's communications with Canning were not directed against his interests, and a coolness arose between them, and he wrote to Croker: "I am perfectly ready to bury in complete oblivion the causes of misunderstanding and alienation, and it is clear that nothing can more contribute to this—particularly considering the relations in which we respectively stand to the present Government—than a total oblivion, when we meet, of politics also."† This was "the little rift within the lute" of their friendship.

When Wellington and Peel undertook to carry Catholic Emancipation, Croker's position was unlike that of most of his party. He had been all his life anxious to see the question settled on grounds of policy and justice; but he thought the proceedings of O'Connell and the Irish Catholics had brought it to a point of intimidation, and he was ready to vote against any concession to intimidation. In his Diary he notes, "I felt it to be due to say to Peel that the greatest surprise of the public was not so much the concession to the Catholics, as his consenting to be the mover of it."‡ Peel's placing his seat for Oxford University at the disposal of his constituents was to Croker "a democratic and unconstitutional proceeding, and a precedent dangerous to the independence of the House of Commons;" he adds, "and so I told him."§ That there were or could be any correlative rights between the electors and their elected was a notion ignored by, and repugnant to, the men of the præ-Reform era. Croker supported, if not very warmly, the Emancipation Bill, but more than twenty years afterwards he wrote to a friend, "I always was an Emancipationist, but not in the cart before the horse style in which Mr. Pitt in 1793, and Peel in 1829, mismanaged and spoiled—nay, poisoned—a thing right in itself."|| The force and meaning of this criticism we cannot make out.

* Vol. i. p. 170. The whole letter is worth reading.

† *Ibid.* pp. 374, 375. The date of this letter is October 3, 1827. Croker was in, Peel out, of office, and prepared to oppose the Ministry of which Godefrich was Premier. The "ever affectionately" of former letters is in this modified to "ever very faithfully yours."

‡ Vol. ii. p. 7.

§ *Ibid.*

|| Vol. iii. p. 258.

Peel's change on the Catholic question did not, at first, seriously shake Croker's confidence in him; but in the next year Peel's conduct on another question of religious liberty—the emancipation of the Jews—again staggered him.

"We threw out the Jews Bill last night," he writes to a friend, "228 to 163, after a very FAINT speech from Peel. He did not grapple at all with the real question, and seemed as if he wished to be beaten. What can this mean? Does he resent against the Church the rejection of Oxford? He last night *in principle* gave up the whole connection of Church and State."*

In the next year he writes to Lord Hertford, "Every one seems to mistrust Peel. I do not."† At the same time, in the opposite political camp, a more shrewd observer, Sydney Smith, wrote of Peel: "Peel veers about like a dog vane in a shift of wind, and cannot keep a straight course."‡ During this same spring Croker was engaged with others in an intrigue to oust Peel from the Ministry. "From what Hardinge heard from Croker," notes Lord Ellenborough in his diary for April, "I am inclined to think *that foolish fellow and others* imagine they could go on without Peel."§ Lord Ellenborough was an object of Croker's dislike, if not contempt. On the completion of the Wellington Ministry Croker wrote to his friend Lord Hertford: "Westmoreland and Eldon have been put into the dirty clothes-basket with Wynn and Bexley, and *thrown overboard*—thrown overboard for Lord Ellenborough."||

Peel and Croker heartily co-operated in opposing Lord Grey's Reform Bills, and they both refused to take part in Wellington's unwise attempt to form a Tory Ministry in order to carry "an extensive Reform."

At a meeting of Wellington, Peel, Lyndhurst, and Croker, Peel said "he was peculiarly circumstanced—he had been obliged to arrange the Catholic question by a sacrifice of his own judgment, and he would not now perform the same painful abandonment of opinion on the Reform Question." He talked of "the advantage to the country that public men should maintain a character for consistency and disinterestedness, which he would for ever forfeit if a second time he were on any pretence to act over again anything like his part on the Catholic Question."¶ A remarkable prophecy, which in a few years had a plenary fulfilment while they who heard it were all yet living.

* Vol. ii. p. 62. The "rejection of Oxford" means Peel's "rejection by Oxford" the year before. † *Ibid.* p. 105.

‡ "Sydney Smith," by Stuart J. Reid, p. 261.

§ Ellenborough's "Diary," vol. ii. p. 1830. Hardinge was a close friend of Croker's.

|| Vol. i. p. 404.

¶ Vol. ii. p. 155.

Later on in that memorable month of May, Croker pressed upon Peel—

“as a last resource, and if every other scheme should fail—the duty of saving the King, the country, and the world from the obvious consequences of the *re-establishment of the revolutionary government* [the remaining in office of the Grey Ministry is referred to in this exaggerated phrase], and he dwelt on the same topics as before; in reply, I persisted so long, and urged points so strongly, that Holmes and Goulburn (who, however, were of my opinion) interfered, and said I had done all that could be done, and that they thought I should push it no farther. Yet I think I shook Peel’s resolution for a moment; I certainly tried his temper.*

Peel’s conduct in 1829, notwithstanding his strong declaration in 1832 against any further change in his opinions, had shaken Croker’s faith in him. At the time of William IV.’s *coup d’état* in November, 1834, Croker wrote to his friend Lord Hertford: “No power shall ever force me to serve under Peel. We are excellent friends, and shall remain so, which would assuredly not be the case if we sat in the same Cabinet.” † On Peel’s arrival from Italy, he sent for Croker, who, nothing loth, went. Peel was, Croker wrote to his wife, “exceedingly friendly, and, said,” he continues, “‘But first, my dear Croker, let me ask you whether you adhere to the resolution you stated to me before I went abroad.’ I said positively nothing could induce me to enter the House of Commons. I thought he winced a little at that, but he said that he would still talk to me in full confidence of all his views.” ‡ Notwithstanding Peel’s “wincing,” real or supposed, we think that he, knowing Croker’s opinions, and with the Tamworth Manifesto in his mind, was not very anxious that Croker should join him. Croker might have said, as did Macaulay when, in 1852, Lord John Russell offered him a seat in the Cabinet, “he did not urge me much.” §

Soon after Peel had formed his Ministry of 1841, he wrote Croker an interesting letter “on the difference between a Prime Minister in these days and in former times when Newcastle and Pelhams were Ministers.”

“Now,” he continues “(particularly if the Minister is in the House

* Vol. ii. p. 59. The person referred to as “Holmes” was the whipper-in of the Tory party, “Goulburn” was the Right Hon. Henry Goulburn, Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Wellington Ministry, Home Secretary during the hundred days, and again Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Peel Ministry, 1841–46. *Conf.* with the passage quoted above Croker’s letter to Peel (*ibid.* pp. 176 *et seq.*).

† *Ibid.* p. 245.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 248.

§ *Vide* “Life of Macaulay,” vol. ii. p. 300.

of Commons, and if he is fit to be Minister) his life is one of toil and care and drudgery. His reward is not patronage, which imposes nothing but a curse, which enables him to do little more than make *dix mécontent et un ingrat*, not ribbons or hopes of peerage or such trumpery distinctions, but the means of rendering service to his country, and the hope of honourable fame."*

What follows is remarkable, having regard to the events which occurred five years afterwards. Peel's conduct at that time is clearly foreshadowed in these words:—

But the man who looks to such objects and such rewards will not condescend to humiliating submissions for mere party purposes; will have neither time nor inclination to be considering how many men will support this public measure or fly off to gratify some spite or resentment; he will do his best for the great principles that his party supported and for the public welfare; and, if obstructed, will retire from office, not from power, for the country will do justice to his motives, and will give him the strength which his party denied to him.†

The formation of the Peel Ministry was hailed with delight by Croker, who believed that Peel and Protection were indissolubly united. On this subject he wrote to Brougham:—

I look further, much, than the mere question of prices of corn and rates of wages, which are what, to a logician, I may venture to call mere *accidents*; the *substance* is the existence of a landed gentry, which has made England what she has been and is; without which no representative Government can exist; without which there can be no steady mean between democracy and despotism. . . . Good God! what a chaos of anarchy and misery do I foresee in every direction from so comparatively small a beginning as changing an *average* duty of eight shillings into a *fixed* duty of eight shillings, the fact being that the *fixed duty* means *no duty at all*, and *no duty at all* will be the overthrow of the existing social and political system of our country.‡

Peel's modification of the Corn Laws in 1842 did not much alarm Croker—he thought “it wisely and safely done,” though he would have preferred that it should have been of a more Protective character.§ He was in the autumn of that year induced by Peel and Sir James Graham irretrievably to commit the *Quarterly Review* to the cause of Protection.|| At that very time the shrewder observer whom we have before quoted, Sydney Smith, wrote to Harriet Martineau:—“I believe Peel to be a philosopher disguised in a Tory fool's cap, who will do

* In another letter to Croker, Peel says: “The voracity for these things quite surprises me. I wonder people do not begin to feel the distinction of an unadorned name” (vol. ii. p. 410). It will be remembered that Peel by his will desired that no member of his family should after his death accept any title as a public reward on account of any services he might be supposed to have rendered to the public.

† Vol. ii. pp. 409, 410.

‡ Vol. iii. p. 13.

§ Vol. iii. p. 30.

|| Vol. ii. pp. 389–392; vol. iii. p. 171.

everything by slow degrees which the Whigs proposed to do at once. Whether the delay be wise or mischievous is a separate question, but such I believe to be the man in whom the fools of the earth put their trust.”*

In 1843 Croker was alarmed by an article in the *Foreign Quarterly Review*, which was attributed to Mr. Gladstone:†—

“I trust, I do trust,” he wrote to Peel, “that is, I at once hope and believe, that Gladstone has not written nor encouraged anything that can be perverted into an intimation of further change. . . . If the country [this term in Croker’s mind was always synonymous with the country gentlemen] sees reason to suspect *your Government of wavering*, mind, I tell you, we are all lost.”‡

Rumours arose in 1844–45 as to Peel’s faithfulness to Protection. Croker wrote Graham early in the year that the country gentlemen “were greatly out of temper, or perhaps I should rather say out of spirits,” and ended his letter with this appeal: “I do think that some occasion ought to be found or made if not of doing, at least of saying, and strongly too, something comforting and gratifying to that great interest which is after all the only safe basis of a Government in this country.” Graham replied, acknowledging that the country gentlemen were out of humour, and that the existence of the Peel Government was thereby endangered. He continued:—

We have laboured hard, and not in vain, to restore the prosperity of the country, and to give increased security to the aristocracy, by improving the condition and diminishing the discontent of the great masses of the people. We have effected this object without inflicting any real injury on the landed proprietors, yet we are scouted as traitors, and are denounced as if we were time-serving traders in politics, seeking to retain place by the sacrifice of the interests of our friends. The country gentlemen cannot be more ready to give us the death-blow than we are to receive it. If they will rush on their own destruction, they must have their way; we have endeavoured to save them, and they regard us as enemies for so doing.§

In the November following Lord John Russell published his Edinburgh letter, which, as Peel said, “justified the conclusion that the Whig party was prepared to unite with the Anti-Corn Law League in demanding the total repeal of the Corn Laws.”|| Croker, when “this Bomb” (as he calls it) burst, was busy writing an article for the *Quarterly Review* in defence of the Corn Laws, and he forthwith wrote Mr. Peel that Lord Russell’s letter was looked upon as “the manifesto of a new revolution,” and inquiring as to the part Peel wished the *Quarterly Review*

* “Sydney Smith,” by Stuart J. Reid, p. 359.

† Then Vice-President of the Board of Trade.

‡ Vol. ii. pp. 30, 31.

§ Vol. ii. p. 11.

|| “Peel’s Memoirs,” vol. ii. p. 171.

to take in reference to it, and declaring that "if any change in the line of concession on the Corn Laws were made he should "abandon in despair all attention to public affairs, and follow or rather slide down the *facilis descensus averni*—that is, Democracy."* He seemed to suspect Peel would not require his assistance, and Peel does not seem to have noticed this letter. When it became known that Peel intended to propose the total repeal of the Corn Laws, Croker's rage and fury knew no bounds; he denied not only Peel's statesmanship, but even his honesty. His letters to Wellington and his other correspondents† are painful exhibitions of petty spite and senile incapacity to comprehend Peel's position and the merits of the question.

Our readers will remember "Mr. Dick" in "David Copperfield," who could not keep King Charles's head out of his memorial. In like manner Croker could not keep the French Revolution, which we know was his "forte," out of what Lord Beaconsfield called his "rigmarole dissertations."

"Sir Robert Peel," Croker said, "has broken up the old interests, divided the great families, and commenced just such a revolution as the Noailles and Montmorencis did in 1789. Look at father and son, and brother and brother, and uncle and nephew, thrown into personal hostility in half the counties of England, and all for what? to propitiate Richard Cobden."‡

Readers of "Coningsby" will remember what is said of Mr. Rigby: "What could be more patriotic and magnanimous than his jeremiads over the fall of the Montmorencis and the Crillons, or the possible catastrophe of the Percys and the Manners?"§

In defence of the part taken by Croker at this time it must be admitted by even the warmest admirers of Peel, amongst whom we reckon ourselves, that Croker and those who thought with him received great provocation from Peel. Their case against him is admirably stated in what Lord Beaconsfield calls "a very interesting criticism on the career of Sir Robert Peel which was given in his presence by Lord John Russell."

"I cannot," said Lord John, "express surprise or wonder at any warmth or vindictive feeling being directed against him [Peel], because in his political career he has done that which perhaps has never happened to so eminent a man before. He has twice changed his opinion on the greatest political questions of the time—once when the Protestant Church was to be defended and the Protestant Constitution rescued from the assaults of the Roman Catholics, which it was said would ruin it. The right hon. gentleman undertook to

* Vol. iii. p. 37.

† Vol. iii. pp. 67, 68.

‡ *Vide* vol. iii. *passim*.

§ Book viii. chap. vi.

lead the defence. Again, the Corn Laws were powerfully attacked in this House and out of it. He undertook to resist a change and to defend Protection. I think on both occasions he came to a wise conclusion, and to a decision beneficial to his country; first, when he repealed the Roman Catholic disabilities, and, secondly, when he abolished Protection. But that those who followed him—men who had committed themselves to these questions on the faith of his political wisdom, on the faith of his sagacity, led by the great eloquence and ability he displayed in debate—that when they found he had changed his opinions and proposed measures different from those on the faith of which they had followed him, that they should exhibit warmth and resentment was not only natural, but I should have been surprised if they had not displayed it.”*

Croker did not confine his display of this natural warmth and resentment to his private correspondence, but exhibited them to the world in the *Quarterly Review*. He contributed several articles which contained severe censures on Peel and his conduct. These censures were deeply felt and bitterly resented by Peel. In a letter to Graham, Croker justifies his conduct on this ground:—“The editor and proprietor of the Review,” he writes, “summoned me as a man of honour to keep the engagement, and to maintain the principle to which I had in December 1842, pledged the Review.”†

It is with melancholy interest that one reads the last letters between these once close friends.

I cannot [wrote Croker to Peel] write to you without expressing my deep regret at having been placed, by my zeal for, and confidence in, your former measures, in a position which has forced me into so decided a difference of political opinions as must render any personal intercourse between us awkward and painful. Thus closes with this note a correspondence of seven-and-thirty years; but it does not alter my—I believe—unalterable affection for yourself, and my regard for Lady Peel and your family, which are as lively and sincere as my wishes for the failure, as I understand them, of all your political views.

If we should happen to meet (which is not very likely, as I go little from home), I hope it may be with such civil forms and as much personal kindness as may very well co-exist with strong political differences.

I am, my dear Peel,

Very sincerely and affectionately yours,

J. W. CROKER.‡

* Speech in the House of Commons, June 19, 1846; see Hansard for that date. The extract above given will be found in the “*Life of Lord George Bentinck*,” pp. 282, 283.

† Vol. iii. p. 172.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 94. The date of Croker’s letter is January 19, 1847.

Peel speedily replied in stern and haughty terms :

SIR,—As I am confirmed by your letter in my previous impression that you are the author of certain articles which have appeared in the recent numbers of the *Quarterly Review*, I concur entirely in the opinion you express, that any personal intercourse between us would be awkward and painful. There are no doubt many cases in which personal good-will may co-exist with strong political differences; but personal good-will cannot co-exist with the spirit in which those articles are written, or with the feelings they must naturally have excited. I trust there is nothing inconsistent with perfect civility in the expression of an earnest wish that the same principle which suggests to you the propriety of closing a written correspondence of seven-and-thirty years may be extended to every other species of intercourse.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
ROBERT PEEL.*

Croker rejoined: "I have no objection to make to the terms, nor of course to the conclusion of that letter; but I cannot admit—and indeed feel myself bound to deny—the personal feelings by which it supposes me to have been actuated."†

Mr. Jennings indignantly denies the "charge that Mr. Croker assailed Sir Robert Peel in an unjustifiable and unbecoming manner;" and he gives two extracts from the *Quarterly Review* for September, 1846, which, he says, "are in themselves sufficient to dispose of the charge."‡ Had Mr. Jennings extended his researches—or perhaps we should say, his quotations—he would have seen, or at any rate shown, that his statement is inaccurate. Croker, after the letters we have just read, and when, therefore, he knew the feelings which his articles had roused in Peel, returned to the attack. In common with another veteran place-man of the days of Lord Liverpool, he concocted another article on Peel. "It is impossible," wrote Croker to his colleague, "not to feel indignation at the apostasy and the mischief it has done; but personally I really have quite the reverse of ill-will, or a desire to give pain."§ Comparing this letter with the ensuing extracts, we are reminded of Croker's brother Irishman, who said to an opponent, "You are a fool, a liar, and a coward; but I will say nothing more for fear of becoming personal." We subjoin some extracts: "Of all Sir Robert Peel's great powers, that by which he will be best known to posterity will be that he is the boldest and heartiest eater of

* Vol. iii. pp. 94, 95. Peel's letter is dated January 15.

† *Ibid.* p. 95.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 97.

§ "Memoir of the Right Hon. J. C. Herries," vol. ii. p. 230.

his own words that ever exhibited on any political stage."* Again, Croker likens Peel "to a runaway horse, scared at the terrific apparition of the League, and further excited by the rod of Mr. Cobden and the spur of Lord John Russell."*

Croker does not confine his attack to the question of the Corn Laws; he impugns Peel's policy as the Tory leader in the Reform struggle. What follows is equally unjust and inaccurate. "The Whigs would never *ex proprio motu* have ventured on such democratical extremities as Sir Robert Peel's egregious blunders drove them into."† During 1831 and 1832, Croker never so much as suggested disapprobation of Peel's tactics and action. Again:

In 1835, he [Peel] instituted an Ecclesiastical Commission for the professed support of the Church. The most remarkable result of this Commission was an event which was received as a great blow to the Church—the abolition of the Welch Bishoprics. It was said of a French wit, "Il n'a de l'esprit que contre Dieu." It may be said of Sir Robert Peel, "Il n'a du courage que contre ses amis."‡

There was at that time no call of duty or honour on Croker to write of Peel in such terms, and the extracts we have given—and we might easily greatly multiply them—show how much of sincerity there was in his avowal that he had "no ill-will or desire to give pain." Bishop Wilberforce had "a very curious observation" of Peel's reception of this article while travelling in a railway carriage with "the Bunsens and Sir Robert and Lady Peel."

"Peel," he says, "was reading the *Quarterly*, and soon settled into Croker's bitter attack on him, peeping into its uncut leaves with intense interest, and yet not liking to show that interest by cutting; and so when Madame Bunsen, who saw nothing of what was going on, offered a paper-cutter, courteously declining it, and lapsing into an article on Pantagruelism, to fall again into the old article, and peep again into the uncut leaves as soon as all was quiet."§

That Peel should feel the sting of Croker's venomous darts would to Croker be merely an illustration of a common saying of his, *Il n'y a que la vérité que blesse*.

"Few men whose names are known to the public have received harder usage than John Wilson Croker." Such is the frank confession of the editor. What was the reason of this, and of Croker's widespread social unpopularity? The answer is easy. Lord Beaconsfield describes Mr. Rigby's manner in society:

* *Quarterly Review*, June, 1847, vol. lxxxi. p. 275.

† *Ibid.* p. 302. *Conf.* Croker's letter.

§ "Life of Bishop Wilberforce," vol. i. p. 393.

† *Ibid.* p. 302.

"Coningsby's ear caught the voice of Mr. Rigby. The speaker was not visible; he was at a distance—surrounded by a wondering group, whom he was severally and collectively contradicting; but Coningsby could not mistake those harsh, arrogant tones."*

With this agrees the admission of our editor, who is not without a considerable taint of the *lues biographica*: "Croker was not the same to all men. To strangers or persons whom he disliked, his manner was overbearing and harsh. The deference with which his opinions were usually received rendered him impatient of contradiction."† The impression produced by his speeches and writings was that the predominant feature of his character was a love of personality and that malignity which according to Lord Russell characterized his opposition to the first Reform Act.‡

Hence the dislike with which he generally was regarded—"disapproved," as was said "by the wise, and unpopular with the multitude." Of this we find in a letter to Lord Lansdowne from Sydney Smith this signal illustration. "Croker said to the late Mrs. Humphrey Mildmay he wished particularly to be introduced to me. 'Yes,' she said, 'that may be agreeable to you, but are you sure it would be equally agreeable to Mr. Sydney Smith?'"§ The lady must have well known the estimate in which Croker was held by society, or she would not have ventured to make such a brusque reply to his request.

In Croker's later years, and when the late Bishop Wilberforce was Vicar of Alverstoke, Croker occupied a house in that parish, the Bishop writing to his brother Robert, gives another illustration of the common opinion of Croker. "I see a good deal of Croker here. He is very kind and very amusing. The most singular thing is that in all his remarks on men, &c., he is very kind. I really think that I have never heard him make an unkind remark on any one. He is very attentive at church, &c." The Wilberforces must have been agreeably surprised in Croker, as he had in the *Quarterly*, "amusingly criticized their father's restless and roving propensities."¶

According to the editor, some of the offensive writings attributed to Croker were not written by him, but there is abundant evidence that his undoubted writings showed the malignity attributed to him. It was not only that he "massacred the Liberals" such as Lady Morgan or Miss Martineau. His personal or political friends, if they differed from him, did not

* "Coningsby," book iv. chap. vi.

† Vol. iii. p. 345.

‡ "Recollections and Suggestions," p. 92.

§ "Sydney Smith," by Stuart J. Reid, p. 317.

|| "Life of Bishop Wilberforce," vol. i. p. 206.

¶ Lord Teignmouth, "Reminiscences of Many Years," vol. i. p. 252.

escape the stream of vitriolic acid he poured on the heads of all opponents.

In the Scotch "one pound note controversy" Croker replied to his old and intimate friend Sir Walter Scott's "Letters of Malachi Malgrowther" in terms which produced this meek remonstrance from Scott:—

MY DEAR CROKER,—I must say there are many and too direct personal allusions to myself not to authorize, and even demand, some retaliation, *dans le même genre*, and however good-humouredly men begin this sort of "sharp encounter of the wits," their temper gets the better of them at last. When I was a cudgel player, a sport at which I was once an ugly customer, we used to bar rapping over the knuckles, because it always ended in breaking heads; the matter may be remedied by baskets in a set-to with oak saplings; but I know no such defence in the rapier and poniard game of wit, so I thought it best not to endanger the loss of an old friend for a bad jest, and sit quietly down with your odd hits, and the discredit which it gives me here for not repaying them, or trying to do so. I can assure you Malachi's spirit has been thought meanly of for his silence, and this ought to be evidence in my favour that my temper at least is unconcerned in this unhappy dispute.*

This is case of difference of political opinion between Croker and one who was not only a personal friend, but a member of the same political party; but a writer might be a member of the same party and not differ in opinion from Croker, and yet not escape becoming one of his vessels of wrath. Every one remembers Lord Beaconsfield's reference to Sir Archibald Alison's "History of Europe" as "Mr. Wordy's history of the late war in twenty volumes, a capital work, which proves that Providence was on the side of the Tories."† Here the parallel between Mr. Rigby and Croker fails. When Alison's History appeared, we read in his Life, that, considering that his History was a great effort made in favour of the Conservative cause at the period of its lowest depression," he was much annoyed that the *Quarterly Review* took no notice of it; he felt and said "this silence on the part of the *Quarterly* was unjust, especially as the editor‡ was an old personal friend.

The publication of "The Croker Papers" reveals the fact that Croker prepared a review of the "History" which drew from the editor‡ the following remonstrance:—

Alison deserves all anybody can say of his negligence, and also of his coxcombical pomposity and preachification, and worst of all his affectation of Liberalism, here and there by way of extenuating to the

* Vol. i. p. 318.

† "Coningsby," book iii. chap. ii.

‡ The late J. G. Lockhart.

wicked his really good principles, political and religious. But he *is* a good old Tory, and a good, honest, amiable man, and he has spent twenty years on this big book, and looks to it (he thinks not in vain) for pecuniary help to a large family. I think, therefore, it would meet your wishes to be gentle to him; and certainly the contrary line would give me personal pain, we being very old acquaintances, and he the Sheriff of my county, whom I must meet often whenever I go to Scotland. It occurs to me that you might do him a real kindness by pointing out his blunders; but it might be done in terms of respect and civility, and without any expression of severity mingled with regret. This, however, if you *could* speak with general respect of his work—and I fear you could not; and if you could not—why, the article is all alive with interest and could spare a note, however good and however amusing.*

Apparently it did not meet Croker's wishes to be gentle to Alison nor consult Lockhart's feelings. The History remained unreviewed, at least by the *Quarterly*, so we conclude from our editor's note—"Alison little suspected that it was *because* the editor was his friend that his work was not reviewed or the severe treatment from which he was thus saved."†

We hoped that these Papers would throw some light on the origin of the enmity between Croker and Lord Beaconsfield, but we are disappointed. Croker says he "never met Disraeli above twice—once when he was very young, at his father's, and once many years later at Lord Lyndhurst's." He adds: "Nothing certainly happened to create any coolness on my part; on the contrary, my impressions, as far as I can recollect them, were agreeable."‡ Looking at what the editor admits as to Croker's demeanour to strangers, it is most likely that there was something on his part to create a coolness, if no stronger feeling, on Disraeli's part, and that his impressions of Croker were anything but agreeable.

A contemporary § hints rather than states, that Lord Beaconsfield's enmity to Croker arose from his refusal to co-operate with him in some newspaper adventure—we presume the unsuccessful *Representative*. A weekly journal, whose name is, frequently belied by what appears in its columns, asserts that the enmity was caused by Croker, in the Ministerial arrangements of September, 1841, persuading Peel to disregard Disraeli's claim to office, and that Disraeli revenged himself by giving to the world in "Coningsby" the well-known portrait of Croker under the name of Rigby. It does not appear from these volumes that

* Vol. iii. p. 12.

† *Ibid.* note *.

‡ Letter to the late Mr. Charles Phillips: vol. iii. p. 303.

§ *Saturday Review*.

Croker was consulted about, or took part in, the arrangements of 1841.* Notwithstanding the sneers of the *Quarterly Review* "at the world of gobemouches who identify Mr. Croker with Rigby," we think there is no doubt that Rigby is Croker, and that the sketch, though not in some particulars free from exaggeration, is on the whole accurate and fair. One has but to look at the portrait prefixed to the first of these volumes, and call to mind Croker's appearance in his later years, to see that this verbal daguerreotype is intended for him.

A man of middle size and age, originally in all probability of a spare habit, but now a little inclined to corpulency. Baldness, perhaps, contributed to the expression of a brow, which was, however, essentially intellectual, and gave some character of openness to a countenance which, though not ill-favoured, was unhappily stamped by a sinister cast that was not to be mistaken. His manner was easy, but rather audacious than well-bred. Indeed, while a visage which otherwise might be described as handsome was spoiled by a dishonest glance, so a demeanour that was by no means deficient in self-possession and facility was tainted by an innate vulgarity which, in the long run, though seldom, yet surely developed itself.†

It is singular that Lord Beaconsfield should fix on Nicholas Rigby as the name by which to designate Croker. The original Nicholas Rigby, it will be remembered, is described as "a coarse and corrupt adventurer, who had never been loyal to anything but his bread and butter, and of whom it may literally be said that the only merit he possessed or cared to claim was that he drank fair."‡ When "Coningsby" was published, this description of the real Rigby was not written, and yet the first part of it exactly describes the Rigby of the novel.

The passages from "Coningsby" we have quoted are abundant evidence of the identity of Croker with Rigby. There are others not less strong. Croker, we are told by the editor, "was often taunted with the great importance that he attached to dates, and the exaggerated value which he attached to trifles."§ Of Mr. Rigby we are told, when we are first introduced to him, that he compared and criticized the dates of every rumoured incident of the last twenty-four hours (and nobody was stronger in dates than Mr. Rigby); counted even the number of stairs which the Minister had to ascend and descend in his visit to the palace, and the time their mountings and dismountings must have consumed (detail was Mr. Rigby's forte).||

* He may, however, have been consulted or have advised in these arrangements. His letters for 1841-42 are missing. *Vide* vol. ii. p. 377.

† "Coningsby," book i. chap. i.

‡ Trevelyan's "Early History of Charles James Fox," pp. 34, 49, 75.

§ Vol. i. p. 27.

|| "Coningsby," book i. chap. i.

In fact, this love of detail marred the effect of his writings and speeches. "His historical sagacity was often at fault in the details with which it was exclusively employed." * We are told by Lord Russell that, in the debates in Committee on the Reform Bill, "Mr. Croker's statements of detail were singularly inaccurate, and even where the particular point on which he insisted was not mistaken, his exaggerations of its importance were repulsive to the House." † Another point of resemblance of which Croker's letters offer frequent illustrations is that after 1832 "Mr. Rigby was a prophet of evil, preaching only mortification and repentance and despair to his late colleagues." In his early life he said his name was not *Croker*, § but after 1832 such was his disposition. Again, Mr. Rigby is represented as "engaged in concocting—you could not term it composing—an article, 'a very slashing article,' which was to prove that the penny postage must be the destruction of the aristocracy. It was a grand subject treated in his highest style. . . . It was full of passages in italics, little words in great capitals, and almost drew tears." ||

Elsewhere we read that "in the *Quarterly* the new postal law had the honour of a separate invective to itself, in which Mr. Croker confidently foretold its speedy and complete failure with the vehemence that was his wont." ¶ This diatribe, which was generally thought to be at once "furious and weak," read in the light of the facts which show the great benefit cheap postage is to the country, affords a good illustration of the unsoundness of Croker's political judgments.

Mr. Rigby is described as fond of discovering or inventing scandals about opponents. "An amelioration of the criminal code was discountenanced because a search in the parish register of an obscure village proved that the proposer had not been born in wedlock. A relaxation of the commercial system was denounced because one of its principal advocates was a Socinian." **

We find Croker in his latest years busily investigating such questions as whether Pitt was in the habit of excessive drinking; †† "Charles Fox's dealing with Irish pells;" ††† whether Huskisson "gambled in the funds while he was in office." §§

* *The Times*, Summary of Events for 1857.

† "Recollections and Suggestions," p. 92.

‡ "Memoirs of Lord Melbourne," vol. ii. p. 316.

§ Vol. i. p. 49.

|| "Coningsby," book viii. chap. vi.

¶ "Memoirs of Lord Melbourne," vol. ii. p. 316.

** "Coningsby," book ii. chap. i.

†† Vol. i. p. 330.

††† "Memoir of the Right Hon. J. C. Herries," vol. ii. p. 271.

§§ Vol. iii. p. 176.

Croker denied that his attack on Lord Beaconsfield's first Budget was in revenge for his being held up to contempt as Rigby. He asserted that he attacked the Budget in the *Quarterly* only because he thought it "highly mischievous to the country and the Conservative party." He further said, "I never saw 'Coningsby,' nor, till after the review was printed, ever to my recollection had heard that it alluded to me *en bien ni en mal.*"

This is making a great demand on our faith. If Croker did not at or any time after the publication of "Coningsby" hear that he had been there portrayed or caricatured as Rigby, he was the only person in the political or literary world who did not hear it. On this matter we think his recollection failed him. Lord Beaconsfield in the House of Commons replied to Croker and so severely attacked the *Quarterly* that Croker said, "Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright could not have done so more offensively in every point than Mr. Disraeli did." * To this attack Croker professed to be "contemptuously indifferent"—a profession which may or may not have been sincere.

The editor is neither fair nor accurate in his account of the enmity between Croker and another eminent man of letters, Macaulay. The editor assigns as the reason of this enmity that the two men had been "pitted against" "each other in Parliament, and that more than once Croker gained a marked and telling advantage over his antagonist. He had greater felicity in ready reply than Macaulay, and on more than one occasion he utterly demolished an elaborately prepared and showy, but unsubstantial, speech of the 'brilliant essayist.'" †

This was not the origin of Macaulay's enmity to Croker; it began at the time when the writ for Yorkshire was moved on account of Brougham's accepting the Great Seal. After his gratuitous and twice-repeated declaration that he had no intention of taking office, Croker commented sharply on the position in which the new Chancellor was placed, and remarked that he had often heard Brougham declare that "the characters of public men formed part of England's wealth," and enlarged on this theme in that "high moral and admonitory tone" which, to use Lord Beaconsfield's phrase, "irresistibly reminded one of Mrs. Cole and her Prayer-book," and he ruined his case by referring to a private conversation. Macaulay replied in defence of Brougham. "You will see," he wrote to his friend Napier, "that I gave Croker a dressing the other night in Brougham's defence. I was in no good humour with B. But the insufferable impertinence and poltroonery of Croker exasperated me beyond all patience. I am thought to have had the best of the battle by our critics

* Vol. iii. pp. 262, 263.

† Vol. ii. p. 47.

here."* Macaulay also was exasperated far more than by any attack on himself by an attack by Croker on Macaulay's friend Lord Lansdowne, to whom Croker openly referred, observing that Calne was "the key-stone of the arch," and this became a favourite saying among the Tory party.†

The editor very prudently does not specify the occasions on which he thinks Croker demolished Macaulay's "showy, but unsubstantial, speeches." Perhaps he had in his mind the memorable debate on the second reading of the Reform Bill in December, 1831, when Macaulay delivered the greatest speech he had up to that time made, to which Croker attempted to reply, and not only utterly failed, but added disgrace to defeat; for, on the following night, Mr. Stanley‡ convicted him of gross misrepresentation "of facts in the version he gave of the differences between Charles I. and the Parliament." The House enjoyed the exposure; not so Croker. What its effect on him was we are told by an eye-witness.

Mr. Croker, whose assurance was proverbial, at first listened to Mr. Stanley with apparent indifference; but as he proceeded in his attack, supported by immense cheering from a very large majority of the House, Mr. Croker's courage gave way; he became very pale, and pulled his hat over his brows. Lord Althorp thought that he was going to faint, and he did not recover himself the whole night.§

The editor thinks he disposes of what he calls Macaulay's "boast" that he had "smashed" Croker's edition of "Boswell's Johnson" by the fact that between forty and fifty thousand copies of the work have been sold, and it has still a steady sale. We apprehend that Macaulay did not mean he had "smashed," or had designed to "smash," the sale of the book, but the value and accuracy of Mr. Croker's notes and comments. If the sale of the book is to be taken as a test that it is not "smashed," what does the editor say of the sale of Macaulay's criticism? Up to 1876, 120,000 copies of Macaulay's Essays, including the one on "Croker's Johnson," had been sold in the United Kingdom by one publisher alone, considerably over 130,000 copies of separate essays, of which that on Johnson is one, have been printed in "The Traveller's Library." Of the numbers sold in the American and Continental editions there are, so far as we know,|| no statistics, and the sale still goes on.

* "Napier Correspondence," p. 98. *Conf.* "Life of Macaulay," vol. i. p. 170.

† "Memoir of Earl Spencer," p. 335. It will be remembered that Calne was Lord Lansdowne's borough, for which Macaulay sat.

‡ The late Earl of Derby.

§ "Memoir of Earl Spencer," p. 383 and note. Macaulay's speech will be found in his edition of his speeches.

|| See "Life of Macaulay," vol. ii. p. 125.

We all remember the interest with which Croker's review of Macaulay's History was expected, and how that expectation was disappointed. The world generally found it to be what Mr. Trevelyan described it "so bitter, so foolish, and above all so tedious, that scarcely anybody could get through it, and nobody was convinced by it."* Macaulay heard that Lockhart wished to suppress this review, thinking that a violent attack by a personal enemy would do no harm to Macaulay, and much harm to the *Quarterly Review*, and, looking at the course Lockhart took as to Croker's review of Alison, we think it is likely Lockhart wished to suppress this review of Macaulay. Be that as it may, the review appeared, and Croker was anxious that it should be "expanded and published in a separate form . . . to supply a more ready antidote to that elaborate compound of falsehood and poison." To this suggestion Mr. Murray replied: "I am loath to admit any defects in the *Quarterly*, but I cannot help thinking that there are many papers of yours which would answer better for republication than that on Macaulay."† Not daunted by this discouragement, Croker replied: "I do not ask *you* to publish it; all I would ask is, that you would allow *me* to do so *meo periculo*. . . . As I acknowledge the copyright to be in you, I shall, if you do not consent, recast my materials (and I have a great many by me which the limits of a review would not allow me to employ) into another and more book-like form."‡

Fortunately for Croker's literary reputation, neither of his designs as to this article were carried out.

We observe that the editor says of Croker's prediction that Macaulay's History would never be quoted as an authority "that it is a prediction which has yet to be disproved."§ With the exception of one syllable we agree with the editor. In our judgment "it is a prediction which has yet to be proved." It is interesting to read Macaulay's latest opinion of Croker as a writer—an opinion which there is no reason to believe he wrote with any intention of its being published. Towards the close of Macaulay's life, he wrote in his journal:—

I read the *Quarterly Reviews* of 1830-31 and 1832, and was astonished by the poorness and badness of the political articles. I do not think that this is either personal or political prejudice in me, though I certainly did not like Southey, and though I had a strong antipathy to Croker, who were the two chief writers. But I see the merit of many of Southey's writings, with which I am far from agreeing—Espricilla's letters, for example, and the Life of Wesley; and I see the merit of the novels of Theodore Hook—whom I held in

* Vol. ii. p. 238.

† Vol. ii. p. 248

‡ Vol. iii. pp. 245, 246.

§ Vol. ii. p. 423.

greater abhorrence than even Croker—stuffed as those novels are with caricatures of my political friends. Nay, I can see merit in Warren's "Ten Thousand a Year." I therefore believe that my estimate of these political papers in the *Quarterly Review* is a fair one, and to me they seem to be mere trash, absurd perversions of history; parallels which show no ingenuity, and from which no instruction can be derived; predictions which the event has singularly falsified; abuse substituted for argument; and not one paragraph of wit or eloquence. It is all forgotten, all gone to the dogs. Croker is below Southey; for Southey had a good style, and Croker has nothing but italics and capitals as substitutes for eloquence and reason.*

Nevertheless, Croker "always commanded an audience. Even his love of personality was made almost respectable by his skill in the art of inflicting pain."† There are many other facts and opinions in "The Croker Papers" with which we should like to have dealt, but our space available at the present time is filled, and we must quit the subject. In a future number we hope to return to it in connection with Lord Malmesbury's "Memoirs of an Ex-Minister."

* Life of Macaulay," vol. ii. pp. 457, 458.

† The *Times*, *ubi supra*.

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 Editors 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 Editors and from each other.]

PROPOSED ALTERATION OF THE CURRENCY.

NOTWITHSTANDING the intelligent advocacy and unqualified approval of Mr. Childers' proposal for the demonetization of the half-sovereign, by a writer in the October number of this Review, I venture to characterize the policy in respect to currency reform recently propounded in Parliament by the Chancellor of the Exchequer as illogical, fragmentary, and economically unsound. As it is understood to be the intention of the Government to bring the measure forward again this year, the monetary interests of the country imperatively demand that its scope and aim should be dispassionately considered, meanwhile, with a view to its becoming law if possible in an amended form. The Statute-book is already sufficiently encumbered with the results of crude legislation on coinage and banking questions, to the needless hampering of financial and trading operations. And any alteration in the currency system—which has unhappily been too long abandoned to the evil consequences of parliamentary neglect—should be made, not according to the barbarous legislative precedents in connection with this class of subjects set up forty years ago, but in harmony with the requirements of a period when the economy of commerce has been reduced to the precision of a science.

The avowed object of the Chancellor of the Exchequer is to protect the public against the risk of loss caused by wear and tear of the gold coinage. It is well known that at present, if sovereigns or half-sovereigns should come into the possession of any holder after these have reached a stage of service which wears them below standard weight, he is liable, in exchanging them, to forfeit an amount represented by the difference in weight between the light coins and those of full weight. No one disputes that a considerable quantity of gold coins of both the current denominations has accumulated in banking institutions and private hands, which would not pass

at the Bank of England or at the Mint except at a diminished value, resulting from wear. The average weight of a sovereign, at the time of issue is $122\frac{1}{2}$ grains, or about 7.9871 grammes; and it ceases to be legal tender when it falls below 122.5 grains or 7.9379 grammes. The standard weight of the half-sovereign when issued has hitherto been 61.637 grains and 3.9938 grammes. When it falls below 61.125 grains and 3.9609 grammes it can no longer be legally circulated as of full value. Should a gold coin be rejected as too light after it leaves the Mint, the person receiving it must bear the loss involved. The Government declines all responsibility concerning weight when gold coins are transferred to the public. Banking institutions, and sometimes private individuals, having occasion to deposit gold coins in the Bank of England, are accustomed to keep back those materially impaired in value by wear, in the hope of being able gradually to dispose of them to clients without loss, by mixing them with coins which are full weighted. In illustration of the extent to which this practice prevails it may be mentioned that when the gold coin which happened to be in the West of England Bank at the time of its failure was remitted to the Bank of England, no less than 50 per cent. of the amount was found to be below current weight. It is estimated that 20,000,000 light sovereigns, and £5,000,000 to £6,000,000 in value of light half-sovereigns, circulate in this manner in defiance of the law. Mr. Newmarch states, in Tooke's "History of Prices," that in 1840 and 1841, when light gold was freely received by the Bank of England for recoinage at the public expense, the proportion below standard weight did not rise above 25 or 28 per cent. But thirty years later, sovereigns under the authorized weight amounted to one-third of the entire sovereign circulation; while in some of the agricultural districts the proportion of light sovereigns rose to 41 per cent. The proportion of light half-sovereigns now reaches about 47 per cent. on an average of the total half-sovereign circulation. Thus it would appear that out of an aggregate circulation of 64,500,000 sovereigns, $31\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., or 20,000,000, ought to be withdrawn as under the fixed current weight; and out of a total of £11,500,000 to £12,000,000 in half-sovereigns, five and two-thirds millions sterling should be called in for the same reason. "Although the Mint has coined, since the beginning of 1850, the enormous sum of ninety-eight millions sterling, more than half these coins have become a prey to bullion dealers and exporters, and these vast issues have not had the effect of driving out of use the worn coins of earlier years" *

* "Investigations in Currency and Finance." By W. Stanley Jevons. Macmillan & Co. 1884. (P. 300.)

The average age of a sovereign until it wears below the legal standard, according to Dr. Farr, is 15·7 years ; the average age of the half-sovereign before it wears below standard weight is seven and a half years. The average deficiency in the weight of sovereigns is ·53 per cent., or more than ten shillings per £100 ; while half-sovereigns are depreciated twice as much, or about twenty-two shillings per £100. A single bank is known to have lost by light gold coin in one year, as much as £6,716, in addition to loss of interest on this stock, while awaiting the opportunity of being placed in circulation. Mr. Jevons estimates the number of light gold coins requiring recoinage, of both kinds inclusive, at 31,500,000, and the probable cost of recoinage he puts at £348,000, as follows :—

To make up deficiency of weight	.	.	.	£300,000
" " in fineness	.	.	.	7,000
Cost of coinage (Mint expenses)	.	.	.	41,000
				£348,000*

From these statistics it is obvious that the gold coinage of Great Britain is reduced to a chaotic condition by which serious injury is inflicted upon the community calling for prompt readjustment ; being, at the same time, especially discreditable to the English nation, which is distinguished above every other for financial and commercial enterprise. Is Mr. Childers' scheme, however, adequate to meet all the exigencies of the case? On the contrary, it is my belief—the grounds of which will presently appear—that while the recoinage of light sovereigns and half-sovereigns is absolutely indispensable, the wear and tear of the gold currency cannot be equitably and efficiently provided for—certainly it cannot be mitigated—by merely degrading the half-sovereign to the level of a "token." The Government propose in their Bill to lower the existing current intrinsic metallic value of the half-sovereign—henceforth to be denominated a "ten-shilling piece"—before it is put in circulation. After the pending measure is carried, this piece is not to be recognised as legal tender in the receipt or payment of any amount exceeding five pounds. The sixth clause of the Bill enacts that the half-sovereign, or rather the coin which is to take its place, shall be alloyed relatively in excess of the sovereign, so that the real value of the former shall be reduced by one shilling as compared with its present standard worth. The half-sovereign will be permitted, nevertheless, to circulate at the value of ten shillings, as previously ; being exchangeable as a token up to that amount. The difference between the factitious value of ten shillings, for which the new

* "Investigations in Currency and Finance," p. 295.

token is to be taken, up to a fixed limit, in business transactions, and its intrinsic metallic value of nine shillings, will be appropriated by the Government in defraying expenses incident to the *entire* gold mintage of the country, as well as in "the exchange of light gold coin for coin of full weight." Thus, by the debasement, or rather the *effacement*, of the half-sovereign, and the profit to be derived by the Treasury from the production of an excessively alloyed gold piece, only worth nine shillings, but which is expected to pass for ten shillings, the risk of loss by abrasion, to the holder both of the sovereign and of the "ten-shilling piece," is to be anticipated and guarded against in the future. It will be observed in this new-fangled scheme that the smaller coin, in addition to suffering metallic deterioration, has assigned to it the performance of a sort of vicarious function in behalf of the sovereign. By virtue of the depreciation of the half-sovereign, the sovereign is to retain its metallic composition and standard value unchanged, while no loss whatever will be occasioned to its possessor from natural and ordinary wear. But I think convincing arguments can be advanced to show that the wiser plan would be to cover by the imposition of a land tax or some other plan, the expense of recoinng and restoring to their normal value light sovereigns and half-sovereigns, and to uphold them, as at present, when of full weight, at that value; at the same time effecting some modification and extension of our paper currency, by which the present pressure on the total gold circulation of the kingdom could be permanently relieved. I propose to submit in a subsequent part of this paper a practicable method by which this desirable object can be realized, without involving any real danger of inflation to the currency. As far as can at present be ascertained, the only substantial advantage likely to accrue from the new Act is of a purely indirect and incidental kind. The surplus profits obtainable from the coinage of the debased "ten-shilling piece," after deducting cost of minting and loss consequent on exchanging light gold coins for those of full weight, are to be applied to the reduction of the National Debt.

The aim of the Bill is wrong in principle and offers a dangerous precedent. Despite the wilful reduction of the former value of a gold coin by the Mint, it is still made to retain that value, nominally, as an exchangeable *token* in the market. A measure framed for so dubious a purpose leaves upon the mind a widely different impression from that which would be produced if an entirely new coin of fair metallic value were introduced, or if an old coin were absolutely cancelled.

If we may judge from a remark by the Deputy-Master in the report of the Mint for 1883, he at least is the opposite of con-

fidest as to the result of this Bill for amending the Coinage Act of 1870. "It need hardly be said that *the financial results of the contemplated measure are extremely difficult to forecast*, the formation of any accurate estimate of the amount of coinage to be withdrawn and issued, or of the profits and expenses of the scheme, being almost impossible." On the other hand, the adverse opinion of the New York *Financial Chronicle*—no mean authority on monetary topics—is expressed very emphatically in an able article on "Token-money in Great Britain," which appeared in the number of May 24th; the measure being ironically defined as a Bill "to relieve careless bankers of their light gold":—

Should Mr. Childers carry his bill through Parliament, the new coins are almost certain to be discredited from the beginning, and the public obstinacy and persistence in preferring the old way to the new, may bring about all the evils which the objectors now foresee. . . . Not the sensible objections which some financiers make to the proposition, but the popular opposition, will defeat the measure, if it be defeated at all.

I take exception to the Bill—(1) On the ground that it sanctions the resting of the paper currency of Scotland and Ireland upon debased coin, the ten-shilling piece being allowed in these countries "to be substituted by bankers for silver coin in the reserve against which bank-notes are authorized to be issued" (clause v.). This clause legalizes as a foundation for the note circulation of the two countries referred to, a standard gold currency interchangeable with debased tokens. Where a difference so radical exists between the intrinsic values of two metallic coins, it is contrary to all monetary canons hitherto accepted to suppose that they can together, justly and securely, sustain a note circulation. The ten-shilling piece, being really below the intrinsic value of ten shillings, if it be treated, as the Bill imports, as being equivalent to that value in the silver reserve basis of a bank of issue, nothing short of a fiction (a stronger term might not inaptly be employed) is created by Act of Parliament, under Government auspices, to inspire financial confidence in a credulous public. If the note issue is thus to rest upon a composite basis in the sense that the two gold coins forming that basis are relatively of different standard weight and fineness, then the whole of the note issue standing on such a basis is, *ipso facto*, depreciated. To demonstrate that this would be the almost universal verdict on the subject, let the statement—as indeed it ought—be distinctly printed on the face of each Scotch and Irish note as follows:—"Secured, partly on a reserve of sovereigns of legitimate standard gold, and partly on depreciated half-sovereigns, which are now displaced as legal tender; the

latter ranking in the category of 'tokens,' lawfully exchangeable only up to £5 value." If the case were thus plainly stated to Scotch and Irish noteholders, I do not hesitate to say that a quasi-panic would be almost inevitable. Moreover, that this "bastard" security should be permissible in the case of Scotch and Irish banks as a basis for their notes, while the Bank of England issue continues to rest undisturbed upon the broad and solid foundation of *genuine* standard metallic currency, apparently implies a distinction which, to say the least, must be regarded as invidious. (2) My next objection is, that the remedy proposed to cover the loss from wear and tear is much too partial to meet all the requirements of the case, especially when it is remembered that so large a proportion of the loss by wear and tear necessarily concerns the sovereign. It appears from the Report of the Deputy-master of the Mint, already quoted, that the total amount of gold sent to the Mint in 1883 by the Bank of England was £4,392,325, of which £3,445,968 was in gold coin, *the greater part being sovereigns withdrawn from circulation as light*, under the provisions of the Coinage Act. No plan, consequently, for dealing with the question of loss from wear can be effectual which does not economize the use of both coins, as far as possible, without deliberately impairing the current value of either. By all means let sovereigns and half-sovereigns, which have fallen in weight by use below their legally recognized currency value, be rehabilitated. But instead of defraying the cost of the operation by the apparently surreptitious device of taking away from the secondary standard coin of the realm a portion of the gold which by law and time-honoured usage has hitherto belonged to it, while, contrary to principles of natural equity, authorising its circulation at its original exchangeable value, would not the straightforward course be to levy a tax, once for all, to cover this expenditure? What is there to hinder such an expedient being accompanied with an official intimation by the Government, that after the gold coinage has been thus restored, the public shall be required to assume in perpetuity the responsibility of protecting themselves from the risk of light standard coins coming into their possession, by returning them to the Bank of England or the Mint before they are worn beyond the limit of their current value? Nothing would be easier than for industrial, financial, and mercantile establishments, which have the handling of coins on a large scale, to exercise a reasonable amount of vigilance in the application of the accustomed tests when parcels of gold coin come into their hands. Such a degree of alloy in every coin as may be necessary to defray expenses of mintage is perfectly allowable. But it seems to me highly

objectionable, both on economic and moral grounds, for any Government to derive revenue from the depreciation of its coinage. Already the Treasury makes a clear gain, I think unjustifiably, of four shillings and sixpence "upon each score of new shilling pieces it puts into circulation, a gain of more than three farthings on every penny, and a corresponding profit on all the other tokens now in use." Now it proposes to lay desecrating hands on the half-sovereign after a similar fashion. With comparatively modern instances before us of States which have unscrupulously liquidated national obligations by tampering with their standard coinage, is it absolutely impossible that some future Chancellor of the Exchequer, under pressure of extraordinary financial exigencies, may be tempted to manipulate the sovereign—the sole coin that will have escaped demonetization if this Bill passes—adducing in justification of his policy the present example of Mr. Childers with reference to the half-sovereign? We stand alone as a nation in the wholesale system of demonetization which threatens to overtake our coinage. In other civilized countries—notably in the United States, which has the most perfect system of currency in the world—there is a plurality of gold coins, and the systematic depreciation of any of them would be regarded by every enlightened Government but our own as a retrograde movement.

The writer of the article on "Mr. Childers' New Half-Sovereigns" furnishes a unique illustration of the logical contradictions in which partisan zeal may unconsciously involve even the best informed advocate. The burden of his commendation of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's scheme is that the right hon. gentleman has followed the advice of John Locke in an essay entitled "Some Considerations of the Consequences of the Lowering of Interest and Raising of the Value of Money." Yet the writer throughout argues in the teeth of Locke's principles, and Mr. Childers' Bill is in direct violation of his policy. In 1695, when our current coin consisted almost entirely of silver, and was supposed to be standard money, it had become considerably depreciated as well as scanty through cutting, clipping, sweating, and other forms of bad usage. The question seriously occupied the attention of the officers of State as to the wisest method of calling in deficient coins, and re-issuing standard coins of full weight. Mr. Lowndes, then Secretary to the Treasury, attempted to show, in a pamphlet which he published, that these objects could be accomplished, without any cost to the nation, by the Government putting one-fifth less silver into all the coins and pocketing the difference. Four years previously, Locke had demonstrated in the essay already mentioned, that it was not by coins receiving certain

“denominations” under public authority that their true purchasing power could be ultimately determined, but only by their intrinsic metallic value. Mr. Childers’ defender himself remarks: “It was fortunate for the country that the advice of Locke prevailed, and in 1696 a Bill passed the House of Commons for the reissue of silver coins of full standard quality and weight. The loss to the Exchequer, estimated at £1,200,000, was met by the imposition of a house duty and window tax.” Locke insisted on the standard value of the coinage being religiously maintained. On the other hand, Mr. Childers, while sparing the sovereign, the rehabilitation of which the writer fallaciously asserts is “the paramount object held in view by Mr. Childers,” demonstizes the half-sovereign, and commits the Government to the tortuous proceeding of calling the depreciated coin a “ten-shilling piece” after the intrinsic worth of the gold it contains has been reduced to nine shillings. According to the degenerate arithmetic of the Treasury, two adulterated gold tokens are to be denominated ten-shilling pieces, and unitedly, for practical purposes, to be taken as equal to a sovereign of twenty shillings standard value, although their real value is only eighteen shillings. Locke counselled that the cost of rehabilitating the coinage in his day should be honestly met by a tax. It is Mr. Childers’ intention to meet the loss that may be sustained by the Exchequer in restoring the sovereign to full weight and upholding its intrinsic current value now, by robbing the half-sovereign of part of its metallic value, dethroning it from its position as a current coin, and yet calling it by a name which falsely imports that its real value remains unaltered. Could contrast be greater between the teaching of the great master and the contemplated practice of his alleged disciple? Nevertheless, the writer of the article referred to considers the highest compliment he can bestow on Mr. Childers to be that “he has read his Locke,” and the heaviest reproach he can cast upon the opponents of his measure that “they have not read their Locke.” Nay, so far does the writer carry his virtual antagonism to the doctrine of the philosopher he professes to revere, that he rather justifies the adulteration which has taken place in the silver coins, on the ground that it keeps them from the melting-pot of the bullion dealer. But, with a singular want of consistency, in another part of his paper he actually suggests that when there arises a demand for bullion from abroad, in the absence of an available supply otherwise of gold ingots, this might be met by “the uncoining of a million or two of gold tokens at the Mint, the withdrawal of the additional alloy, and the exportation of the bullion to the extent required.” It is not surprising, therefore, that he should have so little compunction

about the impending fate of the half-sovereign. The only circumstance that would seem to reconcile him to the idea of saving even the sovereign from depreciation is that, we should probably have some difficulty in conducting our monetary operations without having one coin to which there was attached a fixed standard of value! But if Mr. Childers' "new way of paying old debts" be as economically sound and charming as his plausible advocate would imply, the marvel is that he should stop at its application to meeting the cost of recoinage and future wear of gold coins. Why not extend the utility of so excellent a principle by a further debasement of the coinage to cancel, say, the unfunded or part of the funded debt? Mr. Gladstone has been distinguished as a financier for his unwearied iteration of the motto that governments should "pay their way;" but if the course proposed by Mr. Childers be adopted, the expense of rectifying coinage anomalies will simply have been defrayed by a species of confiscation. If either gold or silver coins bearing a proportional relation to the sovereign be depreciated, the relation is by that process to all intents destroyed, and in so far the whole coinage is demoralized. For that relation to be perfect, it is indispensable that the related coins should have the intrinsic value really which they have nominally, and this postulate of currency science Mr. Childers' Bill not only ignores, but utterly subverts. The question whether individuals in the community will feel richer or poorer for the proposed change is irrelevant.

It is exceedingly significant that, after the fashion of the proverbial postscript to a lady's letter, the concluding paragraph of the article on which I have ventured to animadvert should refer to the most vulnerable point in the Chancellor of the Exchequer's plan; I mean the absence of any provision for the much-needed expansion of the paper currency by the adoption of small notes as a means of economizing the use of gold coins. When he would make it appear, however, that any considerable body of economists desire to replace absolutely the sovereign by a one-pound note, and apply a part of the revenue so obtainable to the maintenance of the half-sovereign as the only standard coin, he travels somewhat beyond the record. But, like a true champion of Bank of England monopoly in note issues, he declines to discuss the alternative of saving the wear and tear of the gold coinage by multiplying English banks of issue, and dismisses that question by briefly remarking: "Here we are standing on the brink of a limitless sea of controversy. We have gone as far as we safely can go in the issue of paper money, and the public security demands cautious restriction." The writer shrinks from the bare conception of chartered privilege in the issue of notes, being

invaded, and accordingly eschews even a cursory investigation of what is the most practical side of the entire subject.

We are thus naturally led up to Mr. William Fowler's amendment to the Bill, as inscribed on the notice-paper of the House of Commons, pointing to what, in my judgment, is the simplest mode of dealing with the difficulties of the case. Mr. Fowler objects to the use of a gold coin not of full standard weight as "token money," on the ground that "it is calculated to create confusion and uncertainty, both here and in other countries, as to the character of our coinage and as to the maintenance of our standard value." But it is to the strongest ground of his opposition to the Bill that I wish prominently to direct attention—namely, "that it is not expedient to make provision for the restoration of the gold coinage until the question of the convenience and economy of an issue of notes, duly secured, of less denomination than five pounds, shall have been duly considered by a Royal Commission or a Select Committee." I entirely agree with the proposition embodied in the concluding part of this amendment as going to the root of the matter. Without interfering with the arrangement fixed by Sir Robert Peel's Act of 1844, as to the Bank of England and the Scotch and Irish banks in regard to the denomination, condition, and amount of their note issues, a concession might be made to all banks of acknowledged stability of the right of issuing one-pound notes, and even notes of the value of ten shillings. This would unquestionably prove at once a great economy in respect to the gold coinage and a distinct public convenience.

The obvious design of all the banking legislation of Sir Robert Peel was to limit and, as far as possible, suppress the circulation of country bank-notes and replace them by notes from the issue department of the Bank of England; his ultimate intention being to transfer to a single central Government office the exclusive function of providing a circulation of notes for the whole of the United Kingdom. In common with some popular expounders of currency principles in his day, Sir R. Peel was betrayed into the absurdity of attributing the derangement of credit and wide fluctuations in the foreign exchanges to the agency of bank-notes, metropolitan and provincial. Hence his avowed hostility, particularly to the one-pound notes of Scotland and Ireland, the summary suppression of which by him was only prevented by persistent local opposition.* He suc-

* Not the least potent factor in preventing the withdrawal of one-pound notes from Scotland was the celebrated *Malachi Malagrouther's Letters* by Sir Walter Scott, which furnish an unanswerable vindication of an expansive paper currency. Sir A. Alison, too, ascribes "the salvation of the Empire" in the crises of war, bad harvests, and specie famines at the beginning of the century, to

ceeded, however, as regards Scotland, in limiting the future note issues of the then existing banks to the average of the year ending May 1, 1845. That average amounted to two and three-quarter millions; and for all notes issued in excess of that sum the Scotch banks were required to have a reserve of gold coin in hand. It was also enacted that no new bank formed in Scotland could be a bank of issue, and that on the failure of any Scotch bank then existing, its right of issue should cease. But the lapse of time and enlarged experience in banking and commerce, combined with a more rational treatment of currency questions generally, have clearly shown the theory propounded by Sir R. Peel, and the policy he based on that theory, to be egregiously wrong, mischievous and unjust, alike in his own day and ever since. Facts conclusively prove that it is not by any expansion in the circulation of convertible bank-notes that credit, prices, or the foreign exchanges are affected, but that it is simply by variation in the rates of interest. Despite his efforts to contract, with the intention of eventually extinguishing, Scotch notes, they are to-day more highly appreciated by the public north of the Tweed than ever; the amount of them in circulation having enormously increased since the enactments were put in force to curtail their issue. But the damage inflicted upon England and Wales by Sir R. Peel's mistaken course, in seeking to reduce the paper currency of provincial banks to the lowest possible *minimum*, continues to be more or less acutely experienced as trading requirements multiply. While the Scotch secured a continuance of the average issue of the twelve months, the English and Welsh banks were only able to obtain the average issue of the twelve weeks preceding 27th April, 1844. These banks also failed to gain permission, which the Scotch, however, received, to issue notes beyond the *maximum*, even by keeping in their "till" gold coin equal to the whole of the excess. The unfortunate result is, that notwithstanding the vast growth of population and trade in England and Wales during the last forty years, the provincial banks have now only a note issue of about four and a quarter

the same cause. "It is remarkable," says he, "that this admirable system, which may be truly called the moving power of the nation during the war, became, towards its close, the object of the most determined hostility on the part both of the great capitalists and chief writers on political economy in the country. Here, however, as everywhere else, experience, the great test of truth, has determined the question. The adoption of the opposite system of contracting the paper in proportion to the abstraction of the metallic currency by the Acts of 1819 and 1844 (followed as it was necessarily by the monetary crises of 1825, 1839 and 1847) has demonstrated beyond a doubt that it was in the system of an expansive currency that Great Britain, during the war, found the sole means of its salvation."

millions, instead of the *maximum* issue of six and a quarter millions allowed them by the Act of 1844. A further disadvantage shared by English and Welsh, as compared with Scotch banks, is, that if in any case they should open a London office, they must at once forfeit entirely their right to issue notes in the provinces. Accordingly the Act of 1844 lands us in the singular anomaly, that immeasurably greater facilities in paper currency are granted to Scotland than to England, although the population of the latter section of the kingdom is six times as large as that of the former, with a trade incalculably more extensive.

In the present instance, however, I do not advocate, absolutely, a return to the *status quo ante* 1844. All that is asked for is a fair and well-secured extension to the English and Welsh banks of note-issue privileges, mainly with the view of economizing the use of gold currency. This plan is recommended in lieu of the proposed debasement of the half-sovereign. It is satisfactory to have in favour of it so eminent a financial authority as Mr. Stephen Williamson, M.P.—at least, as regards its principle. His concurrence is all the more valued because the final solution of coinage difficulties, in his opinion, lies in a direction which I am not prepared to approve—the adoption of bi-metallism. At a meeting of the International Monetary Standard Association held last year, referring to Mr. Childers' Coinage Bill, Mr. Williamson said :

I think we may safely say it will contract the supply of our legal tender of gold money, and it may present an opportunity of directing attention to the propriety of using both metals for our currency purposes. I, as a Scotchman, rather favour the idea of saving the wear and tear of gold by the issue of £1 notes, or notes of a smaller amount than £5.

Mr. Jevons advocates a note issue of small denominations on what he terms "the partial deposit system." He further maintains that the lowest limit of a paper currency should in any case be five francs. The same writer suggests the issue of 50,000,000 £1 notes, on a basis partly of coin and bullion, and partly of securities, giving the Government a profit of half a million a year.

The amount to be issued on securities, instead of coin or bullion, would be greater or less according to the whole amount of the issue; and the profit would of course be secured for the public revenue, after payment of the costs of issue.* If one-pound notes, why not ten-shilling, or even five-shilling notes? I do not share the prejudice which commonly exists against small paper money.†

* "Investigations in Currency and Finance," p. 300.

† Ten, five, and three cent notes were issued in the United States during the war. In Italy there is the one-lira note (value 8*d.*), and local notes of fifty

But Mr. Grenfell, ex-Governor of the Bank of England, in an article which appeared in the *Nineteenth Century* for March 1879, not unnaturally evinces jealousy of the issue monopoly of that institution being encroached upon by the method now recommended. He can conceive of no conditions under which the issue of notes by banks, even when this is subject to undoubted security and strict Government supervision, without an attendant risk of currency inflation. The only logical sequel to such a view is the abolition of a note issue under all circumstances. In the following sentences his dread of a general scheme for issuing one-pound notes appears so completely to paralyze his judgment, that he conjures up a bugbear which can have no possible existence outside his own imagination:—

In such a case (viz., the issuing of one-pound notes by banks generally) the ordinary gold circulation would disappear, and the bankers would have to depend on the Bank of England or upon some other central dépôt of the precious metals. If the Bank of England contained the only central stock, in order to have a right to draw on it at all moments, they would either have to keep a far larger reserve in that place, or run the risk of keeping a greater mass of gold in their own houses than they do at present. On the one side such a state of things would be a great economy of the precious metals; on the other, the country would have, in case of wars or sudden drains, to purchase its gold at a more extravagant rate than under the existing law, when so large an amount is at all times freely circulating throughout the country.

But, according to the scheme now under consideration, the issuing banks would have in their vaults, and so would hold back from circulation, within a fraction, an amount of security corresponding to their note issues. Consequently, the practical effect upon the available supply of bullion for home use and export would be the same as if there was no note issue whatever.

An important branch of inquiry, however, still demands attention: What precautions should be taken to prevent the issue of notes by trustworthy banks without distinction, leading to an inflation of values, and to guard against failure of payment by issuers? A glance at systems of paper-currency prevailing in one or two other leading mercantile countries may assist us in arriving at a safe conclusion on this point. It is worthy of notice that when it was deemed expedient to establish a note issue in India, the British Government, in formulating its scheme for that purpose, found it necessary to depart, in

and twenty-five centesimi, serving as small change. In Scandinavia there are five-kröner notes; and in Norway a note currency is so much preferred that all attempts to establish a gold currency have failed.

some measure, from the principles laid down by Sir Robert Peel. The Government arrogated to itself, with unimportant exceptions, the exclusive right of issue, and assumed all obligation for the ultimate redemption as well as the immediate convertibility of the notes issued. The department of issue at Calcutta consequently forms a branch of the public service, under the management of a Government official, who is also Master of the Mint. Under his control notes are printed and issued; the Government rendering itself liable to pay the amount of each note in cash to bearer at sight. Agents are appointed by Government at various centres throughout the country, called "circles of issue," to issue the notes in exchange for current silver coin or standard silver bullion, and, to a limited extent, for gold. The coin and bullion thus received is held by the Government as a reserve against payment of such notes, with the exception of any amount, not exceeding four crores of rupees (about £4,000,000), as the Governor-General in Council, with the consent of the Secretary of State for India, may from time to time determine. The amount so fixed is invested in Government securities, which, in addition to the reserve of coin and bullion referred to, are set apart by law to provide for the satisfaction and discharge of the notes; the general credit of the Government being also formally pledged for the same object. The notes constitute a legal tender within all the areas prescribed for their circulation, except to the Government of India, at any office, or at the issue department of any agency of issue. They are, in fact, State notes, in distinction from bank notes, and any profits which may accrue from their circulation are appropriated by the Government.

In the United States the Government occupies an intermediate position in relation to paper money; delegating the right of issue, under rigid conditions, to a plurality of banks, instead of to one central institution, while unremittingly exercising official control over the mechanism of the note circulation. The Treasury at Washington, moreover, claims participation in the privileges and profits enjoyed by the issuing banks. In the somewhat complex scheme of the Federal Government, the mechanical operation of engraving the notes is carried on in a separate State department, under the care of an officer styled the Controller of the Currency, who is second in authority to the Secretary of Treasury, but at the same time directly responsible to Congress for the lawful performance of the work entrusted to his department. He is authorised to print notes to an amount not exceeding \$300,000,000 (say £60,000,000), or such an amount as may

be required for the time being, for circulation within the United States. But as the Government itself does not *issue*, no note is complete until it is inscribed with the name of one of the banks licensed by the Government to put it into circulation, and subsequently to convert it into coin, on presentation for payment at any one of the offices of the issuing bank. Each note, printed in the Currency Department and issued by an authorized bank, is receivable at par in all the States of the Union, in payment of debts, and as a rule, of taxes and other Government imposts. Any joint-stock association having a specified capital may become a bank of issue, on the production of an approved certificate to the Controller of the Currency, embodying full particulars as to its constitution and means (always provided, of course, that the terms of the law for the protection of the noteholder are complied with). The association can be supplied with any amount of notes in blank not exceeding the amount of its capital stock actually paid up. But each bank of issue is required to deposit with the Government, United States stock bearing interest, and in exchange receives notes equal in the aggregate to 90 per cent. of the current value of the stock so deposited, but not exceeding its par value. By this arrangement the noteholders become virtually creditors of the whole nation, and are thus assured of redemption in case of default on the part of the issuers to pay in lawful coin. As a further security for payment, it is enacted that each bank shall constantly have in hand in lawful money of the United States, a sum not less than 25 per cent. of the total amount of its outstanding notes in circulation and deposits. It is also imperative that weekly accounts should be rendered by the cashiers of the banks, a regular system of visitation and audit being conducted on behalf of the Government. Hence in India and the United States the note circulation is limited. In the former country it is restricted to £4,000,000, unless on a basis of the precious metals, in the latter country the total issue permitted is £60,000,000 of which £45,000,000 rests on securities alone. It is to be observed, however, that in both these instances the regulation and control of issue reside, not in the banks, but in the Government. Freedom in banking, as in trade, is essential to unfettered industrial and mercantile development in a civilized nation, but if supply and demand in the money market is to be duly guarded from violent fluctuations, free issue ought to be recognised as the sovereign prerogative of Government, even in a free country.

On this theory of issue in relation to Government on the one hand, and to banking establishments on the other, one of three courses is open to the State : either to issue on its own account,

or through the medium of a central bank, or through the instrumentality of a number of banks. The difficulty in adopting the first course is that it would entail upon the Government the necessity of becoming a banker, in the ordinary acceptation of that term; in other words, administering a department for receiving deposits, discounting bills, and advancing loans on security. And it is needless to say that the very idea of the State embarking in such a business is preposterous. There is only one instance on record in which a Government in modern times has issued paper money pure and simple, without doing harm as regards the inflation of prices. We refer to the circulation of convertible Imperial paper money in India. But then the experiment is of recent origin, and circumstances have never admitted of its being severely tested. Besides, as the sum afloat in that empire, in non-metallic notes, is only £4,000,000, in comparison with £150,000,000 in coin, the data furnished by the experiment are insufficient to support any very definite conclusion on the subject. A Government promise to pay may be relied upon, so long as the public revenues can be collected and applied, so far as may be necessary, to the redemption of its notes. But civil turmoil or invasion may speedily disturb Exchequer arrangements, and in such a contingency the customers of a Government bank would be sure to sustain grave inconvenience, while the notes of banks conducted by private wealth and enterprise, and wholly unconnected with the fate of any dynasty or political constitution, would circulate without impediment in the midst of war or revolution.

A single bank of issue is not without some undoubted recommendations. In the case of the Bank of England, the Government, while according to it exceptional advantages, as the medium through which the bulk of its financial business is transacted, enjoys, from connection with the bank, important reciprocal monetary facilities. A single bank of issue, trading at the same time, in deposits and discounts on its own responsibility, and operating under the superintendence of the law, combines the strength derived from its official relation with the State with the freedom of action allowed to it, as an independent corporation. As all the capital invested in it belongs to a private proprietary, it has every motive to resist exacting demands from the State on the one hand, and from the public on the other. But there is an objection to one privileged bank of issue, which, it is to be feared, outweigh all the considerations usually urged in its favour. It is open to the charge of monopoly, and this, in a country conspicuous for its maintenance of free trade principles, presents an aspect of marked incongruity, exciting more or less the envy of rival banks of deposit and discount.

The third, and, as it appears to me, the expedient course, is to adopt, with suitable modification, the American plan of extending the right of issue, to a fixed amount, under State supervision and control, to all banking establishments of approved constitution and stability. Thus may be equally avoided the extreme of unlimited issues propounded by M. Chevalier, and the extreme, no less obnoxious, of the exclusive privilege of issue by a single bank. Nor need the arrangement here suggested interfere in the least with any preference on the part of Government for keeping the Treasury accounts, as at present, with one bank. The question of vital moment, however, remains: on what basis of security are the notes issued to stand? Beyond doubt, the only system which approaches to absolute safety for the noteholder, is that of an issue resting in all cases on the compulsory retention in the bank of an equivalent of gold for the amount of every note in circulation. But if this arrangement were carried out in its integrity, the creation of wealth and the release of capital by the issuing banks would alike be precluded; the sole benefit to the banks being in such a case the advertisement of their names on the face of the notes. The partial exemption of gold coins from abrasion would clearly be gained, but it is difficult to see how, under such conditions, banks could be compensated for the trouble, expense, and lock-up of bullion incident to a note issue. No scheme of issue would be complete which omitted provision for the fair remuneration of banks which tied up their store of precious metals in order to protect the public against loss from the wear and tear of gold coin.*

There are two ways in which the due payment of notes would be practically assured in case of the issuers failing, if the right of issue were thrown open in the manner above indicated. (1) Let the issuing banks be required to deposit public securities for the full average amount of their circulation, available in the event of a bank becoming insolvent; or (2) Let such deposit of securities to the extent of one half the issue be enforced by law, the noteholders at the same time having secured to them a first claim for the other half, on the total assets of the bank. The latter plan has the advantage of being more equitable than the former, and is virtually as safe for the noteholders, while in actual working it leaves

* From the correspondence which took place in 1880-81 between Mr. Gladstone's Government and the Scotch banks, referred to at length in the latest edition of Gilbert's "History of Banking," vol. ii, pp. 435-456 (1882), it would appear that the Government decidedly favours a State issue of notes. But the communications emanating from the Treasury on that occasion are so vague, arbitrary, and contradictory, that I conclude the officials in that department have never turned serious attention to banking principles.

adequate scope for the making of reasonable profits by the issuing banks. The alteration of the Banking Act in the manner proposed would liberate the country from the consequences of the false and injurious legislation of 1844-5. There would also be superseded the ridiculous custom of sending several millions of gold coin to Scotland and Ireland two or three times a year, just at those periods when it happens to be most wanted in the metropolis for the purpose of strengthening the central coin reserve. Moreover, if the right to issue one-pound and ten-shilling notes by all solid banking institutions in the country, were established without distinction, under definite legal restrictions, the monopoly of issue by the Bank of England and the existing Scotch banks would disappear. The obstacle to the establishment of new banks in the northern part of the kingdom would be removed; the expansion of the currency so urgently required for meeting augmented trade requirements would be effected without any such disturbance of the mono-metallic standard of value as would be unavoidable if the scheme of bimetalists were adopted; and the object of Mr. Childers' Bill in saving the wear and tear of the entire gold coinage would be satisfactorily gained, without resorting to the objectionable expedient of *démonetizing* the half-sovereign.

MATTHEW MACFIE,

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

THEOLOGY.

IT may turn out that much more importance than its due is just now accorded to the "Doctrine (or Teaching) of the Twelve Apostles,"¹ recently published by Bryennios, Metropolitan of Nicomedia, from a MS. which he discovered in a library at Constantinople at least ten years ago, and which cannot yet be said to have run the gauntlet of European criticism, although it already forms the subject of numerous publications.² The MS. is at present accepted as the work of one Leo, a scribe of the eleventh century, and there is no doubt that some such book as the *Διδαχή* existed in early Christian times. It was last seen, so far as can be traced, in the ninth century, by Nicephorus Callistus, who said it contained 200 lines; the MS. has 203. Eusebius, the Origenite, called it orthodox ("Hist. Eccl." iii. 25); and Athanasius, born at, and bishop of, Alexandria, says (fourth century) that, though not canonical, it had long been in use for the instruction of catechumens in the churches, chiefly in Egypt, perhaps because of Clement of Alexandria, who, at the end of the second century, quotes from the first part of the newfound MS. What seems to take away much of its value is the fact that it was long ago incorporated in the "Apostolical Constitutions;" and again, an *opusculum*, the "Constitutions of Clement," contains nearly all its first part, but with a totally different sequel; while two other tracts, the "Epitome of the Rules of the Catholic Tradition of the Holy Apostles," and the "Extract from the Ordinances of the Apostles," consist wholly of the same first part. M. Bonet-Maury holds that the MS., as we now have it, is the result of at least three recastings; the original having been the work of a Judæo-Christian Hellenist of Alexandria, about A.D. 130 or 140, to which additions were made twenty years later; the work being finally revised and extended in the Asiatic Church at the beginning of the third century. M. Massebiau does not differ much as to the final date, but puts the first part back before the

¹ *Διδαχή τῶν δώδεκα Ἀποστόλων, κ.τ.λ. ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει.* 1883.

² For the convenience of students, we give a list of the chief foreign publications. Hilgenfeld: in the last number of the second edition of his "Novum Testamentum extra Canonem receptum," 1884. Zahn: "Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons;" Erlangen, 1884. Von Gebhardt and Harnack: "Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur;" Leipzig, 1884. Funck: in the *Theologische Quartalschrift* (lxvi. 13); Tübingen, 1884. Aug. Wünsche: "Lehre der zwölf Apostel." Prins: "Didachi," &c.; Leyden, 1884. Bonet-Maury: "La Doctrine des douze Apôtres," with a translation and critical and historical commentary; Paris, Fischbacher, 1884, with which Canon Farrar's version in the *Contemporary Review* can be compared. Massebiau: "L'Enseignement des douze Apôtres," in the *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, x. 2. Duchesne: in the *Bulletin Critique*, Oct. 1884, &c.

year 100; and very strangely, as it seems, claims a Roman origin for the "Doctrine."

As to the contents of the little book, it is a sort of church catechism, intensely Jewish. It starts with the two Ways of life and of death, an idea widely spread throughout antiquity: to be traced perhaps aboriginally to the duplex organisation of the human brain, and certainly to be seen in its most marked development in the dualism of Zoroaster and the well-defined dominions of Ormazd and Ahriman.³ But the Apostolic "Doctrine" here, as Jesus did, draws directly on Judaism. For instance, in Deut. xxx. 15 we have, "See, I have set before thee this day Life and Good, and Death and Evil." The same idea is frequently found elsewhere in the Hebrew writings, especially in the Psalms. "The way of sinners," says Jesus Ben-Sirach, "is made plain with stones, but at the end thereof is the pit of hell" (xxi. 10), and Jesus of Nazareth was ever harping on the same Jewish theme of the strait gate and narrow way, and the wide gate and broad way (Matt. vii. 13, 14). The way of life, so frequently mentioned in Acts, consists, according to the "Doctrine," in loving God and practising the golden rule, which is to be found in the positive or negative form in all religions from Confucius to Comte,⁴ and which is here negatively expounded to mean the observance of the second table of the Jewish decalogue—not killing, not hating, not stealing, not coveting, not bearing false witness, not committing adultery. The great virtue recommended is humility. After some instruction, the catechumen became a disciple and, as was the practice between rabbi and disciple among the Jews, is called "my child" (1 Tim. i. 1, and ii. 18, &c.). He next enters into the assembly of the "saints"—a

³ A whole treatise might be written on this. The "Doctrine of the Mean" makes Confucius (6th century B.C.) say: "What Heaven has conferred is called Nature. An accordance with this Nature is called the Path [of duty]. The regulation of this Path is called Instruction" (i. 1). The other famous Chinese philosopher, Mencius (4th century B.C.), said "Righteousness is man's Path. Benevolence is the characteristic of man. As embodied in man's conduct, it is called the Path of duty" (Works, Book V. ii. 11 and VII. ii. 16). Vishnu is called *Mārgaḥ*, *tattvam*, *prābhavaḥ*—the Way, the truth, the life (compare John xiv. 6). Gautama, the Buddha (5th century B.C.), laid down the "noble eight-fold Path" to Nirvāna—Nirvāna being neither life nor death, but the extinction of both—which consists in right belief, sentiments, speech, actions, occupations, endeavour, memory and meditation. The ancient Japanese Shintō religion is simply the Way of the Gods. Nānak (15th century A.D.), the founder of the strange Sikh sect, which substitutes actual sword worship for that of Mars and the Hebrew adoration of a god of battles, laid down a four-fold Path to Nirvāna, consisting in suppression of self, disregard of ceremonies, the cherishing of enemies, and the knowledge of good.

⁴ The golden rule had long been the property of mankind before Christians were heard of. The Confucian Analects say: "What I do not wish men to do to me, I also wish not to do to men" (v. 11); "what you do not want done to yourself, do not to others" (xv. 23); and "recompense injury with justice; kindness with kindness" (xiv. 36). And in the *Mahā-bhārata* we find—"To injure none by thought, word or deed, to give to others, and to be kind to all is the constant duty of the good;" and "Do naught to others which if done to thee would cause thee pain: this is the sum of duty." In classic times the rule—"quod tibi fieri non vis, alteri ne faceris" was upheld by such writers as Seneca, in his Epistles; Pomponius Atticus; Pliny, in his Letters.

term which was applied by the Jews before Christianity to the faithful people; and he had then assiduously to frequent the members of the church—*ἐκκλησί*—a term which was used by the Jews, especially in the Septuagint, to denote the assembly of the people of God. He was to seek peace; not to doubt; to give liberally to his brethren—a considerable circumscription of the wide term “neighbour”—and, if he were a slave, to remain subject to his master (Ephes. vi. 5). He was to acknowledge (confess) his sinfulness in the assembly—an ancient Jewish practice, see Levit. xxvi. 40; Numb. v. 7; Nehemiah ix. 2; Ps. xxxii. 5; Dan. ix. 20. Meat sacrificed to idols was not to be eaten (Acts xv. 29; xxi. 34); no enchantments or magic potions were to be used; procuring abortion was forbidden. Before baptism the disciple had to fast one or two days with his baptizer and others—it was a practice among the Jews to fast for sick or imprisoned friends, or even to divert a misfortune—and fasting is also prescribed in the “Doctrine,” on Wednesdays and Fridays, explicitly to make a difference from “the hypocrites”—the Pharisees—who fasted on Mondays and Thursdays. Here we see theological antagonism peeping forth. Baptism was to be in running water, but in scarcity of water three sprinklings on the head sufficed. Jesus, we are told, had forbidden swearing (Matt. v. 34, 36; James v. 12), but the *Διδαχή* only forbids perjury. The Lord’s prayer (nearly the Matthew version) was to be said thrice daily; praying thrice being a Jewish custom. The eucharist was clearly a common meal like the love-feast of the Christians of Pontus, for there are three thanksgivings or graces: one for the cup—the drink—one for the broken bread—the food—and a third when the company is filled (*μετὰ το ἐμπλησθῆναι*). The grace was a Jewish custom also, and at the celebration of the Passover the cup was sent round first by the father of the family. The grace in the “Doctrine” gives thanks for “the vine of David,” and Jesus is mentioned throughout the MS. only as “the servant of God.”

As to the church authorities, there were first the Doctors, who were to be received and honoured as the Lord, and supported at the expense of the community; but among and above these were the Prophets, a superior class of doctors, who were filled with the Holy Ghost, and could pray extempore. The prophet was supported like other doctors by the community where he took up his residence, “for the labourer is worthy of his food;” and, adds the “Doctrine,” “the first fruits of the wine-press and the threshing-floor, of cattle and of sheep, must be given them, for they are your high priests.” The Jewish high priests had their first fruits too. Next, it is somewhat surprising to find, came Apostles, who were also to be received as the Lord, and in their peregrinations could stop and be fed for one day, or two, in the same place, but if they stayed three days they were false prophets.⁵ These apostles must have had time to fall a sad way below their “twelve” predecessors, and seem to have been not unlike the Greek monk for whom young Rousseau interpreted, and who

⁵ Compare Matt. x. 11; Mark vi. 10; Luke ix. 4; x. 7, which contain no restriction as to time.

was collecting entirely on his own behoof "for the restoration of the Holy Sepulchre." After the prophets, doctors, and apostles, came the bishops—another considerable surprise—and the deacons. These bishops or superintendents were really the elders, and there were several in the same community.⁶ Among the Jews the body of the elders watched over discipline in the synagogues, and reprov'd and excommunicated (John ix. 22; xii. 42; xvi. 2), and they were quite distinct from the doctors; but among the sect which used the "Doctrine" they administered the goods of the community, for the Essene tenet of all things in common is very obvious in this *Διδάχη*, and some were also beginning to perform the service of prophets and doctors (*Δ.*, xv.)—the thin edge of the wedge that has since been driven so well home by the Christian hierarchy. Travellers coming in the name of the Lord were to be made to work after three days, otherwise they were traffickers on the name of Christ. Finally we remark the seeds of theological rancour—or the "beauty of holiness," whichever we choose to call it—in the precept:—"Reprove one another, in a spirit, not of anger, but of peace: and whenever one offends against another, let none of you speak to him, or listen to him till he repent." (See also 2 Thessal. iii. 6.)

The new popular edition of Mr. Matthew Arnold's sequel to his "Literature and Dogma"⁷ ignores the *Διδάχη*, although it frequently mentions the "Pastor" of Hermas, the so-called epistle of Barnabas and the epistle of Clement of Rome, the connection of which with the "Doctrine" we have just been noticing is of the most intimate kind. In "God and the Bible" we arrive at a somewhat clearer definition of Mr. Arnold's new-named God, "the Eternal-not-ourselves that makes for righteousness," on which we have already made some comments. (WESTMINSTER REVIEW, April, 1884, p. 529).

Of a not-ourselves we are clearly aware (p. 50). It is whatever appears to man as outside himself, affecting him whether he will or no, and not in his own power (p. 74). The Apollo of the Greeks, for example, was the eternal-not-ourselves that makes for intellectual beauty (p. 48). Men do not yet know enough about the particular Eternal that makes for righteousness, to warrant their pronouncing *this* either a person or a thing (p. 13). At all events the "this" is not a magnified and non-natural man (p. 25). No one has discovered the nature of God to be personal, or is entitled to assert that God has conscious intelligence (p. 13).

So far as to the not-ourselves; from which it is abundantly clear that this Eternal is an old friend with a new face, not unlike the Pan of the Orphic verses. We are only repeating ourselves and others when we add that here Mr. Arnold's dislike of the anthropomorphic is as patent as was Mr. F. D. Maurice's dread of the Absolute. In fact the whole thing is as near that Proteic, natural, no-creed—called, for

⁶ This a sad blow for the Bishop of Lincoln, who alleged that "episcopacy was an institution of God himself;" "which might make one suppose," says Mr. M. Arnold, "that *directly* God had said 'Let there be light'—or perhaps even before it—He had said: 'Let there be bishops!'"

⁷ "God and the Bible." Popular Edition. By Matthew Arnold, formerly Professor of Poetry and Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. Smith, Elder & Co.

want of a better name, pantheism—as may be. Somebody once, in John Sterling's hearing, was claiming Wordsworth as a Christian poet. "No," cried Sterling emphatically, "Wordsworth is not a Christian; he is nothing but a Church of England pantheist!" But now as to the "making for righteousness." This righteousness is the special "everlasting righteousness" of the Hebrews alone. There is no doubt about it, and there is no connection whatever with any of the other numerous righteousnesses. "From Pindar, Æschylus, and Sophocles may be quoted sentences as religious as those which we find in Job or Isaiah:" but "this early preoccupation with conduct and righteousness did not last" (p. 66). Therefore we are to go, not to the practical outcome, the conduct of the Jews—oh no; Mr. Arnold fights far away from that: never alludes to it in fact—but to their theosophic maxims and utterances. Then, why not to those of Pindar, Æschylus, and Sophocles? Why shut out such authorities as are cited by ourselves on a previous page (see *ante*, notes ³ and ⁴)? Simply—to look at it from a world-wide point of view—because of the accident that Mr. Arnold's mind was early filled and biassed by the Hebrew and Greek bible-scripture. This, too, explains his overflowing mysticism about "the method and secret of Jesus," "the good shepherd," "the door," "the bread of life," "the true vine," "the light of the world," "the lamb slain from the foundation of the world," and so on.

Nevertheless we are but too delighted to have his excellent company when he discourses in this wise:—

The story of the Fall is all a legend; it never really happened, any of it (p. xii.). The old story of the contract for man's redemption in the Council of the Trinity is not true. The personages of the Christian heaven and their conversations are no more matter of fact than the personages of the Greek Olympus and their conversations (p. xiv.). Satan and Tisiphone alike are not real persons, but shadows thrown by man's terrors (p. xv.). Future times will scarcely comprehend the audacity of our popular religion in calling those who abjure it atheists (p. 2). The immortality propounded by Jesus must be looked for elsewhere than in the materialistic aspirations of our popular religion (p. 237). The four gospels are anonymous (p. 120); they have passed through oral tradition and more than one written account (pp. 100, 113, 134). We have Luke at fourth hand (p. 224). The Western canon cannot be traced further back than A.D. 397 (p. 114).

But then he gives us the saying of Irenæus that there must be four gospels and only four, because there are four zones of the world and four winds. And elsewhere we learn "the twenty-two books of the completed canon of the Old Testament thus answered to the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet"! But still we are "to enjoy the Bible, and turn it to our benefit" (p. 99). Although it is inexact (p. 57) and full of legendary and fanciful accounts (p. 73); although it supplies mechanical texts to the religious world (p. 117); although we must take scissors and paste to it (pp. 206, 207), still "we [Mr. Arnold] start with admitting that truth, so far at least as religion is concerned, is to be found in the Bible, and what we seek is that the Bible may be used and enjoyed" (p. 3). As the Sheykh says to the Merchant in the Arabian Nights: "By Allah, O my brother, thy

story is wonderful; and were it engraved upon the intellect, it would be a lesson to him who would be admonished!" Mr. Arnold modestly poses as being very weak in science: indeed in one place he avers he cannot see the force of the proposition that the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles (p. 33)—it is of a piece with his declaration that "in the domain of religion, as in the domain of poetry, the whole apparatus of learning is but secondary" (p. 103). This, of course, coming from him, we take leave to set down as mere rhetorical flourishing; and we shall even venture to draw an illustration of our own views from the science of the past. There was once another Bible, "the greatest of bibles"—*μειλιστη βιβλος*—the astronomical *Almagest* of Ptolemy, which was also composed, like a good deal of Mr. Arnold's Bible, in the second century of our era. For fourteen hundred years it ruled astronomy and astrology; nothing was taken from it, little was added to it: and as Laplace says ("Expos." v. 2) "even nowadays that is exploded it is one of the most precious monuments of antiquity." For fourteen centuries! until in or about the time when Luther was laying the foundations for the idolatrous worship of the other Bible—a Bible—an idol, which has nearly run its day too, and which nothing thereafter can ever set up again.

Mr. Poole's title⁸ is enticing, but the volume itself is disappointing. The writer, holding a travelling scholarship from the Hibbert trustees, spent two years in Germany and Switzerland, and now apparently prints his note-books, dividing them into chapters, which he calls a "Series of Essays." The result is an obscure amount of too often pedantic and unreadable matter. Great portion of the materials of an excellent book are doubtless there, but the present production is not much nearer to a book than a heap of stones is to a house.

He takes up the interesting subject of early Christian culture in Ireland, but drops it after half-a-dozen pages of notes. Here he mentions how the nucleus of Irish Christian organization in the 5th century was the monastery, and not, as in other countries, the diocese. The abbot⁹ or abbat, as Mr. Poole insists on writing, and not the bishop, was the representative chief. We may perhaps disregard Mr. Poole's odd brief jotting: "often a band of bishops is found settled at one place." For they cannot have been still the mere "elders" of whom the "Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles" speaks (see p. 209 *ante*), and he says nothing about the sees being hereditary from father to son, an arrangement which by the way subsists at this day among the priests of the very peculiar, rich and learned *Montô* sect of Buddhists. The clergy grouped themselves around the monastery, and so leisured learning, and not pastoral theology, became the motive of ecclesias-

⁸ "Illustrations of the History of Mediæval Thought in the Departments of Theology and Ecclesiastical Politics." By Reginald Lane Poole, M.A. Published for the Hibbert Trustees. Williams & Norgate.

⁹ Abbat, which went out of use two centuries ago, is a by-form. Mr. Poole also uses *œuvres*, *monopholete*; *cosmologer* instead of *cosmologist*; *Jerom*; *Lewis* for the Kings of France, except once when he talks of *Louis the Pious*; and surely it is a little ridiculous to expect us to recognize in "the dying Pippin," the *Carlovingian Pepin le Bref*.

tical life. It was a period of splendid manuscripts. An Irish abbot in 653 gave a critical edition of the Psalms, collated with the Hebrew text, and there was a local Latin version of the Bible distinct from the Vulgate. Nor was it all monastic learning. Greek, which had become practically unknown elsewhere in the west of Europe, was widely studied in the schools of Ireland—a fact which points to a pre-Christian period of high culture; there was a classical spirit, a love of literature for its own sake, and a keen delight in poetry. The apostle of Burgundy, St. Columban, used to write to his friends in humorous Latin verse, which reads like the scribbling of a pure pagan.

These Irish savants, when they became European missionaries, brought imagination, as they brought spiritual force, into a world well-nigh sunk in materialism. But all this was after three centuries arrested at its source by the fatal inroad of the Norsemen in 795; although Joseph Scaliger, whom Mr. Poole does not quote, said “*du temps de Charle-Magne, et 200 ans après, omnes fere docti estoient d’Irlande.*” Mr. Poole for this part of his subject relies on Hauréau, A. W. Haddan and Todd’s “*St. Patrick*,” but gives no sign of having heard of Skene, to whom our accurate knowledge is mainly due, or of Anderson’s “*Rhind Lectures*” of 1879.

Some interesting facts may be picked out of this volume, illustrating the vigorous Protestant or protesting spirit which was never quite extinct throughout the Middle Ages, and was ever cropping up afresh, no matter how often smothered; the men of light and leading struggling one after another to be free, and to free others. For instance, Claudius, the Spanish bishop of Turin (818–830), wrote:—

You worship wood fashioned after the manner of a cross,¹⁰ because for six hours Christ hung upon a cross. Worship, then, all virgins, because a virgin bare him; worship stables, for he was born in one; old rags, for he was swaddled in them; ships, for he oftentimes sailed in them; asses, for he rode thereon. . . . God commanded men to bear the cross, not to adore it.

Later, the whole body of the canons of Sainte-Croix at Orleans were, in the 11th century, accused of heresy, and thirteen of them—two recanting—were burnt alive. “These men were distinguished among all for wisdom, acts of holiness, and almsgiving,” but they held the universe to be eternal and without author; miracles to be extravagance, *deliramenta*; baptism to be a pious fraud; and denied the resurrection, transubstantiation, saint-worship, and the rest of it. One of these canons was confessor to the Queen, and when he was condemned his royal penitent is said to have torn out one of his eyes as

¹⁰ By the way, Mr. Poole, in a note on p. 30, accuses Dr. Reuter of an anachronism in speaking of a crucifix in the time of Claudius. “Pictures of the crucifixion there doubtless were,” he adds, and “perhaps crosses bearing a painted figure, but these are not what we call crucifixes.” We are pretty well aware of the evidence which has been collected on this subject; but it is all necessarily unsatisfying, being an effort to prove a negative, and we could have wished that a passage which Mr. Poole himself translates from the “*Apologetic*” of Claudius (p. 34) had not escaped his notice. Said Claudius: “For the memory of our Saviour, we worship, reverence, adore, a cross *painted and carved* in his honour.” We should have liked to hear how Mr. Poole gets over this passage, which, perhaps, supplied Dr. Reuter with his “anachronism.”

he passed to the stake. Perhaps she only "set her ten commandments in his face," as the Duchess of Gloucester sweetly says in "Henry VI."

The general introduction to Canon Churton's "Apocryphal Scriptures,"¹¹ and the separate introductions to each book, are models of concise but full and business-like writing. The text follows the English Bible, from which the Apocrypha have been omitted chiefly through the influence of the Bible Society, under the pressure of English Dissenters and Scottish Presbyterians, although the S.P.C.K. continues to print these books separately. At the same time that he generally adopts the English Bible text, "which, though rugged and obscure in parts, fairly represents the Greek of the most approved versions of the Septuagint," Mr. Churton endeavours to give a more comprehensive version, which does not pretend to critical value, by inserting bracketed additions—chiefly from the Syriac and the Vulgate. Of course it is the "authorised version" which Canon Churton uses, except for Maccabees iii. and iv., which come from Cotton and Bagster, and this renders the appearance of his book somewhat ill-timed when we are awaiting the revised version of the Old Testament.

We must not omit quoting a remark of Canon Churton's (p. 539):

Like other apocryphal writers, the author of Maccabees iii. had a moral purpose—to inculcate lessons of devotion and patriotism—taking as his basis some historical events, and embellishing his narrative with fancies of his own.

Perfectly so; but we should have included the canonical writers as well. We cannot trace that Mr. Churton even mentions the Book of Enoch, quoted in Jude 14 as genuine, preserved in the Ethiopian Bible, discovered in the last century by Bruce in Abyssinia, and translated by Archbishop Laurence.

A chapter headed "Apologia," gives to Mr. Conway's "Farewell Discourses"¹² an unusual personal interest. He traces himself from the age of nineteen, when from a law-student he suddenly became a Methodist with a serious call to ride about Maryland in mourning, warning the population generally of the wrath to come. He was diverted from this state of life by a beautiful settlement of Hicksites—a variety of Quakers not known in England¹³—which consisted of mile after mile of pretty houses in smiling fields, cleared of weeds and brambles by well-dressed freed negroes working for wages alongside the farmers. This must have been about 1850. One of the Hicksite preachers declared that the blood of Christ could not save men any more than the blood of a bullock; which, to quote an old story, showed "where Paul and He differed." They had good schools and happy homes, but did not believe in the Trinity. These facts threw Mr. Conway into terrible doubts, from which he was rescued by an angel, in the unwonted form of a little book of Emerson's, and he soon

¹¹ "The Uncanonical and Apocryphal Scriptures." By Rev. W. R. Churton, B.D., Canon of St. Albans. Whitaker, Warwick Lane.

¹² "Farewell Discourses" delivered at South Place Chapel, Finsbury. By Moncure D. Conway, M.A. E. W. Allen, Ave Maria Lane.

¹³ Originated in America, as Mr. Conway does not tell us, by Elias Hicks, about 1825. He openly rejected the essential truths of Christianity, says Seebohm, but maintained the minor peculiarities of Quakerism.

afterwards shook off Methodism. His friends then broke with him, and he was "exiled to a life of poverty among strangers." But his bent was wofully religious. "Six days did I labour," he says, "and the seventh toiled on a tread-mill of services—Sunday school, two or three sermons, and a prayer meeting to close with; and to this day it gives me a keen delight to see anybody breaking the Sabbath." He joined the Unitarian body and went to Harvard, where he "enjoyed the friendship of Emerson, Parker, Longfellow, Garrison, Phillips, and other great men." He subsequently took charge of the Unitarian churches at Washington and Cincinnati, but split off from this community on miracles. Then the Secession War broke out, and he threw himself into the anti-slavery agitation, editing a paper at Boston and lecturing. He was sent over to England to influence opinion in favour of the North, and this led to his becoming, in 1863, minister of South Place Chapel, whose congregation is "far advanced beyond care for Unitarian or other dogmas." The minister was then still looking to Theism for "a faith which would work by love." He saw it grow into a promising movement, but he has also, he says in his "Apologia," seen its decline, "and we now hear little of it," because it aspired to make itself a finality. "Theism seems to think that what people believe or say about (its) God is of immense importance to God"—a development of that self-sufficiency of man which is at the root of all religious intolerance.

A god who can be blasphemed [writes Mr. Conway, with epigrammatic truth] is no God at all. He would be no God if he desired praise. People who suppose God cares whether people believe in him or not, are one and all believing in an idol that has no more existence than Pluto.

As to the future of religion, he says that the Church of England now has one wing more liberal than Unitarianism, more independent than the Independents, and another more active than Wesleyanism—it takes the wind out of their sails. It has already a secularist and a rationalist bishop, and some Unitarian clergymen. "I do not suppose," he adds, "that the Church of England will be disestablished, because I believe it will be converted;" and there is no doubt, we may add, that Mr. M. Arnold, for all his scorn of dissent, is throwing all his weight into that scale. He had once hoped that the free and humanitarian Church might be organized in London, but the past is so strong in the Old World that free thought is largely absorbed in mere rebellion, denial and criticism; and free religion runs to individualism: is, in fact, destructive rather than constructive. So that we must look elsewhere; and our South Place sage tells us "there is fair reason to believe that the next world-prophet will be born in America, and the home of all races be the cradle of a universal religion."

Though Mr. Conway declares that "the religious freedom of this South Place Society is one of the good angels of the Church of England," we have looked in vain for any mention of that chapel in Dr. Stoughton's kindly and highly interesting sketch of religion in

England during the present century.¹⁴ Though necessarily condensed, it is full of facts, and is eminently readable. No matter where the volumes are opened there is something to fix the attention. Now it is a full length portrait of Irving which may be contrasted with Carlyle's; then Cardinal Wiseman writing from the Flaminian Gate. Elsewhere we have the birth of Ritualism in 1844 in the Margaret Street Chapel, with its low table, red altar cloth, and two unobtrusive candlesticks; or we have Plymouth-brother Darby excommunicating Plymouth-brother Newton as a heretic; or George III. cutting his Windsor bookseller because he found a copy of Tom Paine on the counter. Then there is Legh Richmond with his famous tracts—"British Christian classics," Dr. Stoughton calls them—"The Dairyman's Daughter" and "The Young Cottager," and the Sunday School Union with its 6 A.M. breakfasts to 1,200 at the London Tavern in 1829. Or it is William Forster, the Quaker, in "1805, 9th mo., 20th, Brighton," "grateful to feel the extension of the heavenly wing;" or the poet Montgomery and Moravianism; or the development of the Unitarians from the Presbyterians; or Sydney Smith's burlesque of the Bishop of Chester's charge in 1825, which shows how the clergy of those days did that which they ought not to have done, and left undone those things they ought to have done.

Hunt not, fish not, shoot not,—
 said the bishop (*apud* Sidney Smith)—
 Dance not, fiddle not, flute not;
 But before all things, it is my particular desire
 That once at least in every week you take
 Your dinner with the squire.

Additional charm and value are due to the fact that a great portion of the narrative is given at first hand from Dr. Stoughton's own wide and varied personal experience, and there is scarcely a well-known book of the time which he does not lay under contribution. But we may look in vain for any trace in these volumes of Deism, Secularism, Positivism, or that stubborn factor Mormonism; or for any mention of such men as Mr. Herbert Spencer, Professor F. W. Newman, Mr. Harrison, or even Mr. M. Arnold; while there is plenty about the Darbys, and the Moodys and Sankeys and the Salvation Army¹⁵.

Mr. Conway having assured us that the next world-prophet is to be produced on the other side of "the Pond"—by the way, he was born in the States himself—we took up, with some curiosity, Mr. Stanley's

¹⁴ "Religion in England, from 1800 to 1850: a History, with a Postscript on subsequent Events." By John Stoughton, D.D. Two vols. Hodder & Stoughton.

¹⁵ We confess ourselves to a decided preference for "another guess sort" of Salvation Army. In the military hospital at Wady Halfa "sufferings are soothed by the gentle voices and deft hands of two trained nurses from Netley: Sister Armour Gray wears the Zulu medal, the Egyptian medal and star, and the ribbon of the Red Cross; Sister Clements (Miss G. Gerrard) wears the orange and blue ribbon for service in Zululand. They belong to no religious order, but are regularly attached to the medical staff, with the relative rank of lieutenants by general order."—*Daily News*, Dec. 12, 1884.

American book on "The Future Religion of the World"¹⁶. We regret to have to confess to a disappointment: it is evident that Mr. Stanley is not "he that cometh," and we must look for another. As well as we can make out the future religion is this: the Ich or Self is One, which includes the Greek *The All is One*, and the Indian *Thou art It*. This axiom asserts the identity of all insulated selves or lives with the Great Ich or Self, or Universe-life, culminating in Supreme Mind or God. The Self, whether in the capacity of one of the insulated selves or of the great self, is eternal. The neighbour is indeed and without metaphor the self, as the leading axiom proves; and animals are our own selves in undeveloped form. The sole real and practical religion is Duty to the One who is All, and this sense of duty is the instinctive tendency of the insulated self towards that which was its pristine, and will be its ultimate, condition. The physical medium in which the great Life exists and works is the *Æther* or atmospheric air. True life, as well as mere material oxygen and nitrogen, exists in the atmosphere, which discloses a deep significance in the text: "In Him we live and move and have our being," which is literally true. The action, motion, or mode of life of the Self is, in its condition of World-Self, that of self-distribution; it is a perpetual circuit—progress, development, increase of unity, and final reunion in the subordinate selves; and Sin is halting in or going back from this healthful, normal, universal progress.

As well as we can grasp all this, it is John Sterling's "flat Pantheism" over again. Mr. Stanley says not—though he fights very shy of the subject—because "Pantheism is a deification of the material universe." He draws the line of deification apparently at animals that breathe his *Æther*, and he even includes fish. But does he not know that plants largely live on air, and may be practically said to breathe by their leaves? His favourite "Boodhists," as he calls them, have in the extreme East a pious poem which says that the flowers are Buddha. Shelley, too, of whom Mr. Stanley seems to know nothing, wrote:

Yet not the slightest leaf
That quivers to the passing breeze
Is less instinct with thee,
Yet not the meanest worm,
That lurks in graves and batters on the dead
Less shares thy eternal breath,
Spirit of Nature!

Goethe, whose name Mr. Stanley does not mention, makes Mephistopheles tell Faust that he is "A part of the part which in the beginning was the All:" though this, perhaps, implies Dualism; and the papist Pope—equally outside Mr. Stanley's ken, apparently—has in the "Essay on Man" the fine passages commencing:

All are but parts of one stupendous Whole.

Emerson also,—Mr. Stanley does mention him once—says in "Wood Notes:"

¹⁶ "An Outline of the Future Religion of the World." By T. Lloyd Stanley. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

He is the heart of every creature,
 He is the meaning of each feature;
 And his mind is the sky,
 Than all it holds more deep, more high.

And it is odd how like this new religion of the future is to Tersteegen's hymn, which Wesley, by-the-bye, altered in his translation: ¹⁷

Air, which filleth all, wherein we always move;
 Ground and life of all things, sea without bottom or shore;
 Wonder of all wonders I sink myself in thee.

We strongly advise Mr. Stanley, now that he thinks he has exhausted Yahakobh—meaning Jacob—and Moshai (Moses) and “Booddha the Boodh,” and Yaishooa, for so he writes Jesus, to devote some sustained study to the Pantheism he has rediscovered; and he cannot begin with a better book than Dr. Hunt's exceedingly able composition “Pantheism and Christianity,”¹⁸ which we noticed on its appearance.

A typographical curiosity of some interest to those who do not mind its being a modern forgery, is the *Biblia Pauperum*,¹⁹ consisting of reductions of some quaint old Nuremburg woodcuts, explained by extracts from Wycliffe's Bible, printed in black letter. Supposing these cuts to have been faithfully reduced, it is very remarkable how constantly and perfectly a Jewish cast of features is obtained in what is, at the best, but clumsy, though excellent, work. The very paper-borders, and binding (white vellum, with ancient-looking clasps) are copies from books of the period; and altogether, the volume ought to be striking and effective for the vast majority who are not hopeless bibliophiles. The affectation of the title-page is scarcely to be excused, and it would have been as well if the prefatory “Note by the Printers” had been written in grammatical English. As Wycliffe's Bible is not in every one's hands, we quote the notorious miracle of healing the blind man of Jerusalem, which is given only by John (ix. 6, &c.):—

He spette in to the erthe, and made cley of the spotel and anoynted the cieie on hise ighen, and said to hym, go and be thou waischen in the water of siloe that is to seie sente, thannc he went and waischide, and came seyng,

¹⁷ Mr. Stanley, who knows so much about the atmosphere, does not seem to be aware that in Mazdeism it is shared by Ormazd and Ahriman, by God and the devil; because it is in the air, Vayu, that the conflict between the two principles takes place: a myth founded on the violence of storms, which the Vedas too describe as contests between Indra and the serpent Ahi. Only part of Vayu, therefore—the good part—was worshipped by Mazdeans (*Avesta*: Rām Yasht, 5). Mr. Stanley, too, lays immense stress on the wondrous first lungful of the medium or Æther with which “the babe, when separated from its mother,” sucks in the Universe-life. But the first breath is not a whit less, or more, wonderful than the second, or the last. Nor does he seem to know that he is but hashing up for us the Latins' old idea of the *animus*, which at the outset was merely the wind or breath.

¹⁸ “Pantheism and Christianity.” By John Hunt, D.D., Vicar of Oxford. Kent. London: Wm. Isbister, Limited. 1884.

¹⁹ “A Smaller *Biblia Pauperum*, conteynynge thyrtye and eighte Woodcuttes, illustratynge the Lyfe, Parables, and Miracles off oure blessid Lorde and Savioure Jhesus Crist, &c.” Unwin, Paternoster Square.

and so neighboris and thei that haddén seen hym bifor, for he was a begger, seiden, whethir this is not he that satte and beggid.

First premising with Carlyle that such a thing never has been, or can be, and agreeing with the old canons of Sainte-Croix that the tale is a mere *deliramentum*, it may be suggested that, even supposing the miracle to have taken place, it might have been somewhat hard upon the blind beggar, who no doubt made a comfortable living out of his affliction at the "pitch where he satte and beggid," thus so suddenly to have the bread taken out of his mouth; and we shall point the remark by citing an old Morality of the very date of these woodcuts—the end of the fifteenth century—"La Moralité de l'Aveugle et du Boiteux," which was first played in 1496. The fun of this piece is that a worthy pair of beggars, who, in partnership—one lending his legs, and the other, his eyes—had been doing a very profitable business, are suddenly hemmed in by a procession bearing the relics of St. Martin, and cured, in spite of all they can do to escape, by the mere passing-by of the martyr's bones. Nothing can exceed their anger and dismay. In an instant of time, without a word of notice, and by a cursed miracle, they find themselves robbed of their lucrative professions, and thrown helpless on the world.

M. Morin (a well-known writer on such matters) reprints a collection of fifty-six brief journalistic articles, consisting chiefly of very free-thought indeed on religious subjects,²⁰ although there are some on Taxation, and on Alsace and Lorraine. Many of these papers are apparently nearly twenty years old, and they naturally are, in general, though not always, of a popular, superficial character. Their chief interest for English readers is as showing how such controversy is carried on in France, and, if we mistake not, such readers will be somewhat revolted by the coarse character of the articles, "Le Culte de la Nullité" and "L'Anthropophagie Sacrée." Seriously to accuse believers in transubstantiation of downright cannibalism when they consume a cereal eucharist is hurtful to the cause of truth. We remark that in the essay "Des Mythes Religieux" M. Morin says: "Original sin is based on the story of the apple eaten by Adam and Eve" (p. 18); but as a matter of fact there is no apple at all in the biblical tale; the Hebrew word is *p'ree*, fruit.

We have also to acknowledge several other books. We are glad to remark early in the Bishop of Exeter's feeble Divinity Lecture Sermons, on the hackneyed subject of Science and [Dr. Temple's] Religion,²¹ the confession that "to propose to reconcile these opposites would be a task which hardly any sane man would undertake" (p. 5). Further on we read "there is a well-known common toy, called a kaleidoscope, in which bits of coloured glass placed at one end are seen through a small round hole at the other," and "we eat our food on the assumption that it will nourish us to-day as it nourished us yesterday:" utterances which strongly remind us of Dickens's inimitable type of

²⁰ "Essais de Critique Religieuse." Par A. S. Morin. ["Miron."] Paris: Félix Alcan (formerly Germer, Baillière & Cie.).

²¹ "The Relations between Religion and Science," &c. Macmillan & Co.

unctuous platitude, Chadband. The "Agnostic's Progress"²² is an anonymous and semi-sceptical allegory: a sequel to the "Pilgrim's Progress." Mr. Hodder's "Life of Simon Peter"²³ shows some industry in a well-gleaned field. Strauss neatly deprecates somewhere "going out of one's way to assail the paper fortifications which theologians choose to set up." This book does not precisely answer to the description; it is rather a pious house of cards, which is not worth a puff. Dean Plumptre's book²⁴ is a hollow and timid, but elaborate and tiresome endeavour—so far as can be made out—to revive purgatory and prayers for the dead; and the Bishop of Peterborough's "The Gospel and the Age"²⁵ is merely a collection of sermons, some of them a quarter of a century old.

Mr. Gill's "Evolution of Christianity"²⁶ reappears in a "second edition," but we cannot adopt a modest phrase of the author's (p. v.) and say that "its pages glow with the incandescence of genius." Nor can we agree that "evolution absolutely discredits radicalism"—a sentiment aptly dated from the St. Stephen's Club, but scarcely suiting with the subject of the book, although Mr. Gill is further good enough to inform us that it is "certainly not unfriendly to the Church of England," and is strongly in favour of "the inalienable claims of ancestral nobility."

The Rev. Mr. Jamieson's "Profound Problems,"²⁷ the "fruit of thirty years patient and prayerful study," are eminently Scotch. He relies for much of his philosophy upon some unscientific speculations as to "ether" being a spirit, which savour strongly of Pantheism. Indeed, he says himself (p. 41), "if this be Pantheism, we have no objections," which we should have thought, in Scotland at all events, smelt strongly of the fagot. This ether is not the chemist's C_2H_4 ($C_2H_4O_2$), nor Mr. T. Lloyd Stanley's æther (see *ante*, p. 216), but the supposititious interstellar vehicle or medium of the vibrations of light.

PHILOSOPHY.

MR. MASSON'S book on Lucretius and the atomic theory¹ is a real addition to the literature of the subject. It is written in a very readable style; it contains much good criticism; and the com-

²² "The Agnostic's Progress from the Known to the Unknown." Williams & Norgate.

²³ "Simon Peter: His Life, Times and Friends." By Edwin Hodder. Cassell & Co., Limited.

²⁴ "The Spirits in Prison, and other Studies on the Life after Death." By E. H. Plumptre, D.D., Dean of Wells. Wm. Isbister, Limited.

²⁵ "The Gospel and the Age." Sermons on special occasions. By W. C. Magee, D.D., Bishop of Peterborough. Isbister.

²⁶ "The Evolution of Christianity." By Charles Gill. Second Edition, with Dissertations. Williams & Norgate.

²⁷ "Profound Problems in Theology and Philosophy." By Rev. Geo. Jamieson, B.D., Minister of the First Charge, Old Machar. Simpkin, Marshall & Co.

¹ "The Atomic Theory of Lucretius contrasted with Modern Doctrines of Atoms and Evolution." By John Masson, M.A. London: George Bell & Sons. 1884.

parisons of the Epicurean speculations with modern scientific ideas are extremely interesting and suggestive. Such comparisons are not, as is sometimes thought, a mere exercise of ingenuity. When coincidences of detail are found between ancient speculations and modern results of experimental research, the tendency, even among scientific men who feel admiration for those who had the true idea before others, but were unable to verify it, is to allow them too little rather than too much credit for their insight. * In an age of specialists there must be everywhere a more or less unconscious depreciation of the "crude guesses" of early thinkers in comparison with securely established results. Some devotees of experiment have gone so far as to say that the early thinkers had "no right" to hold the true opinion till they could verify it experimentally; that they ought to be condemned rather than praised for anticipating theories that were incapable of establishment till long after. The settlement of the dispute between those who take this view and those to whom it seems that, the end of science being a true view of nature as a whole, the thinkers who first applied the conception of the uniformity of nature to details are entitled to all the more praise because their theories could not be experimentally verified, is perhaps impossible, for such differences of opinion depend on subjective causes that are, to a great extent, out of the reach of argument. But this, at least, is certain, that the view of the universe which experimental science is gradually making inevitable is one that had already been arrived at in the ancient schools of philosophy. Not only is this so, but the chief conception of modern physics and chemistry, that of the atom, was first arrived at by the speculative insight of the Greeks, and, as Mr. Masson shows, was received by modern science from Epicurus as expounded by Lucretius, not rediscovered by the experimentalists. In his study of the "*De rerum natura*" Mr. Masson lays stress on the fact that Lucretius, although he had an interest in physical studies for their own sake, regarded physical research as important chiefly for the purpose of destroying superstition. The expulsion of the idea of caprices of the gods as influencing nature he regards as a benefit conferred on the world; but he regrets that Lucretius did not accept the theistic idea which, in the absence of Christianity, he might have found in Plato, for example—the idea of God acting by uniform laws, and not by caprice. The theism of Dr. Martineau is defended by the author against the modern representatives of the Epicureans. Mr. Masson finds it difficult to explain the tone of "bitterness" he perceives in the attacks of some modern writers on what they regard as superstition when contrasted with the compassion of Lucretius "for those against whom he is compelled to utter the awful verdict of science." But is not this explained by the consideration that the moderns have not long since emerged from "ages of faith" such as were probably inconceivable to the Roman poet? What is it, but the experience of the Middle Ages organized in the modern consciousness that suggests to Mr. Masson himself the possibility that, in the celebrated passage in praise of him who was able to learn the causes of things, Virgil did not mention Lucretius by name "only because he dared not"?

This "System of Psychology"² (by an American author, and published simultaneously in London and New York) is not one that could very well be used as a text-book, or that should be criticized as if it were intended for one. It is rather one of those books that ought to be studied for the sake of the new light they throw on various special points. The author would perhaps have got more credit for the originality that parts of it display if he had detached his own contributions from his exposition of the whole subject, and published them as psychological essays. But just as he himself has gained advantage from going over the whole ground, so may the reader who follows him over it. This is, in fact, the only way to get at the new ideas in the book. A careful reader will find that while the author is of the purely English school of psychology, and sometimes for a considerable space merely repeats in his own way the analyses of Dr. Bain, he is frequently able to make really new suggestions in dealing with the parts of the subject that have already been treated in much detail by those whom he regards as his masters. It is not often that the student has to travel over a large space without meeting with something original, although there are chapters that offer comparatively little. The idea of taking literature, and especially poetry, as material for the study of the emotions is in itself good, and there are good things to be found here and there in the 200 pages of the second volume that deal with the psychology of emotion; but on the whole the idea is not carried out so well as it might have been; the treatment is too descriptive, and not sufficiently analytical. A less important criticism is that some of the poets quoted are very minor poets. The chief thing, however, in criticizing a book of this kind is not to dwell on occasional defects of treatment, which could not well be absent in two volumes of about 600 pages each, but to indicate its character as a whole and its positive qualities. The worst fault of the style is a certain want of concentration; and the real psychological work which the book contains is more than sufficient to compensate for this and for any defects of treatment that may be found in parts of it.

The editor and translator of these dictated portions of Lotze's lectures³ is one of those who have found themselves attracted to Lotze by the reconciliation he seems to them to make possible between the mechanical view of nature to which they are led by science, and the teleological view which they require for the satisfaction of their ethical aspirations. In addition to the present "Outlines of Metaphysic," two other volumes of Lotze's philosophical "Outlines" are to appear in a few months—those on the philosophy of religion and on ethics; afterwards, if these should be received favourably, the editor hopes to publish the "Outlines of Psychology," of "Æsthetics," and of "Logic." Whether Lotze's philosophy is accepted or rejected as a whole, there

² "A System of Psychology." By Daniel Greenleaf Thompson. 2 vols. London: Longmans. 1884.

³ "Outlines of Metaphysic." Dictated portions of the lectures of Hermann Lotze. Translated and Edited by George T. Ladd, Professor of Philosophy in Yale College. Boston: Ginn, Heath & Co. 1884.

cannot be any doubt that it is extremely suggestive in detail, and that these translations, and the translations of Lotze's larger works which are appearing in England almost simultaneously with the present American series, will stimulate thought on all philosophical questions.

Two large volumes of the English translation of Rosmini⁴ are, like the small volume of Lotze, parts of a series. The aim of Rosmini's philosophy is to refute scepticism—to establish the fact of a knowledge of objective "being" as given in every act of perception. He starts from the scholastic point of view; and it is from this point of view that all his criticisms of ancient and modern philosophic systems are made. His admirers, however, claim that scholasticism contains, along with perishable elements, truths that have been lost sight of by the modern world. A return is to be made to a scholasticism cleared of its perishable part, in which we must doubtless include the division of "philosophy" called "Angelology," which treats of "the existence, cause and cognizable essence of angels." Others are unable to see in Rosmini's "philosophy of being" itself anything but an uncritical realism. It will probably be found difficult to persuade philosophical students generally to give the time that is necessary to master a system which, however elaborately constructed, has the appearance of being an anachronism. The translators are certainly doing their best to make Rosmini known in England; and no doubt his philosophy—apart from the interest it has in relation to his life—must in any case have a certain historical interest as one among other attempts to explain and correct all modern systems from the scholastic point of view, and as having gained adherents and admirers outside the limits of Catholicism.

The aim of Mr. Young's book on "Destiny"⁵ is to establish principles such as those referred to in the passage from Comte which he prefixes to it. This passage is to the effect that when the present intellectual anarchy has disappeared, when agreement on first principles can be obtained, appropriate institutions will issue from them without shock or resistance. Mr. Young's principles of social re-organization are set forth in a series of strange diagrams, accompanied by "readings" in equally strange terminology. They seem to have had their origin in the speculations of Fourier. The author has made more than one practical effort to realize his social ideal. The most important of these took shape in "The Domestic-Agricultural Association of Citeaux," the failure of which is not to be attributed to "defects in the Phalansterian Theory," but "to altogether different causes."

Although few readers of this little "Digest" of the philosophy of

⁴ "Psychology." 3 vols. By Antonio Rosmini Serbati. Vol. I. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1884.

⁵ "The Origin of Ideas." By Antonio Rosmini Serbati. Translated from the Fifth Italian Edition of the "Nuovo Saggio sull' Origine delle Idee." Vol. III. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1884.

⁶ "Destiny; or, Man's Will-Means and Will-Ends: a new Critic and Logic." By Arthur Young. London: Houlston & Sons. 1884.

Henry James⁶ are perhaps likely to be convinced that he will "come to be recognized as the deepest thinker of the century," his speculations as set forth here are not without an interest of their own. They are interesting as displaying clearly the characteristics of a small class of writers of a mystical turn who have the power of throwing out suggestive phrases and ideas, but little power of giving systematic development to their thought. The special character and physiognomy of Mr. James's works seems to have been determined by his study of Swedenborg.

The author of this essay of twelve pages⁷ discusses the nature of "the altruistic act" in its relation to the pleasure of the agent. His aim is to show that, although pleasure may be felt in an action done for the good of others, it is not necessarily the end. In a truly altruistic act the pleasure which the agent has in view is not his own; the idea of his own pleasure is indeed present, but only sub-consciously. This sub-conscious pleasure may move into "the full glare" of consciousness, and, in that case, actions that promote the good of others may come to be done for personal pleasure. But such actions are not ethical. They are "absolutely" good because they are beneficial; but they are not good "relatively" to the intention of the agent—that is, not in the truly ethical sense—because they are not done with a direct view to the benefit of others. We ought not, in ethics, to speak either of "unconscious" egoism or of "unconscious" altruism. "All early action for others must be selfish, and performed for personal delight, because intellectual ends are then few. The oft-repeated duty must, on the other hand, relapse into habit, pleasure disappearing down the scale. The truly ethical act occurs between these two stages."

Professor Fowler's essay⁸ is "independent of a much larger work entitled the "Principles of Morals" on which the author has been engaged. It contains, as he says, a statement rather than a defence of views, accompanied by applications to practice, the author believing "that the questions of theoretical ethics would be far less open to dispute, as well as more intelligible, if they were considered a little more with reference to practice." When all this is considered, we can scarcely expect much originality from the book. As a matter of fact, we find that the treatment of theoretical questions is a little conventional and a little vague. The "popular form" of the exposition is more obvious than the "scientific conception of morality" which is to be exhibited in this form. Of course the attitude of the

⁶ "Philosophy of Henry James, Author of 'Moralism and Christianity'; 'Lectures and Miscellanies'; 'The Nature of Evil'; 'Christianity the Logic of Creation'; 'Substance and Shadow'; 'The Secret of Swedenborg'; 'Society the Redeemed Form of Man': a Digest." By J. A. Kellogg. New York: J. W. Lovell.

⁷ "The Altruistic Act: an Essay in Ethics." By Alchemist, Montreal. Montreal: Witness Printing House. 1884.

⁸ "Progressive Morality: an Essay in Ethics." By Thomas Fowler, M.A., LL.D., F.S.A., President of Corpus Christi College, Wykeham Professor of Logic in the University of Oxford. London: Macmillan. 1884.

moralist applying ethical precepts to practice is quite different from that of the ethical philosopher. Professor Fowler has made the mistake of trying to combine the two attitudes. This is sufficient to explain the character of his analysis of conscience, where he finds "the moral sanction" (the sanction of self-approval or self-condemnation) to be superior to all others merely because the pleasures and pains of which it is the source are, "in the normally constituted mind," more intense and more durable than all other pleasures and pains. In the practical part of the book it becomes very clear that the author has devoted much attention to political economy. At least he may very well seem to some readers to lay undue stress on the special virtues that have relation to the production and preservation of the wealth of the community. Political economists have been in the habit of pointing out that the conclusions of their science are hypothetical, and cannot be transformed directly into precepts; but this often seems to be forgotten by economists themselves, as well as by those who denounce political economy as "immoral."

M. Guyau's new book⁹ is an interesting and not unsuccessful attempt to apply the doctrine of evolution to ethics. He sees that, if an ethical principle is to be established that shall be proof against the disorganizing influence which analysis exercises on traditional and "unconscious" morality when it is brought into clear consciousness, this must be some principle that is itself disclosed as the result of analysis. Evolutionists are not justified in assuming that, because in the progress of the human race, so far, morality has become better organized, it will at length become automatic, or that the ethical instinct will be entirely uninfluenced by metaphysical theories. If we are to have a morality without the "absolute" sanction and "absolute" obligation of the categorical imperative of Kant, for example, we must find a substitute for this sanction and this obligation in the facts themselves—in the history of the development of human nature as it has actually taken place. It is found that the sense of moral obligation is simply one expression of the spontaneous activity of man. The feeling of duty springs from the feeling of power to impose an ideal on nature. Spontaneity, the tendency of life to diffuse itself and to become more intense, is prior to the idea of pleasure as an end; the utilitarians are therefore wrong in making morals an affair of calculation of pleasures. But spontaneous activity expressing itself in the realization of ideals is pleasurable; and the pleasure that is found to accompany activity stands in the place of a sanction, just as the impulse to action stands in the place of obligation. We need not be afraid that this impulse will tend to disappear under analysis. It has its origin in the unconscious part of our nature, but it is at the same time common to the two spheres, the conscious and the unconscious. When we bring it into clear consciousness we are simply contemplating our own life in its intensity and its extent; and life does not, in becoming conscious of itself, tend to destroy itself. Egoism and altruism are united to a certain

⁹ "Esquisse d'une Morale sans obligation ni sanction." Par M. Guyau. Paris: Alcan. 1885.

extent by the tendency of the individual life to expand ; an isolated, egoistic life is a mutilated life. The higher moral ideals spring from the love of "risk" in action and speculation. Those who risk most in action and speculation are those who have most power ; from the consciousness of greater power springs a higher sense of duty. The author's theory of the development of the ethical instinct seems to him to be confirmed by the observation that other instincts tend to be formed in a similar way. The artist, for example, who is able to create beautiful form, is conscious of a kind of "obligation" to create it, and feels an indignation resembling moral indignation against that which contradicts his ideal. If such an instinct for form had been of equal importance for the preservation of the race, then the æsthetic instinct would have become as much a part of ordinary human nature as the moral instinct.

Dr. Morell's "Manual of History of Philosophy"¹⁰ (part of which consists of republished matter), although written from a point of view that now seems a little antiquated, has some value as being a not unattractive introduction to the subject. The matter of his "Outlines of Mental Science"¹¹ (a republished work) has been superseded to a greater extent than that of the History. Notwithstanding changes in point of view, however, there is much that remains permanent in psychology, and this text-book may be studied with advantage along with others. Its most characteristic features are due to the influence of Herbart.

To the third edition of his "Selections from Berkeley,"¹² Professor Fraser prefixes the following note :—"The demand for a third edition of the 'Selections' has afforded an opportunity for amending the expression of the thoughts contained in the General Introduction and in the annotations. It is hoped that the book is now thus and otherwise better fitted for its intended office, as an aid to reflection on the fundamental questions raised in Berkeley's short and easy method with Materialists ; or new metaphysical conception of the Universe."

An edition of Mill's *Logic*¹³ has now appeared, uniform with the "People's Edition" of the "Political Economy."

¹⁰ "Manual of History of Philosophy." By J. D. Morell, A.M., LL.D. London : W. Stewart ; Edinburgh : J. Menzies.

¹¹ "An Introduction to Mental Philosophy on the Inductive Method." By J. D. Morell, A.M., LL.D. London : W. Stewart ; Edinburgh : J. Menzies.

¹² "Selections from Berkeley. With an Introduction and Notes. For the use of Students in the Universities." By Alexander Campbell Fraser, D.C.L. Oxon., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Edinburgh. Third Edition, revised. Oxford : at the Clarendon Press. 1884.

¹³ "A System of Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive : being a connected View of the Principles of Evidence and the Methods of Scientific Investigation." By John Stuart Mill. People's Edition. London : Longmans. 1884.

POLITICS, SOCIOLOGY, VOYAGES, AND TRAVELS.

EIGHTEEN years have passed since the chief representatives of Positivism in this country attempted, in a volume of essays on "International Policy,"¹ to work out the application of their principles to the dealings of England with the other nations and peoples of the world, wherever she might be in contact with them. These essays, with one omission (the article on Japan), are now reprinted in a cheaper form. The lapse of time has rendered many of the illustrations and examples cited no longer available, and not even to be understood without a fair knowledge of the state of things existing in Europe at the time to which they refer. Moreover, the profound changes which have taken place in the mutual relations of Germany and France, and in the relations of each to Europe, have terribly shaken, if they have not quite cut away, the ground from under Mr. Frederic Harrison's arguments, and proportionately lessened our confidence in his estimate of the position France must hold in the future of the world. We do not doubt that Mr. Harrison's faith in her destiny is as whole and firm as ever. But his readers' faith in Mr. Harrison cannot fail to be disturbed, when they see before them a state of things so different from that on which the writer looked and from which so much of his inspiration is drawn. But if time has rendered obsolete the less essential parts of some of these essays, it has on the whole strengthened their main principles. International morality has made some advance—not very great, not very continuous, but still appreciable. Slowly and imperfectly the grand truth that the rules which govern the relations of communities to each other ought to be founded on principles identical with those which ultimately determine the morality of private actions, is making its way. Every step that public opinion makes in this direction brings it into closer harmony with the lofty humanitarian principles of the Positivists. But regarding the mode in which, and the occasions when, these principles are to be applied to practical affairs, public opinion is not likely to follow this very advanced school. The truth which they seem to overlook is that the morality of actions, whether of communities or of individuals, is relative not absolute. It depends on the rules of conduct practised and recognized by the other parties concerned. Nevertheless, these essays are a wholesome corrective to the selfishness common to all communities, and the arrogance which too often characterizes the dealings of the strong and prosperous. The writers are men of known abilities, masters of their facts as well as of the principles which they endeavour to fit to them. Mr. Richard Congreve, Mr. Frederic Harrison, Professor Beesly, Mr. Pember, Dr. Bridges and Mr. Henry Dix Hutton are men who need no introduction even to the general reader, still less to students of history and politics.

¹ "International Policy. Essays on the Foreign Relations of England." Second edition. London: Chapman & Hall, Limited. 1884.

The little volume of "Essays on Modern International Law,"² for which we are indebted to Mr. T. J. Lawrence, of Downing College, Cambridge, deals in a very lucid manner, unincumbered by technicalities, with the legal aspect of several questions of great interest and growing importance. Amongst those which might be called questions of practical international politics, he treats of the Suez and Panama Canals, and in the course of his examination of the numerous legal questions which have arisen in regard to them, we get a fairly exhaustive analysis of the new problems introduced by such enterprises into international law, and a clear statement of the principles which Mr. Lawrence considers most to be relied on for their solution. In helping to popularize the true principles which ought to guide the decisions of statesmen in dealing with questions of such enormous importance, Mr. Lawrence is doing a great public service. In international, far more than in any other branch of politics, passion and ignorance are apt to usurp the functions of enlightened justice. The jealousies and suspicions with which Englishmen, hardly less than their hyper-sensitive neighbours, have received every proposition for settling the points in dispute concerning the Suez Canal are a good illustration of this. Dispassionate discussion of the principles of international law which bear on these disputes is the best way of disarming such suspicions, and leading to a satisfactory settlement. For this reason, if for no other, we should welcome an essay on either of the great oceanic canals, so temperate and scientific in tone as are those before us. The truth is, as Mr. Lawrence points out, that the legal characteristics of the Suez Canal are conflicting and cannot be fitted to any of the old precedents.

"From one set of attributes we might argue that the canal was, in law, a narrow strait between two open seas; from another, that it was an inland water-way, subject entirely to the authority of the local sovereign; and from a third, that it was a great international work, under the control of the leading Powers of Europe. . . . It is anomalous, and everything about it is anomalous. . . . Never before has sovereignty over so important a portion of the earth's surface been so strangely shared between a number of Powers."

The author accordingly arrives at the disappointing conclusion that, "agreement apart, international law does not afford any rules for the conduct of States in reference to the Suez Canal." This is evidently too sweeping a charge against the science of which Mr. Lawrence is a devoted student and able exponent. Presumably Mr. Lawrence only means that the recognized rules of international law cannot be safely applied without modification to every international question which has arisen or may arise in reference to the Canal. Be this as it may, Mr. Lawrence makes out a very good case in support of his proposal for "internationalizing" the canal. "Mere neutralization" would lead to numberless difficulties and anomalies, as he has little

² "Essays on Some Disputed Questions in Modern International Law." By T. J. Lawrence, M.A., LL.M., Deputy Whewell Professor of International Law, late Fellow and Tutor of Downing College, Cambridge. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Co. London: George Bell & Sons. 1884.

difficulty in showing. Instead of this, Mr. Lawrence "ventures to suggest the creation of an Oriental Belgium of minute proportions, extending along the whole length of the canal, and to a considerable distance on either side of it." The new State would be neutralized and guaranteed by the Great Powers, who would stipulate that the canal and its approaches should be open to the passage of all ships at all times. For the manner in which the difficulties presented by this scheme are to be overcome, we must refer the reader to the book itself. We confess the author appears to us somewhat of an optimist. Further light on the obscure and novel legal questions surrounding international rights in inter-oceanic canals will be found in the very able historical review of the relations of England and America to the Panama Canal scheme, and the critical examination of the diplomatic correspondence relating to it. The absurd pretensions of the United States to neutralize the canal by their sole guarantee is shown to be not only in violation of the celebrated Clayton-Bulwer treaty, but also quite opposed to some of the most elementary and universally recognized principles of international law. Besides these essays on actual cases, the volume contains others on more purely academical questions. He discusses the question, "Is there a true International Law?" and answers it in the affirmative. "The Work of Grotius as a Reformer of International Law," is, in fact, a sketch of the circumstances under which modern international law had its origin, the materials out of which it was compounded, and the influence which moulded it. In another essay Mr. Lawrence traces the growth of "the concert of Europe," which he thinks will gradually gain a greater and more openly recognized right of control over the affairs of Europe, the doctrine of the equality before the law of all independent States being no longer true in fact. Mr. Lawrence's remarks on this subject may be read in connection with Mr. Congreve's, in the work last noticed. There is sufficient agreement between them as to the facts, but considerable divergence of views as to their ethical significance. In the concluding essay we have the author's reasons "for believing that a state of perpetual peace will be gradually evolved upon earth." In pursuing these speculations, Mr. Lawrence shows considerable knowledge of modern European history, and his essays will be found worth reading by all who are interested in the questions dealt with.

Mr. Auberon Herbert³ reprints, with alterations and additions, the series of clever dialogues on Government in general, and party government as practised by the Liberals in particular, which readers of the *Fortnightly Review* were recently favoured with. It is hardly necessary to say that these dialogues are clever, sparkling, and full of telling but shallow sneers at the shams and insincerities of politicians. As a satirist, Mr. Auberon Herbert is at his best. When he tries his hand at sober, constructive statesmanship, he loses touch of human nature, and wastes his energies in building up a system of political

³ "A Politician in Trouble about his Soul." By Auberon Herbert. London: Chapman & Hall, Limited. 1884.

morality, which would be admirable if it did not pre-suppose human nature to be quite different from what it is. He proclaims himself a disciple of Mr. Herbert Spencer, but carries his master's principles, freed from the master's limitations, so much further that one is almost tempted to suspect him of desiring to discredit them by the *reductio ad absurdum* process. Government must confine itself simply to the defence of life and property, says the master. Taxation even to supply the means of carrying on the legitimate functions of Government must be voluntary, says the disciple. Indeed Mr. Auberon Herbert openly employs the *reductio ad absurdum* process against Mr. Spencer's theory of property in land. There are but two creeds possible for men—belief in the majority, in force—*i.e.*, ultimately Socialism; or else complete Individualism, which is the perfection of liberty. Mr. Auberon Herbert is a conspicuous example of what he justly admires in Mr. Herbert Spencer—"fearlessness in thought and speech." He has the courage of his convictions, but we prefer the courage to the convictions.

The constitutional history of India,⁴ if it be permissible to use such a phrase at all, has an interest of a totally different order from that of the constitutional history of countries like England. We cannot look to it for the gradual evolution of ideas and the institutions which correspond to them. Spontaneous growth is not found in it. The student who studies forms of government for the purpose of tracing them back to their first beginning and then unfolding their successive stages of progress will find no material in Anglo-Indian history. No light is thrown by it on the law of spontaneous development in matters of government. But to the historian or the statesman who inquires by what means great empires have been built up, and vast populations controlled by a distant Power, the history of the English in India is an unrivalled field of study. "It is a record of experiments made by foreign rulers to govern alien races in a strange land, to adapt European institutions to Oriental habits of life, and to make definite laws supreme amongst peoples who had always associated government with arbitrary and uncontrolled authority." Those who approach the study of Indian history with the last-mentioned object in view, not less than professional law students, will find a very clear and useful guide in Mr. Herbert Cowell's "Tagore Lectures," the second edition of which, revised to 1883, has lately been published. They give the briefest and most intelligible account, compatible with due comprehensiveness, that we have met with, of the existing councils for the making of laws and the courts for their administration; and the same may be said of their treatment of the origin and past history of the courts and councils which have passed away or developed into existing institutions. The intricacy of the subject and the unfamili-

⁴ Tagore Law Lectures. "The History and Constitution of the Courts and Legislative Authorities in India." By Herbert Cowell, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, and Tagore Law Professor, 1869-1872. Second edition, revised (and brought down to 1883) by the Author. Calcutta: Thacker, Spink & Co.; Bombay: Thacker & Co., Limited; London: W. Thacker & Co. 1884.

arity of English readers with it, as well as the necessity of condensing so much dry fact into the didactic shape necessary in lectures to students, make them very dull reading for every one else. The chapters are well arranged, with marginal notes, and there is an index, so that references are easily made.

Mr. Dowell's "History of Taxation and Taxes" is a laborious work in four good sized octavos. It may be divided into two portions, as indicated by its title. The first is a record of the taxation which prevailed in successive periods, chronologically arranged from the earliest times to the date of Mr. Childers' first budget in 1883. The second portion traces the history of every particular impost of any consequence that has figured in the fiscal system of England. Covering such a vast field it was perhaps inevitable that much of the work should be scamped. Be that as it may, the earlier periods are very sketchily dealt with; it is only when we get to the Revolution of 1688 that we find anything like an attempt at fulness of treatment. We hope we are not doing an injustice to the Assistant-Solicitor of Inland Revenue if we surmise that there is little that can be called original investigation in this work. Careful compilation, laborious industry, we have abundant evidence of; but of original antiquarian or historical interest there is little if any. Neither does Mr. Dowell venture into the sphere of political or social economy. The principles of taxation and the actual effects of obsolete taxes are almost unnoticed. We do not mention these omissions by way of objection to Mr. Dowell's work, but rather to define more carefully the limits of its subject-matter.

Mr. T. J. Elliot claims to have "*solved*, so far as agriculture is concerned, 'The Land Question.'"⁵ It is necessary to state at once that what Mr. Elliot understands by "The Land Question" appears to be simply "Is farming a profitable occupation?" The land question, thus reduced to a simple matter of account, is solved by a reference to Lord Herbert's farm ledger. Mr. Elliot answers his own question in the affirmative, and claims to have proved his case by an analysis of the results obtained, during the years 1850-1873, on a farm "which may be taken as a type of one of an inferior class of farms on the vast estates in Wiltshire of George Robert Charles, thirteenth Earl of Pembroke, and tenth Earl of Montgomery." Whether Mr. Elliot has "solved the Land Question" in the quite arbitrary sense which he chooses to attach to those words, we leave practical farmers to judge for themselves, only reminding them that the years covered by the experience of Lord and Lady Herbert were, on the whole, very good years; that almost every element that enters into the farmer's calcula-

⁵ "History of Taxation and Taxes in England, from the Earliest Times to the Present Day." By Stephen Dowell, Assistant-Solicitor of Inland Revenue. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1884.

⁶ "The Land Question: its Examination and Solution, from an Agricultural Point of View, as Illustrated by Twenty-three Years' Experience on the Wilton House Home Farm, near Salisbury, Wilts. By the Right Honourable the Lord Herbert and Lady Herbert of Lea. Analyzed by Thomas J. Elliot, M.R.A.C., F.H.A.S., Professor of Estate Management at the Royal Agricultural College Cirencester. London, Paris, and New York: Cassell & Co., Limited.

tions has changed since those years; and that there was an indefinite amount of capital ready to supplement the not inconsiderable amount (£3,500 for a farm of 273 acres) actually employed. Finally we would suggest that the success of one particular farmer on one particular farm is no guarantee of the success of other farmers on other farms. If Mr. Elliot really thinks he has thrown one single ray of light upon the great problem generally understood by "The Land Question," we will excuse the unconscious dishonesty of the title he has given his volume of statistics, and recommend him to consult some handbook of questions of the day before he again tries his hand at solving them.

"*Les forces de l'Industrie*,"⁷ by M. Louis Bourdeau, is a very fascinating work, as well as a work of great research. These qualities are especially marked in the earlier chapters, which deal with the forces employed by primitive man. M. Bourdeau's object is to give a connected summary of the successive steps by which the human race has arrived at its present mastery over the forces of the material world. He distinguishes four kinds of motive force, each of which characterizes, by its employment, a new phase of progress. These are:—

1. Les forces humaines, seules disponibles durant l'état de nature et l'état sauvage.

2. Les forces animales, soumises et disciplinées pendant la phase pastorale.

3. Les moteurs naturels, c'est-à-dire les cours d'eau et les vents, utilisés dès les temps anciens.

4. Enfin les moteurs artificiels, représentés par les explosifs et la vapeur, d'acquisition plus récente.

Besides these "forces motrices," he treats of the "forces physiques," namely, heat, light, and electricity. M. Bourdeau is at his best in the first three chapters, those which deal with Forces Humaines, Forces Animales, and Moteurs Naturels. Here he has industriously collected, and skilfully arranged, a vast number of passages and references from ancient writers of all languages, and by their aid he endeavours to establish the chronological order of invention of the various weapons and implements and devices for utilizing natural forces. Such direct historical evidence is the most valuable kind of evidence when it can be had, but obviously it cannot be had for pre-historic times. M. Bourdeau appears to us to rely too exclusively on evidence of this kind, and to have made but scanty use of the rich materials which antiquarian research has placed at his disposal. There is something unsatisfactory also in the way our author speaks of primitive man, as if he had been fashioned by pure chance or caprice, and suddenly set down in the midst of an environment to which he had not been in any degree adapted, and had then and there to set to work to struggle, as best he could, against the unaccustomed difficulties of his new situation. Thus, for instance, he says (p. 12), "*Le premier besoin que*

⁷ "*Les Forces de l'Industrie. Progrès de la Puissance Humaine.*" Par Louis Bourdeau. Paris: Ancienne Librairie Germer, Ballière et Cie. Félix Alcan, Editeur, 108, Boulevard Saint-Germain. 1884.

l'homme ait ressenti dans le monde a été celui de détruire." Sentences like this imply that there was a definite moment when the species became man, and began to have man's wants. They are admissible only on the theory of a special creation of the human species, and are inconsistent with the theory of man's evolution from some lower form. Nor is it possible that man can at any stage of his development have been so wretchedly ill-adapted to his environment as M. Bourdeau asserts, for the simple reason that man has not only held his own against species very perfectly adapted to their environment, but has so infinitely outstripped them all, which could not have happened had he not been on the whole better adapted to the conditions of life. These inaccuracies, however, do not affect the real substance of the book, which is not chiefly concerned with primitive man. It is a really valuable history of the conquest of Nature by man. The reader must not expect that in one moderate-sized volume, covering so vast a field, every particular implement of war or industry should be described. M. Bourdeau has done well in limiting his aim to supplying a rather rapid summary of the development of a few types, instead of a multitude of individual varieties. There is one omission which leaves the book less useful for the student than it ought to be. That is the want of an index, which we hope will not be forgotten in succeeding editions.

"*Icaria: a Study in Communistic History*"⁸ is a condensed well-written account of the origin and history of the remarkable, but little noticed, attempt of Etienne Cabet to establish a rational Democratic Communistic Society on a grand scale in America. This wild, but partially successful, attempt was one outcome of the great movement towards Democratic Socialism which agitated Europe in the second quarter of this century, and culminated in 1848. Early in that year, a few weeks before the outbreak of the revolution in Paris, the pioneers of the Icarian community actually started from Havre to take possession of the magnificent tract of country, as they believed, which had been purchased for them in Texas. Their first bitter disappointment was to find that their new possession fell sadly short of its description, and was, in fact, quite unsuited to their requirements. We cannot pursue the sad romance of the Icarian enthusiasts, doomed to such bitter disillusioning. "The story of *Icaria* is a record of hardships, dissensions, and disappointments almost innumerable; but it is also a record of endurance and of unswerving devotion that commands respect." In spite of the high and rare qualities possessed by almost all the members, split after split, and secession after secession, marked their course, proving how extremely precarious is the bond which, in the absence of some exclusive religious faith, keeps men together in a communistic association. This makes the history which Dr. Shaw has given to the world profoundly depressing. But it has a special value for the student of sociology. *Icarianism* is, as the author points out, the most typical representative of the rational Democratic Com-

⁸ "*Icaria: a Chapter in the History of Communism.*" By Albert Shaw, Ph.D. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. The Knickerbocker Press. 1884.

munism of the Utopian School, as opposed to the religious communists, such as the Shakers and Amanists. As an actual experiment in this direction, lasting over a generation, and still existing with some possibility of ultimate success, it is deserving of careful study. Dr. Shaw very truly remarks that writers on Socialism are too fond of abstract reasoning, and apt to neglect the actual experiences of men who have tried to put their theories into practice. We regret that the author has not made a fuller study of this depressing but instructive experiment. He has an excellent narrative style, and is conspicuously fair and sympathetic, without a trace of partisanship.

"The Conventional Lies of our Civilization"⁹ is an American translation from the German of Max Nordau. It is a very outspoken criticism of the existing order in religion, politics, the relations of the sexes, our economical and social arrangements. It exposes unsparingly the shams which have established themselves in each of these departments of thought and action, and pleads earnestly for greater courage and consistency on the part of those who perceive and yet adopt these shams. The key-note of the present age, according to the author, is pessimism, which reveals itself in numerous forms. The cause of this pessimism is hypocrisy. Our actions are at variance with our deepest convictions, and no one has courage to bring his life into harmony with these. To combat this weakness, and show its evil consequences is the aim of the author. To do this effectively requires some courage, and to this merit the little book before us is entitled. Its tone also is temperate as well as earnest. But in spite of its good points the book is unsatisfactory. The author is profoundly dissatisfied, but it is by no means easy to find out what he wants. He ridicules Monarchy, but cares nothing for a Republic; he defends private property and an hereditary aristocracy, but would forbid inheritance. In his criticisms of the "lies" of a monarchy, an aristocracy, and a Parliament, he shows that he does not understand these institutions as they exist in England. These chapters are therefore the least instructive to English readers. The chapters on Religion and Matrimony are better.

The July number of the WESTMINSTER REVIEW for the current year contained a long article on "The Woman Question in Europe,"¹⁰ founded on, and indeed mainly consisting of selected extracts from Mr. Theodore Stanton's exhaustive collection of *Essays*. Any one who wishes to get a bird's eye view of the position which this comprehensive question in its most important subdivisions occupies at present in the several countries of Europe may be recommended to turn to that article. But if we are not mistaken it will but whet the reader's appetite for the fuller information and more comprehensive treatment

⁹ "The Conventional Lies of Our Civilization." From the German of Max Nordau. Chicago: L. Shick, Publisher. 1884.

¹⁰ "The Woman Question in Europe: a Series of Original Essays." Edited by Theodore Stanton, M.A. With an Introduction by Frances Power Cobbe. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington, Crown Buildings, Fleet Street. 1884.

which can nowhere be found so well as in these original essays edited by Mr. Stanton. The idea of securing "in each country of Europe, the collaboration of one or more women, who, in connection with a literary training, had participated, either actively or in spirit, in some phase of the women's movement," was a very happy one, and would have entitled its author, had he not already won it, to the gratitude of all who wish well to the movement. Indeed, one need not even be a well-wisher of the movement to feel grateful for Mr. Stanton's work. It is difficult to exaggerate the value and importance of so complete and fair a record of the phases through which this great question has passed, and is passing, under the varied influences and differing conditions that environ it in different European countries. Its value is proportionate to the importance for good or for ill of the movement: and even the enemies of this beneficent social revolution do not deny the vastness of the issues involved. A true account of its failures and mistakes as well as of its hard-won triumphs is essential if its progress is to be peaceful, rapid, and enduring. No one can read these able and interesting essays without perceiving the moderation of tone which pervades them, the result no doubt of the writers' practical experience of the difficulties and dangers which beset the social reformer's path, and which have their roots deep down in human nature, female as well as male. The writers are in most cases practical workers in some field of reform, not *doctrinaire* pedants evolving magnificent dreams out of their inner consciousness. The names of the English contributors—Mrs. Fawcett, Mrs. Grey, Dr. Frances Hoggan, Miss Boucherett, and Mrs. Barnett—sufficiently bear out this statement, so far as England is concerned, and their continental sisters are almost as well known in their respective countries. Their essays contain far more than a dry account of the achievements of the spirit of emancipation; they give very full and often picturesque pictures of the past, and actual, social and legal status of women as wives and daughters. We have a particularly bright and pleasantly-drawn picture of Swedish women. One of the most interesting of all the essays is that of Marie Zebrikoff on Russia. Here we find a social and political environment different from anything to be found in other countries, and we are met moreover, by the unexpected phenomenon of women enjoying an extraordinary degree of equality with men, in a country which in all other respects is socially and politically far behind every other European people. Marie Zebrikoff sets herself to examine and explain this anomalous fact, and the result is a thoughtful and deeply interesting essay. One word is due in acknowledgment of the editor's labours. The original essays were written, it appears, in six different languages. But so well has the translation been done that no one could suspect he was reading anything but the original. The tone pervading the essays we have already commended, and it is but right to acknowledge the editor's share in a result to which his judicious pruning must have contributed. Miss Cobbe's Introduction is earnest, eloquent, and appropriate.

By a curious coincidence, while Mr. Stanton comes from America

to study this question in Europe, an Englishwoman goes to America to study the same question there, and the results of both investigations are before us. Miss Emily Faithfull,¹¹ while promising us little more than such information on the position of women in the New World, as she obtained by observation in her three visits to the United States, has in reality given us a most charming and instructive picture of American Society, American Institutions, American industries, and even American scenery. To us who take a deep interest in the problems that lie so near Miss Faithfull's heart, the charm of her bright suggestive pages, is enhanced by her observations on the position of women. But we might be doing her book an injury, and perhaps frightening away some few intending readers who do not share our sympathies, if we omitted to assure them that they need not fear they will be bored by wearisome complaints of male selfishness and female wrongs. Indeed, they might read the book from cover to cover without surmising that its author was a noted champion of women's rights, and an indefatigable worker in the cause of women's education and employment. Whatever she touches on, even when she rouses our indignation against the degrading practices of the Mormons, Miss Faithfull is invariably temperate as well as earnest. A life of practical work in a noble course has taught her the inherent difficulties of the task she is engaged in, and that the evils she would eradicate are not the mushroom surface-growths of modern civilization. We gather that the author first visited the States about eleven or twelve years ago, and has twice repeated her visit, the last time in 1884. In the interval between her first and last visits, much progress has taken place, not only in the position of women, but in social matters generally. She takes us with her, not in strict chronological or geographical sequence, but just as her recollections suggest, all over the States—North, South, East, and West. She introduces us to the houses and families of many distinguished Americans of both sexes. She enables us to see them at home, and to view their lives and characters from a point of view to which the male visitor cannot attain because he is a male. And in addition to these advantages possessed by her book over the ordinary books about America, it shows us in how many ways "America is helping to solve the most delicate and difficult problem presented by modern civilization." We cannot attempt any *résumé* of what America has done and is doing in this respect; but it is evident that while much remains to be done the future is full of promise and encouragement.

Mr. Barneby's "Life and Labour in the Far Far West"¹² is one of those unattractive matter-of-fact books of travel, which only Englishmen seem to write, and certainly none but Englishmen would read.

¹¹ "Three Visits to America." By Emily Faithfull. Edinburgh: David Douglas, Castle Street. 1884.

¹² "Life and Labour in the Far Far West: being Notes of a Tour in the Western States, British Columbia, Manitoba, and the North-West Territory." By W. Henry Barneby. London, Paris and New York: Cassell & Co., Limited. 1884.

Indeed, no one but a Britisher, with his curious blending of philanthropic and commercial motives, would have undertaken the journey, the record of which forms the subject of the volume now before us. Mr. Barneby, like so many other writers of travels, never intended to publish his experiences. In the spring and summer of 1883 he visited British Columbia, Manitoba, and the North-West Territory, with the double object of enjoying himself, and collecting information about farming and emigration, "in the hope of thus being able to assist those in England who might be thinking of seeking a new home across the Atlantic." We will not inquire too curiously whether he made any less disinterested use of this information. The loose sheets of his journal were sent home from time to time to his wife, by whom they were re-written in a book. "And it is to this care and industry that the public and I (the author) are indebted for the present volume ever seeing the light at all." After taking us thus frankly into his confidence, and informing us moreover that this is his first, and will probably be his last, literary venture, we shall not criticize it too closely. But there is one obvious fault in the book—namely, the intolerable deal of trivial personal occurrences which it records, and by which the reader, however practised he be in "skimming," is delayed and distracted in his efforts to get at the scattered and rather meagre information, which alone is of any interest to readers outside the circle of the author's personal friends. There is just enough of such information to make it worth the while of intending settlers and emigrants of all sorts to search for it through the mass of rubbish which forms the bulk of the book. The author gives us the impression of being sincere, truthful, and unsensational; and we cannot doubt that we have before us "his actual impressions as they occurred to him on the spot." Therein lies the whole value of the book. The author has not taxed his power of observation immoderately, nor is his faculty of expression exceptional; but it is something to leave on his readers' minds the conviction that what he has put down he observed himself, and did not borrow either from his imagination or from official, which too often are misleading, reports.

One of the most interesting books on New England that we have read for a long time is Mr. Pidgeon's "Old World Questions and New World Answers."¹³ The author has a pleasant style; his occasional descriptions of scenery are fresh and unconventional; his accounts of the men and things he saw are clear and exact; here and there a humorous anecdote is capably told. All this, however, is in the nature of padding. The chief value of the book lies in the admirable pictures it gives of industrial and agricultural life among the little-visited but characteristically American valleys and villages of the New England States. Here the rush of immigrants from all quarters of the globe has had little effect, and the men of Connecticut and Massachusetts are the best representatives of the pure American.

¹³ "Old World Questions and New World Answers." By Daniel Pidgeon, F.G.S., Assoc. Inst. C.E., Author of "An Engineers' Holiday." London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1, Paternoster Square. 1884.

Amongst them, if Mr. Pidgeon tells truth, "the dignity of labour" is a reality, and the reader cannot choose but envy the bright, happy, well-to-do, well-educated men and women, who find a pride and pleasure in tending the wonderful machines which the inventive genius of New England manufacturers has devised. Any one who wishes to know how factory labour can be made pleasant, healthful, comfortable, even refined, may be recommended to read what Mr. Pidgeon has to say of the great clock and watch-making factories in the Naugatuck Valley. There the Waterbury Clock Company alone turns out 1500 clocks per diem, and the Watch Company 600 watches per diem, at a ridiculously low price, which, however, yields a handsome profit. The great secret of success is that, "It is now universally acknowledged, at least in the Naugatuck Valley, that everything which contributes to the physical comfort and mental benefit of the workman pays a good return on its first cost." But even these "veritable palaces of industry," as Mr. Pidgeon calls them, are surpassed by the Willimantic Thread Company, whose thread "will lift more ounces of dead weight, and is smoother than any other," although made of the same cotton and with the same machinery. We can fancy the smile of incredulity, or the sneer of contempt with which the manager of a great Yorkshire or Lancashire factory would read of the Willimantic Mill, with its "closely mown lawn, tastefully planted with maples," its approach by a "wide gravelled path, winding through a garden," its handsome ante-rooms, "provided with numbered" closet-spaces for wraps and hats, hung with pictures, and further decorated with sub-tropical plants, so that we seemed to be on the threshold of some great conservatory, rather than approaching a mill by the work-people's entrance." Yet, this is no toy workshop.

The floor of its vast single-room, nearly a thousand feet long, and 200 feet wide, contains indeed 50,000 spindles; but instead of looking upwards to a low, dark ceiling, and a chaos of whirling pulleys and belts, the eye seeks the azure of a New England sky, through a roof partly of clear, partly of coloured glass, prettily disposed in geometrical designs. The walls are mere piers, separating great windows, also of clear and coloured glass, below each of which the brickwork is fashioned into pockets, filled with soil, and forming great flower-beds planted with climbers, such as taxonia, cobœa, and English ivy, together with geraniums, petunias, and flowering shrubs, which frame the spindles, so to speak, in roses.

The younger hands, in addition to their regular wages, get a cup of milk and a slice of bread and butter, gratis, at 9 o'clock every morning, and in another section of the help a small cup of bouillon is similarly served out at 10.30. These indulgences are found to "pay." "The girls go from their work as they come to it, singing, laughing, almost dancing, and I know," says the manager, "that in their high physical condition, they cannot help turning out more and better work than the others." The apparent extravagance of decorating the spinning-room so profusely with flowers and shrubs is explained by the fact that the transpiration of the plants keeps the air in proper hygrometrical condition. But the manager adds his belief that the very intelligence to which their thread owes its superiority is

fostered almost as much by cleanliness, order and beauty, as by education itself. To complete the triumph of this noble "captain of industry," to whose genius these wonderful things are due, and in justice to a despised nationality whose potential merits are not always justly estimated, let us add that "almost all the help at Willimantic is Irish." Mr. Pidgeon is a little bit of an enthusiast, and perhaps deals too much in *couleur de rose*, but he has undoubtedly brought forward strong evidence in support of his cheering belief that the factory system is, or may be made, much more moral and beneficent in its effects on the workers than the older system which it displaced. He devotes a whole chapter to some very sensible remarks on this hopeful view of a system which is just now in bad repute. We have no space for noticing the very interesting chapters on several other New England towns, a Shaker village, Boston, the Hudson River, the Lakes, Canada, &c. Mr. Pidgeon, who appears to know a little of everything, devotes a chapter to examining the fallacies of Protection, and its disastrous effects on wages. Taking for granted that it must very soon be abandoned, he conveys a timely warning to Englishmen to aim at that "greater personal intelligence in work in which at present we are behind America; to import some American readiness and grip into our Board Rooms and Offices, and some sense of the dignity of labour into our workshops." lest the industrial supremacy of the Old World pass over to the New.

Mr. William Rathbone¹⁴ appeals, partly on similar grounds, to patriotic Americans to abandon the fatal system of Protection. But what he chiefly lays stress on, taking for granted its economic wastefulness, is its social effects in aggravating the precariousness of the wage-earners' position, exaggerating the contrasts between wealth and poverty, between high wages and low wages, or no wages, and by the discontent so caused, bringing about a social danger far more fatal to national prosperity, than even that economic waste which Protection undoubtedly involves.

The Marquis of Lorne's "Canadian Pictures"¹⁵ is an "edition de luxe"—Imperial octavo, handsomely bound, gilt edges, profusely illustrated. It is eminently "suitable for a Christmas present." The noble author is not a great master of the Queen's English. His style is decidedly slovenly and inaccurate. But he is a thorough believer in Canada—its people, its institutions, its beauty, its fertility, its climate. His advice to intending emigrants is generally sensible, though it is sometimes foolishly expressed. For instance (p. 36), "I should counsel all who contemplate emigration, and the taking up of

¹⁴ "Questions of the Day.—XV. Protection and Communism: a Consideration of the Effects of the American Tariff upon Wages." By Wm. Rathbone, Member of the British Parliament for Carnarvonshire. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. The Knickerbocker Press. 1884.

¹⁵ "Canadian Pictures, drawn with Pen and Pencil." By the Marquis of Lorne, K.T. With numerous illustrations from objects and photographs in the possession of and sketches by the Marquis of Lorne, Sydney Hall, &c. Engraved by Edward Whymper. London: The Religious Tract Society, 56, Paternoster Row, and 65, St. Paul's Churchyard.

farm life, to have, if single men, from £50 to £100 exclusive of the cost of the journey, and if married, from £150 or £250 to £500." There can be little doubt that all intending emigrants, and most other people for the matter of that, would be very glad "to have" from £50 to £500, or even more. If only the Marquis would tell them how to make sure of having even this insignificant minimum, we promise him a handsome fortune from the sale of his very pretty and pleasant volume. The engravings are beautifully done by Mr. Edward Whymper.

The author of "The Peruvians at Home"¹⁶ introduces "this the first (and probably the last) important literary offspring of my brain," in a preface amusing for its self-complacent egotism. The book contains the miscellaneous observations and experiences of two years of residence and travel, during which the author came in contact with people of all classes. It is not in any sense an "important literary" performance, but it is readable if one knows nothing and cares to know a little—a very little, of what may be seen on the surface of Peruvian society, and is not fastidious about style.

Very different is "Soltera's" lively account of a very spirited performance—a ride, without friend or other companion than a hired boy and a muleteer, from the Pacific to the Atlantic coast of Honduras.¹⁷ Soltera was induced to go to Honduras by the offer of land and the post of head-mistress of a new school at San Pedro Sula, where she hoped to make a home for herself. The cheapest and quickest way of getting from Sydney to her destination, involved riding from Amalpa, a port on the Pacific coast. This portion of the journey formed the greater part of the ride, as well as much the most difficult and adventurous part. Arrived at San Pedro Sula she found that the school had no existence, and, in fact, the whole thing was a scandalous "take in" on the part of the worthy priest who had engaged her to go out. There was nothing for it but to get back to England as soon as money could be procured from home. The journey from San Pedro Sula to Puerto Cortez, the port of embarkation, completed the ride from ocean to ocean. Soltera tells the story of her adventures remarkably well. More than that she does not profess to do.

The best that can be said of "All Round Spain"¹⁸ is that it is well meant. It is trivial, prolix, disconnected, vague, feeble. The journeys described were performed under the most common-place circumstances. But the author appears to be a kindly "poor old bachelor."

An interesting account of the first part of Hicks Pasha's disastrous expedition will be found in Col. Colbourne's "With Hicks Pasha

¹⁶ "The Peruvians at Home." By George R. Fitz-Roy Cole. London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Co., 1, Paternoster Square. 1884.

¹⁷ "A Lady's Ride across Spanish Honduras." By Maria Soltera. With illustrations. Edinburgh and London: Wm. Blackwood & Sons. 1884.

¹⁸ "All Round Spain, by Road and Rail, with a short account of a Visit to Andorra." By F. H. Deverell. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington, 188, Fleet Street. 1884.

in the Soudan."¹⁹ The author was one of the general's staff, and owes his safety to an illness, which compelled him to return from Jebel-ain. "Of that last band of Englishmen who rode side by side through the Nubian desert, but three remain: De Coetlogon, Martin, and myself, the last of an army of 12,000." In spite of some rough life, the author appears to have thoroughly enjoyed the expedition. The information his narrative contains, will be not only interesting but cheering to many anxious minds now turned towards the expedition on the Nile, where the author is again at work. There are some really good descriptions, full of genial humour (*e.g.* the camel's amiability, p. 21); but our attention is sadly distracted, and our temper tried by the author's bad habit of scattering scraps of poetry over his pages, sometimes three in a page.

Mrs. Williamson's little book²⁰ is a genuine, if slight, contribution to our knowledge of the Northern Chinese, especially their women. Although the Zenana rules are not as stringent as in India, they are sufficiently strict to make it very difficult for a male foreigner to see much of the women of the country. Mrs. Williamson, a doctor's wife, readily obtained admission to domestic circles inaccessible to men; and although she has little or nothing to reveal, and her literary power is but feeble, her simple record of "observations of every-day life, made during my journeys through North China, and during my intercourse with the people," has both interest and value. Her journeys were partly missionary, but unconsciously she leads a thoughtful reader to the conclusion that missionaries are about the last commodity required by a country where "the art of living" is practised so nearly as Confucius taught it.

Miss Gordon Cumming gives us this quarter another of her very pleasant books of travel.²¹ India is the subject of her pen this time. The preface explains why half the book appeared some years ago as the second part of "From the Hebrides to the Himalayas," but does not tell us why the rest of the book has been kept back so long that, as she implies, much of its interest is lost. Miss Cumming claims to have been one of the very first to discover the "new sensation" of travelling for pleasure in India; but that was during Lord Mayo's Viceroyalty, as we gather from a chance allusion. Her theme is therefore somewhat stale now, but she writes so pleasantly, and India is after all so many-sided, that her pages must prove generally interesting.

¹⁹ "With Hicks Pasha in the Soudan: being an Account of the Senaar Campaign in 1883." By Col. the Honourable J. Colbourn, formerly of the 60th (King's Royal Rifles) and latterly in the service of His Highness the Khedive. London: Smith, Elder & Co., 15, Waterloo Place. 1884.

²⁰ "Old Highways in China." By Isabella Williamson, of Chefoo, North China. The Religious Tract Society, 56, Paternoster Row, and 65, St. Paul's Churchyard. 1884.

²¹ "In the Himalayas and on the Indian Plains." By C. F. Gordon Cumming, Author of "In the Hebrides," &c. With 42 illustrations. London: Chatto & Windus, Piccadilly. 1884.

“On Tuscan Hills and Venetian Waters”²² contains many pleasantly written chapters on phases of Italian popular life and scenery. The authoress is not a globe trotter, and does not hurry us breathless from sight to sight. She allows us to rest awhile wherever she sets us down, and gives us time to become acquainted with her surroundings. The book is beautifully got up and very prettily illustrated.

Mr. Menzies Fergusson’s “Rambles in the Far North”²³ contains much antiquarian and general information about the Orkney and other islands of the North Sea. Any one who contemplates a visit to “the far north” of the British Isles ought to take this capital little book in his pocket.

Mr. Gomme gives us another volume of the *Gentleman’s Magazine Library*.²⁴ It comprises Popular Superstitions, and “to some extent forms a second volume to that on Manners and Customs.” For no part of the laborious task which Mr. Gomme has hitherto executed with such excellent judgment is he more competent than for that which is comprised in this volume. For, as he reminds us in his thoughtful “Introduction,” he has for some time made a special study of folk lore. The present volume is arranged in three sections—Days and Seasons, Superstitious Customs and Beliefs, and Witchcraft. But “these do not exhaust all that the *Gentleman’s Magazine* has to say upon the subject of Popular Superstitions and its kindred subjects.” There are still four sections which will form another volume. “Days and Seasons” is a particularly valuable section as illustrating the policy of the early Christian missionaries in absorbing heathen popular customs into the ritual of the Church.

“The English *Viâ Dolorosa*”²⁵ is an eloquent but dreadfully pessimist summary of the oppressions to which the agricultural labourers of England have been at various times subjected, but from which Mr. Heath thinks they have now at length been freed for ever.

The author of “Die Wohnungen der Arbeitenden Klassen in London.”²⁶ does not write specially for Englishmen, though he thinks that his conclusions will interest them. Berlin and other large German towns suffer almost as much, in proportion to their population, as London from the miserable housing of the poorest classes. The chief object of the essay is to show Germans what has been done

²² “On Tuscan Hills and Venetian Waters.” By Linda Villari, Author of “In Change Unchanged,” &c. Illustrations by Mrs. Arthur Lemon. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 26, Paternoster Square. 1895.

²³ “Rambles in the Far North.” By R. Menzies Fergusson, M.A. Second edition. Alex. Gardner: Paisley; and 12, Paternoster Row, London. 1894.

²⁴ “THE GENTLEMAN’S MAGAZINE LIBRARY. Being a Classified Collection of the Chief Contents of the Gentleman’s Magazine from 1731 to 1868.” Edited by George Laurence Gomme, F.S.A. Popular Superstitions. London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row. 1884.

²⁵ “The English *Viâ Dolorosa*; or, Glimpses of the History of the Agricultural Labourer.” By Richard Heath, Author of “Edgar Quinet: his Life and Writings,” &c. London: E. Marlborough & Co., 51, Old Bailey.

²⁶ “Die Wohnungen der Arbeitenden Klassen in London. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der neueren englischen Gesetzgebung und ihrer Erfolge. Von Dr. Wilhelm Ruprecht. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht’s Verlag. 1884.

towards improving the dwellings of the poor in London, and especially to examine the working of the laws passed for that purpose. Dr. Ruprecht thinks his countrymen will be surprised to see "how comprehensive and thorough" the English laws on this subject are, and how little they have, notwithstanding, accomplished. He pays a high compliment to English journalism, and especially to the *Pall Mall Gazette*, for the manner in which they have taken up this and other social reforms. He examines a number of suggested reasons for the failure of these legislative efforts to cope with the evil, and suggests others, but does not help us much, after all, to get over the difficulties.

"Agrarische Zustände in Frankreich und England"²⁷ is a very exhaustive examination of the position and prospects of agriculture in France and England, founded on official reports of the various commissions appointed in recent years by the respective governments of the countries in question. It is one of the series of "Schriften des Vereins für Socialpolitik," and is to be followed by a similar volume on Italy. France is very fully dealt with. England rather meagrely. The division of land and the conditions of its occupation; the agricultural crisis of the last ten years; the prospects of agriculture; the Land Laws and their reform are the principal questions examined in reference to England.

The Italian Minister of Agriculture, Industry, and Commerce, continues to issue his annual statistics. Amongst these we may mention the following volumes:—"Annuario Statistico Italiano. Anno, 1884" (Roma: Tipographia Eredi Botta, 1884); "Annali Di Statistica. Serie 3^a." Vols. 9 and 10. (Roma: Tipographia Dei Fratelli Bencini. Piazza S. Venanzio. 35, 1884.) "Appunti Di Statistica e Legislazione Comparata, sugli Istituti Di Credito Fondario" (ditto); "Statistica dell'Istruzione Elementare, Per l'anno Scolastico, 1881-2, Introduzione" (Roma: Tipographia Delia Camera Dei Deputati, 1884.)

We have also received the following:—"Crime in New South Wales. A paper written for, but rejected by, the Royal Society of that Colony. By Henry Heylyn Hayter, C.M.G., Government Statist of Victoria" (Melbourne: M'Carron Bird & Co., Flinders Lane, West, 1884); "Economic Tracts, No. XIII. The Standard Silver Dollar and the Coinage Law of 1878. By Worthington C. Ford" (New York, the Society for Political Education, 4, Morton Street, 1884); "Speech of Chas. Reemelin, held at the Annual Festival of the German Pioneers of Cincinnati, May 27, 1884" (T. J. Smith & Co., Printers, Cincinnati, O., 1884); "The Last Function of the House of Lords. By E. R. Pearce-Edgcumbe" (John Heywood, Deansgate and Ridgefield, Manchester; and 11, Paternoster Buildings, London, 1884); "The Laws and Customs of the Stock Exchange: Second Edition. By Rudolph E. Melsheimer, of the Inner Temple, and

²⁷ "Agrarische Zustände in Frankreich und England. Auf Grund der neueren Enquêtes; dargestellt von F. Frhrn. von Reitzenstein und Ervin Nasse." Leipzig: Verlag von Duncker & Humblot. 1884.

Samuel Gardner, of the Stock Exchange" (London : Henry Sweet, 3, Chancery Lane, 1884.)

"A complete History of England, for junior classes: Blackwood's Educational Series. Edited by Professor Meiklejohn"; and "Standard Reader, Book III," same series (Wm. Blackwood & Sons, London and Edinburgh, 1884.)

SCIENCE.

CULTIVATED plants play so important a part in modern civilization that cultivators and the general public, as well as botanists, will be grateful to Alphonse De Candolle for writing their history.¹ The origin of cultivation is necessarily obscure, but all that a life of research can do in elucidating it has been accomplished by the author. His book opens with a first part, consisting of two short chapters, which is essentially an introduction, and would have been better so termed, for the chapter headed "Methods for Discovering or Proving the Origin of Species" raises hopes destined to disappointment, for the author contemplates nothing beyond the original home of the species cultivated. The second part is substantially the book. It classifies plants according to the parts which are valued by man; so that the several sections or chapters treat of plants cultivated—1st, for their roots, tubercles, or bulbs; 2nd, for their stems or leaves; 3rd, for their flowers; 4th, for fruits; and 5th, for seeds. The amount of information, and the multitude of ideas and hypotheses thus discussed, with a view of establishing the diffusion and development of plants under the hand of man, are a marvel of industry, acumen, and varied attainments, such as it is given to few persons to achieve. Among the plants cultivated for their so-called roots, the history of which the author sets forth, may be mentioned the radish, horse-radish, turnips, madder, Jerusalem artichoke, salsafy, potato, batata, beet-root, manioc, garlic, onions in all their variety, yams, arrowroot, and many others less known. The plants cultivated for their stems or leaves, comprise cabbage, garden cress, purslane, New Zealand spinach, celery, parsley, artichoke, lettuce, chicory, endive, spinach, leek, among vegetables; while among fodder plants, lucerne, sainfoin, clovers, vetches, cohrus, cornspurry, and Guinea grass, serve as examples in which botany, history, and philology combine to account for distribution. The same chapter gives the history of tea, flax, jute, sumach, maté, coca, indigo, henna, tobacco, cinnamon, hemp, mulberry, the American aloe, and the sugar-cane. The plants cultivated for their flowers, which the author discusses, are limited to the clove, hop, carthamine, and saffron. The fruits are a more numerous class. Sweetsop, soursop, and other species of genus "Anona," the citron tribe, the sweet and bitter oranges, vine, jujubes, mango,

¹ "Origin of Cultivated Plants." By Alphonse De Candolle. London : Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1884.

strawberries, cherries, plums, and almonds, pears, apples, pomegranate, pumpkins, and melons, prickly pear, gooseberry, currant, olive, capsicum, tomato, fig, banana, all receive discussion, while matters of human interest are well sustained by the references to travellers, discoverers, and historians, no less than in the facts of distribution, and of botanical characters, which enrich the pages. The plants cultivated for their seeds, which are discussed, include among others the cocoa, the pistachio, broad-bean, lentil, pease, carob tree, haricot-bean, buckwheat, chestnut, the various grains, millet, sorghum, rice, maize, poppy, anatto, cotton, coffee, nutmeg, sesame, castor-oil plant, walnut, areca, and the cocoa-nut palm. Finally, in the third part, a tabular summary is given of the plants treated of, classed as they belong to the Old World and the New World, from which it appears that out of 247 species studied, the Old World has furnished 199, and America 45. Some parts of the world are remarkable for their poverty in cultivated plants. New Zealand has only yielded the New Zealand spinach. Australia has furnished but one cultivated tree—the “*Eucalyptus globulus*.” No cultivated plant is derived from Patagonia, or the Cape, while the only nutritious plants worth cultivating, yielded by the United States, are the Jerusalem artichoke and the gourds. The vast antiquity for which the cultivation of the more valued plants, like maize, rice, potato, bread-fruit, date, banana, &c., has been carried on, extends immeasurably beyond the historic period, while the plants, which have been cultivated for less than 2,000 years, are chiefly artificial foddere, vegetables, medicinal plants, and plants with fruits which are edible, or seeds which are nutritious or aromatic. The author concludes by stating that cultivated plants belong to fifty-one different families of “phanerogams.” The spread of plants into high latitudes is due to the production of early varieties, which ripen before the cold sets in, and the author considers an interval of 4,000 or 5,000 years necessary to produce the modifications which enable a plant to support a greater degree of cold.

Dr. Brown devotes a small volume to forestry in the mining districts of the Ural Mountains.² The book is divided into two parts, which treat of the East and West sides of the range. This division gives scope for an account of a journey to the Urals, by which an interesting account of the Nijni-Novgorod fair is introduced, along with many particulars concerning the Volga and the Kama. But the chapter is more descriptive than geographical, and better suited for general reading than a text-book. The forest exploitation in the government of Ufa is carried on under the system of “furetage.” This is a method of obtaining timber in coppice woods where the growths shoot freely from the stumps of trees, so that the wood is restored without the aid of seed. The strongest shoots are cut out, and the wood-cutter returns every eight or ten years. The method of “furetage,” as prac-

² “Forestry in the Mining Districts of the Ural Mountains in Eastern Russia.” Compiled by John Croumbie Brown, LL.D. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co. Montreal: Dawson Brothers. 1884.

tised in the Pyrenees, is compared with that of Russia. In the second part, after some account of the country and the people, a description of the Ural forests and of the Ural mountains succeeds. The mountain structure is given, chiefly as it was expounded by Sir Roderick Murchison, and chiefly with reference to the distribution of gold and copper in the rocks which flank the range. The development of metallurgy in Russia is chiefly a history of the work of the two blacksmiths, "Demidoff" and "Batachoff," who were stimulated by Peter the Great to develop the mines of the Ural. But particulars derived from the St. Petersburg School of Mines give interesting details of the produce, the furnaces, the ores smelted, and other matters concerning these industries, in which the forests play no unimportant part in furnishing the fuel. The mines, however, are not permanently remunerative, probably because the wood in their neighbourhood is used up faster than it grows, and hence the management of the forests comes to be closely connected with the mining prosperity. Dr. Brown gives many examples of abuses in the management of the forests, but they are chiefly of local interest, as exemplifying the conditions of bribery by which Government regulations are evaded. There is more padding in this volume than in others of the series which have come under our notice, and at the same time less systematic description of the work which a forest officer needs to study. No doubt the book is useful, but we trust that Dr. Brown will endeavour, some day, to systematize the information which he is bringing together, and construct out of it a practical treatise on forestry in the various regions of the world, which might give the student a clear insight into the nature of his duties, and the conditions under which his work has to be done.

There was no more marked figure in the modern science of England than that of George Rolleston, the Linacre Professor of Anatomy and Physiology at Oxford. If any one were capable of quarrelling in any way with the self-devotion and self-sacrifice which are implied in the consecration of a life like Rolleston's to the service of his country, we could only reply that the life was too short for its sturdy strength to become softened by consciousness of power, and too energetic to have felt the need of abandoning any of the many interests which had engaged his earlier years. Yet Rolleston accomplished much; though of necessity his best work can only live in the scientific methods of pupils and memories of friends. What remains of his minor published labours has now been brought together in two volumes,³ which preserve a record of intellectual activities in anatomy, physiology, zoology, archæology, and some other subjects of more specially medical character. These writings have been carefully edited by Professor William Turner, and to them is prefixed a portrait, and life by Dr. E. B. Tylor, which gives an excellent though brief account of

³ "Scientific Papers and Addresses." By George Rolleston, M.D., F.R.S. Arranged and edited by William Turner, M.B., LL.D., F.R.S., with a Biographical Sketch by Edward B. Tylor, D.C.L., F.R.S. With portrait, plates and woodcuts. 2 volumes. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1884.

the chief events in his existence, though it may seem inadequate to those who knew Rolleston, in its vivification of a personality, in which the hearty joyousness of youth was so singularly blended with a delicate nervous intensity, which would have achieved far greater things if fancy had moved less vividly along the paths of thought. And we could have wished that something had been attempted to convey to others the atmosphere of that selfless devotion to whatever work was before him, or whatever interest appealed to his sympathy which made Rolleston's life a power in the science of England among all who came within its influence. Possibly the reader of his collected writings may conceive some idea of it as he reads the memoirs which are now brought together. Rolleston's writing commenced in 1856 with a report on Smyrna, which has not been reprinted. Between that date and 1881 he published about seventy-nine scientific papers, the more important of which are now brought together, and arranged according to subjects. The papers on the affinities of the brain in the higher monkeys, on the structure of the placenta, on the skulls found in British barrows, and the skulls of Bushmen, will always be read with profit, as fine contributions to science: But hardly less interesting are the discussions on domestic animals, and the archæological papers which describe the ancient cemetery at Frilford, where successive interments in Roman and Anglo-Saxon times took place. These works are in their way models which the student will know how to value. It is chiefly in the addresses, in which the writer comes more in contact with the minds and sympathies of his fellow-men, that Rolleston's writing is most profitable; for it is here that his character and life are most marked. From the publication of the work before us, those naturalists who knew Rolleston but slightly will keep their memories fresh, and the many to whom he was unknown will learn from it to reverence a character which is unique in the modern history of science.

The growth of the science of Chemistry has been more rapid, has advanced further towards perfection, with greater practical utility to mankind, than any of the sciences which are of comparatively recent origin. The historical side of the development of the science, though formerly treated sufficiently in lectures by the professors of the subject, has not often occupied a prominent place in text-books, probably because the growth of the science has progressed so fast that it has been more important to re-state facts in accord with newer views, than to trace the steps by which those views were developed. Impressed with these ideas, Mr. Pattison Muir has written "A Treatise on the Principles of Chemistry,"[†] in which he records the growth of chemical theory. The book consists of two parts—the first part giving a statement and discussion of the atomic and molecular theory and its applications, with the various branches of physical chemistry, which are designated chemical statics; while the second part is devoted to chemical kinetics, under which term are included dissocia-

[†] "A Treatise on the Principles of Chemistry." By M. M. Pattison Muir, M.A. F.R.S.E. Cambridge: University Press. 1884.

tion, chemical affinity, and relations between chemical action and the distribution of energy. The book is composed with great care, and written with admirable clearness, while numerous references to the literature of the subject give its pages the authority of a history. The first book is divided into four chapters. The first chapter traces the growth of ideas concerning atoms and molecules, with that brevity, clearness, and illustrative detail which are the characteristics of the work. The second chapter, termed atomic and molecular systems, records in a similar manner the ideas which have been held concerning the nature of the relations of the atoms of the elements to each other in chemical compounds. The third chapter, termed the periodic law, examines the history of the connection between the atomic weights and the physical properties of elements. And the fourth chapter is the applications of physical methods (thermal, optical, &c.) to problems of chemical statics. The second book, dealing with chemical action, is also in four chapters, which are termed dissociation, chemical change, chemical affinity, and other applications of kinetical methods. Here also the method is historical, and the conditions of the current hypotheses of chemistry are well stated; with the conclusion that much work has yet to be done before a general theory of chemical change can be hoped for. It is a book admirable alike for its methods and its facts, and equally necessary to the professional chemist and the student.

Ruddiman Johnston's "Reference Atlas of Political Geography"⁵ is a small folio of thirty-four maps, of which fifteen are devoted to Europe. The maps are coloured so as to show the provinces of the different countries; the rivers and mountains are marked more strongly than is usual, and the names of places are in clear type, with their exact situations conspicuously indicated. Although termed a "Reference Atlas," it is rather a school atlas, and the omission of all but the more important or best known towns, will make it welcome to the learner. There is an index of thirty-three pages, which indicates the position of every place mentioned in the Atlas.

The Meteorological Office of India has published an admirable Rainfall Map,⁶ on the scale of one inch to sixty-four miles. It is printed in blue colour, in nine gradations of tint, which indicate the relative intensity of the rainfall. The first zone gives the annual fall of less than five inches. Most of the zones indicate intervals of ten inches in the fall; though as the fall becomes heavy the intervals are twenty and thirty inches. But upon the map the average rainfall in inches

⁵ "The Reference Atlas of Political Geography." By T. Ruddiman Johnston, F.R.G.S. Edinburgh: T. Ruddiman Johnston.

⁶ "Rainfall Chart of India." Showing the average annual distribution of the rainfall according to the locality and season. Based on the original registers in the Meteorological Office of the Government of India, supplemented by the returns printed periodically in the Government gazettes and collected from other sources. The data comprise the registers of about 1,800 stations, for periods varying from three to sixty-nine years, the averages of shorter periods being corrected proportionately to those of longer periods at neighbouring stations. Of these 985 are shown on the chart. Compiled for the Government of India, by Henry F. Blanford, F.R.S., Meteorological Reporter to the Government of India. Calcutta, 1888.

is shown by a number, printed against every place where it has been recorded. The periods of rainfall and maximum fall are printed upon the several parts of the map, and around the coast. The elevations of places above the sea are indicated in feet by printed numbers. There is thus an enormous amount of most trustworthy information, given in a graphic form, which leaves nothing to be desired, unless it were a slightly paler tint for the rainfall which exceeds 100 inches, the intensity of which obscures the printed information beneath. This map may be expected to have important results in the commercial development of the country, and is certainly the most important work which the Indian Meteorological Office has issued.

The Marquis of Lorne, when Governor-General of Canada, conceived of founding a Royal Society for the Dominion. This idea has been happily realized. The first members, eighty in number, were nominated by Lord Lorne in May, 1882. The Society consists of four sections—the first devoted to French literature, history, and archæology; the second section discusses in the same way English literature and history. The mathematical, chemical, and physical sciences are grouped as a third section; while the fourth section includes the geological and biological sciences. We presume that in the future the work of the Society may be further enlarged to comprise those engineering and agricultural sciences which are already so important in the Dominion, and likely still further to influence its welfare. This Society has already published a substantial volume of quarto Transactions, in which are printed the more important of the memoirs read before the Society in 1882 and 1883;⁷ while the proceedings give a lively account of the circumstances connected with the foundation of the Society. It would be beyond the possible limits of a notice such as this to give any account of the many highly valuable memoirs by Canadians which are here published, but probably those forming the geological section will be regarded as not the least important. Mr. Selwyn contributes articles on the geology of Lake Superior, and on the Quebec system in geology. Sir William Dawson describes the Tertiary and Cretaceous floras of British Columbia, and Dr. George Dawson describes the axis of Laurentian rocks as it extends westward. There is a valuable paper by Alexander Murray on the glaciation of Newfoundland, and many other papers describe fossils, as well as animals and plants. But not the least important contributions are those of Dr. Sterry Hunt, on the history of serpentines, and of the rocks which, in American geology, form the Taconic range. The history of serpentine has long been one of the most difficult questions in geology. Of late years there has appeared to be a preponderance of evidence that serpentine results from the decomposition of the mineral olivine, or some similar mineral in igneous rocks, in which it is contained. Dr. Sterry Hunt adopts an aqueous origin for serpentine; but we cannot help thinking that, although the change by which the materials of the igneous rock are altered is, certainly, an aqueous

⁷ "Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada for the years 1882 and 1883. Volume 1. Montreal: Dawson Brothers. 1883.

process, there is no sufficient reason for modifying the current ideas concerning this rock; nor do we imagine that there is any real difference between the ideas which Sterry Hunt develops, and those adopted by Professor Bonney in our own country. This important publication is illustrated with excellent plates and woodcut figures, which are chiefly representative of fossils, though the physical section includes some striking figures of blowpipe reactions. The people of the Dominion are to be congratulated on the honourable work which their Royal Society has already done, for it is not only good earnest of a prosperous future, but must win the hearty co-operation and sympathy of cultivators of learning in the Old World as well as America.

We can imagine few tasks more difficult than editing a manual of an ever-progressing science, which is thirty years out of date; and we doubt whether Professor Phillips's "Manual of Geology" was a work of sufficient originality to deserve the honour of being made to live again. The editors have divided the work according to subjects, Professor Seeley taking physical geology and palæontology in the volume⁸ now before us, while Mr. Etheridge is responsible for the "History of the Strata," which will form a second volume. Professor Seeley states that he has preserved every page of the original work which was in any way valuable; but it is only in chapters i., vi., xi., and xix. that we can find any traces of it, and the preservation of such fragments seems rather due to the editor's regard for his author than to any special importance that they possess. The new matter added makes the present part almost equal in bulk to the size of the original work. Taken as a whole, the book presents geology in a new aspect, and aims at giving a unity to the science which demands some notice. The editor regards geological history as an evolution in which deposition of strata, elaboration of igneous products and ore deposits, and the succession and distribution of life are mutually dependent phenomena, which exemplify the persistence and action of physical laws; and with this key the work assumes a completeness and method which are not obvious in the table of contents. Other writers have been content to expound facts; Professor Seeley, in addition, endeavours to account for them. He would have us understand not merely the properties, modes of origin of sands, clays, and limestones, and their history as deposits, but also the reasons why one kind of rock came to be superimposed upon another, and conceives that the mineral characters of the strata are a means of discovering the conditions of their deposition, and therefore show how the succession of the rocks is associated with changing contours of ancient lands, from the destruction of which they were derived. The identification of a stratum is dependent on its origin; since the deposit, which is sand in one place, is necessarily represented by clay in another. The argument by which

⁸ "Manual of Geology: Theoretical and Practical." By John Phillips, LL.D., F.R.S. Edited by Robert Etheridge, F.R.S., and Harry Govier Seeley, F.R.S., in two parts. Part 1, "Physical Geology and Palæontology." By H. G. Seeley, F.R.S. With tables and illustrations. London: Charles Griffin & Company. 1885.

the elaboration of igneous products and ore deposits is connected with the succession of the strata is as follows: Professor Seeley accepts the evidence that the earth is a cooling body, and conceives that the contractions of the crust of a sphere must be at right angles to each other on the two sides of the sphere; and that minor contractions, forming the spurs of mountains, are developed at right angles to great contractions, which form the main chains of mountains, because the earth is a sphere. To the shrinkage which develops the main chain in one period, and the lateral chains in another period of time, would be attributed the elevation and depression of land which governs the succession of the strata. But the editor has adopted the idea that the contraction of the rocks, no less than deposition of sediments, which arrests radiation, would develop heat along the lines of contraction; and to this cause attributes the microcrystalline texture which distinguishes slate from clay; and to a more intense form of the same action the schists and crystalline rocks are regarded as due. That is, a passage in texture from clay into slate, from sandstone and slate into schists, and from schists into granitic rocks, towards the axis of a mountain chain; and it is contended that these conditions of the rocks have resulted from the greater intensity of the pressure of contraction, and greater heat developed in such positions, so that the igneous rocks are metamorphosed sands and clays. Certainly the chemical analyses are identical. And since it is recognized that certain lavas are the liquified forms of corresponding crystalline rocks, they too are regarded as the materials of strata which have been melted up. Granites and rhyolites would be obtained from sandstones, and gabbros and basalts from clays. Ore deposits are similarly derived from the strata. Plants and marine animals obtain from sea-water salts of the metals, and accumulate them upon the sea-bed; and then, when the strata become metamorphosed, the heated waters passing through them are supposed to dissolve out these salts and redeposit them in fissures produced by movements of the earth's crust. The succession of life on the earth is held to depend upon the succession of the strata and formation of igneous rocks, because those phenomena also result from the change of level of land, which causes the life of one area of the earth to be displaced, and to be spread in another area, where it is superimposed upon a different group which had become fossilized in the stratum which was there accumulated. These are among the more striking theories which underlie the book, and which are set out independently of the facts. The future can alone test the value of theories. The facts form the main feature of the volume. They are given first in general exposition, and then in detailed statement, with the illustrations drawn chiefly, though by no means entirely, from our own islands. Thus the water-formed rocks are described, and then follows a short account of the character of the more striking British deposits, classed as sands, clays, slates, and limestones, arranged according to their geological antiquity. The same method is applied to the metamorphic, plutonic and volcanic rocks, and to mineral veins and ore deposits. Thus the volume departs from the ordinary plan of text-

books in giving special attention to the physical phenomena, which may be studied in our own country, and the histories of British plutonic and volcanic rocks are not the least interesting of the chapters. The palæontology is not treated at corresponding lengths; and it is impossible not to wish that Professor Seeley had at least written another chapter, showing the practical application in the history of the strata, of the principles which are termed "Elementary Ideas in Palæontology!" The distinctive characteristic of that chapter is an elaborate argument to show that just as strata of different mineral nature are superimposed on each other, owing to changes in level of land, so also the life in those strata has been superimposed. And thus the difference of fossils in successive beds is not attributed to descent from the life in the underlying deposits, or to imperfection of the geological record consequent on denudation of intervening beds, but to migration, produced by the change of land-level, which altered the sediments deposited. The summary of the succession in time of the genera of the chief groups of fossils, given in another chapter, appears to lead up to a division of the strata into new groups. In a sentence, the book, as far as it goes, is geology from the point of view of evolution. It is clearly written, well printed, and has about 150 woodcut illustrations of rock structures and fossils.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

THE Accadians, the primitive population of Babylonia and Assyria, were perhaps even a more wonderful people than the Egyptians. Almost every one could read and write, the writing material being clay, and their conquerors, the Babylonians and Assyrians, found literature so much to their taste, that they busied themselves in making interlinear translations. History, science, poetry, religion, all these were contained in the little brown tablets of which we see specimens in Museums. In B.C. 3800 the standard treatise on astronomy was of such dimensions that students were enjoined "to hand to the librarian in writing the number of the book or chapter they wished to procure," and a work on omens consisted of 137 books. As every object and force of nature had its spirit, most of which were of course evil, this knowledge of omens was indispensable. The mediæval devil has his counterpart and perhaps origin, in the Assyrian dragon of chaos, as the Christian doctrine of the resurrection of the body comes from Egypt. This belief, according to Mr. Sayce, has "its root in the old childlike superstition which confused together words and things," and originated in the idea that continued existence depended upon continued remembrance of the name. In treating of the vexed question of Egyptian Chronology, Mr. Sayce follows Mr. Mariette in believing that the dynasties are consecutive, not contemporaneous. "There were several

¹ "The Ancient Empires of the East." By A. H. Sayce. London: Macmillan & Co. 1884.

periods in the history of Egypt, it is true, when more than one line of kings was ruling in the country ; but it is clear that either Manetho or his epitomizers struck out all except the one line which was considered legitimate, and so drew up a catalogue-of successive dynasties."

Mr. Wylie's book² is of great importance in many respects. The period treated is one of which little special attention has been hitherto devoted ; in the "Epochs of Modern History" series for instance, Mr. Wylie book fills up a gap. It is a vast repository of facts collected during twelve years' research. But the chief interest of the book lies in this, that it may be regarded as a fair specimen of the kind of work which results from patient research among original Records. Like Professor Rogers—whose facts, however, he at times challenges—Mr. Wylie has chosen to write his history almost exclusively from the Patent, Close, Parliament, and other Rolls and documents preserved at the Public Record Office, where he has been a constant searcher for twelve years. The hundreds of facts elicited from these documents are guaranteed in every case by reference to the Rolls, &c. Even the least significant facts mentioned in the records, as for instance, grants out of the Exchequer, are shown by Mr. Wylie in their bearing upon contemporary affairs and their real interest thus elicited, but the text is undoubtedly overloaded with precise details. This is a fault on the right side, but because a date or a day or particular Tom, Dick or Harry may be mentioned in a record, it does not follow that they are of genuine interest. Mr. Wylie does not foist in his facts, nor permit himself any irrelevant digressions, but he connects his facts with a narrative, which must be allowed to be rather bare and irregular, though having the merit again of being founded upon contemporary chronicles only. His most highly coloured language is reserved for the headings of chapters, "Dramatis Personæ" "Revolted Mortimer" "The Pirate War" &c., being so designed, we should think, to render more palatable the vast array of circumstantial detail which they contain. As a book of reference on the other hand the book is invaluable for this period.

The inaccuracies of Mr. Green, the cautious but far from lucid remarks of Bishop Stubbs are noted. The number of names mentioned is immense and must form almost a complete repertory of all the names of persons known at that period. Mr. Wylie is also not without humour, and is alive to the advantage of placing in juxtaposition the interpretation of a generous imagination and the naked truth as expressed in irrefragable facts. The book of the expenses of the Household of "Madcap Harry" for the year ending September 30, 1404, is extant at the Record Office. It sets forth the Prince's receipts for the year at £3,025 2s. 8d., and shows a deficit at the year's end of £61 14s. 8d. The details will be found most entertaining. Shoes for twenty-three pages, including three females, £15. Offertories at church 16s. 8d., &c. This vast sum is equivalent to about £40,000 of our money. The battle of Shrewsbury is very graphically des-

² "History of England under Henry IV." By J. H. Wylie. Vol. I. London : Longmans. 1884.

cribed—"one of the worst batayles that ever came to Inglande and unkindest," a day "rather to be celebrated with tears than triumphs." But in reading any history of these times it is impossible to keep Shakespeare out of the mind. In reading of the battle of Shrewsbury, the most prominent figure to every reader must be old Falstaff. Shakespeare is and must remain the great historian of these and all times of which he has treated. All other histories must be grouped as accessories round his drama. Mr. Wylie feels himself under the spell like the rest of us; at the heading of his pages will be found line after line of "Henry IV.," quoted, while at the bottom sober references to Patent Rolls will be found supplementing them.

Mr. Wylie gives a most interesting history of the Orders of the Garter and Bath, and especially we think his remarks on the Lollards likely to dispel a great deal of verbiage which has been wasted on that subject. We may mention that a work which Mr. Wylie suggests would prove most useful, namely, a History of the Customs Revenue, has already been performed in two quarters, and will shortly be forthcoming—"a History of the Custom's Revenue," by Mr. Hubert Hall, of the Public Record Office, and in Germany, "Englische Handels-Politik in Mittelalter," by Dr. G. Schanz, Leipzig. •

Mr. Friedmann's *Anne Boleyn*³ is not a biography of Henry VIII.'s second queen, but as its title imports, a history of England from the time when the divorce case between Henry and Catherine of Arragon first brought Anne into prominence till her death in 1536. Anne's lineage was not noble—her great grandfather Sir Geoffrey Boleyn was Lord Mayor of London in the time of Henry VI.—and the pedigree devised for her in 1530 "was received with derision by the nobles of ancient descent." Shakespeare's Anne Bullen protests (to a lady friend whose conversation does little credit to her morality) that she "would not be a queen for all the world" and greater authorities than Shakespeare have been inclined to consider her a victim to the ambition of her family. It here appears, however, that she was the ruling spirit of all Henry's proceedings in his divorce from Catherine. Henry VIII. was (in Mr. Friedmann's opinion) a man of little strength of character: the way he allowed himself to be led was contemptible, "from first to last supreme power was vested in some other person than the king—some *alter rex*." It was at Anne's instigation that Henry first began to profess scruples about the legitimacy of his marriage with Catharine. The idea of a divorce seems to have been first mooted in 1527: *istud benedictum divortium* referred to in a letter from Clerk, Bishop of Bath, September 13, 1526, refers to the divorce between Henry's sister, the Queen of Scotland, and Angus. The divorce case before the Pope dragged on till 1533, when Anne procured the appointment, as Archbishop of Canterbury, of Cranmer, "an admirable deceiver," who "possessed the talent of representing the most infamous deeds in the finest words." Cranmer obtained permission (from Henry) to decide the case, and gave sentence against

³ "Anne Boleyn: a Chapter of English History. 1527-1536." By Paul Friedmann. Two Vols. London: Macmillan & Co. 1884.

Catharine, May 23, 1533. Anne, who had been privately married to Henry in the preceding January, was then crowned queen, June 1. The King's great desire was to have a son and heir. On the 7th of September, the new queen was delivered of—a daughter, Elizabeth. Anne's influence with the King did not, however, decline until in the following year he had been again disappointed in his hope of a son. Henry then began to pay attentions to other ladies, first a young lady whose name does not appear, then Margaret Shelton, Anne's cousin, and finally Jane Seymour, and in the spring of 1535 expressed a desire to discard Anne, but was deterred by hearing that this would tacitly confirm his marriage with Catharine. Catharine died January 7, 1536, and her death was so opportune for Henry, and the circumstances of it so suspicious, that there is little doubt but that she was poisoned. Henry did not conceal his joy at her death: the day after the news reached his court he "appeared in the gayest of dresses, all in yellow with a white feather in his cap," and was very merry at a ball in the afternoon. In May following, Anne was tried and executed, one of the charges against her being that she had poisoned the Queen (Catharine) and tried to poison the Princess Mary; and that she and her brother had laughed at the King and at his dress. Henry's negotiations in North Germany with the view either of acquiring the Kingdom of Denmark for himself, or of making a confederacy with Denmark and the Free Cities against the Emperor, are explained at some length. Mr. Friedmann appends some notes to prove that Anne was the eldest daughter of Sir Thomas Boleyn, the authenticity of the brief dispensation of Julius II., and other disputed points. In one of these he gives an opinion that Bishop Fisher was at liberty for a time in the Spring of 1535. It is true that Palamede Gontier in a letter to the French Admiral from England, February 5, 1535, says, that when he was at the Court on the 1st, the Duke of Norfolk asked after the Admiral's health, and so did "messieurs of Suffolk and Fischer:" but Bishop Fisher would never have been coupled thus by name with the Duke of Suffolk, and such an event as his being at court would never have been passed unnoticed by Chapuis with whom he had been plotting an insurrection in favour of Mary. If this "Fischer" was not Wiltshire he may have been Fitzwilliam the treasurer. The despatches of Eustace Chapuis when ambassador in England of the Emperor Charles V., have supplied most of the material for this history and throw a new light on many of its intricacies. Perhaps however Mr. Friedmann might have used those despatches without adopting so much of their tone. Chapuis as an Imperialist and a Churchman, sent to England to uphold the cause of Catharine, and a personal friend of that Queen and her daughter, could not but speak with bitterness of one whom all held to be the author of Catharine's misfortunes and the head promoter of heresy in England. Again what he retails about Anne was in very many cases told him by her bitter enemies who were seeking the Emperor's support to an insurrection in favour of Catharine and Mary.

In its bearing upon the question of the day, the reconstitution of

the Lower House of Parliament, an essay upon the history of the law of Election to Parliament in the Middle Ages, by Herr L. Riess,⁴ may be read with interest, not only on account of the subject, but of the painstaking manner in which this short work is performed. The author has made a careful study of the works at his command, Stubbs, Merewether, Cox, &c., *Rolls of Parliament, Parliamentary writs, &c.*—all printed works, of course—and regrets not to have had the opportunity of supplementing the information at which these works stop short, by reference to original documents in the Record Office. Careful research like this would be amply repaid in the domain of unpublished matter: the result of a study and comparison of the published works available proving so satisfactory. On many points the author is forced to join issue with Bishop Stubbs, and supports his contention in the right way by reference to the *Rolls of Parliament, &c.* He differs, for instance, from Stubbs in his computation of the number of boroughs which sent Members to Parliament. It is impossible to state, in a few words, the result arrived at. The work is entirely for students, and will be read and appreciated, at its genuine value, only by them. In mediæval times the extremely complicated nature of local government, simplified now-a-days, but still sufficiently intricate to baffle ordinary minds, tends to the discussion of many side-questions such as the relative position of “*libertates, civitates, burgi, communitates, hundredæ, ballivæ, &c.*,” and a thousand other points concerned in the government and administration of the land. Herr Riess also fixes with a greater show of reason the date of a work which has great weight on the question under discussion, the famous “*Modus tenendi Parliamentum.*” This, Sir T. D. Hardy placed in the first quarter of the fourteenth century. Herr Riess more accurately, as it appears, places it at the end of Richard II.’s reign, at the date of the original MS., which he concludes was the work of one of the king’s own clerks. This study will be accepted as a genuine addition to the student’s ideas on the subject.

It is now nearly thirty-eight years since Lord Bloomfield⁵ died, but it is certain that it could never be too late to publish such a work as that which has just been edited by Lady Georgiana Bloomfield, his daughter, and she deserves every commendation for this great addition to history. The period of Lord Bloomfield’s life was one which was most eventful to this country and the continent of Europe in general. After the fall of Napoleon the First England was the first nation to set about repairing the miseries which that imperious monarch’s insatiable ambition had brought upon so many nations, and it was a great deal owing to the men who represented her at the courts of foreign sovereigns that she maintained the position she had obtained

⁴ “*Geschichte des Wahlrechts zum englischen Parlament im Mittelalter.*” Von Ludwig L. Riess. Duncker & Humblot. London: Trübner & Co. 1885.

⁵ “*Memoirs of Benjamin, Lord Bloomfield, G.C.B., G.C.H.*” Edited by Georgiana, Lady Bloomfield. Two vols. London: Chapman & Hall, Limited. 1884.

by the glorious deeds of her armies. An outline of Lord Bloomfield's life commences the book, and from the earliest part of it we find that those characteristics which are paramount in bringing about good to others developed themselves in him as years went on. He was born on the 13th of April, 1768, entered the Academy at Woolwich when he was eleven years of age, and obtained a commission at thirteen. After a few years' service he was one of the first officers appointed to the Royal Horse Artillery at its formation in 1803. After various services he was appointed Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Court of Bernadotte, King of Sweden. Bernadotte ascended the throne of Sweden in the year 1818 under the title of Charles the Fourteenth, and, being a foreigner, the responsibilities of the British Minister were very great; but Lord Bloomfield was a man who had the full confidence of his sovereign, and during his period of service at the Swedish Court fulfilled all the trust that was confided in him. Bernadotte's career as a soldier in the Republican army of France is well known. Like Napoleon, he rose from the ranks to become the ruler of a nation, but instead of bringing his country deeper into the horrors of war, he became a man of peace, and during his twenty-five years' reign he laid the foundations of prosperity which have lasted to the present day, and are likely to last for ages to come. On the 7th of June, 1823, he sent his first official despatch to Mr. Canning, in which he states how Bernadotte assured him of his "ardent wishes to co-operate with His Majesty King George IV. most cordially in the maintenance of those relations of amity and good understanding which have so long subsisted between Sweden and Great Britain," and he proved as time went on how sincerely he spoke. Every despatch and every note in Lord Bloomfield's diary show on the one hand how sincere Bernadotte was, and, on the other hand, how much the Minister exerted himself to preserve this state of affairs between the two countries. Bernadotte had many difficulties to contend with, the chief of which was that the nation over which he ruled was on the verge of a financial crisis, but by soldierlike courage and his great liberality with his own money he eventually overcame them all. Sweden is a country which is so akin to us that we must always feel a deep interest in her—no less interest now than fifty years ago. There are many extracts from Lord Bloomfield's diary giving a very full account of that country and her resources, both agricultural and mineral, also accounts of his journeys through Norway, Denmark, and Russia, which will well repay the reader. The principal families of the country and their mode of living, their characteristics and hospitality, the latter of which he says could not be greater "even in Ireland," are noted in a most careful manner. After he left the Swedish Court he was appointed a commandant at Woolwich, a position which he held for some years. The book itself is got up in such a manner as to add a great deal to the pleasure of reading it; the print is all that could be desired, not a fault could be found with it by the most particular of readers, and this is an important point for people who have the desire to read.

Colonel Malleon, the author of "The Decisive Battles of India," continues his studies in a field in which he is so peculiarly well qualified to write—"The Battlefields of Germany,"⁶ The present volume is only the first instalment of the complete work projected by the author. Probably for the reason that trustworthy evidence is not forthcoming for a much earlier date, Colonel Malleon begins with the Thirty Years' War and describes in detail the chief military events and campaigns of that fearful struggle. Brietenfeld, the Lech, Nürnberg, Lützen, Nördlingen, Jankowitz, &c., are graphically depicted for us by a writer whose training as a soldier enables him to appreciate more accurately than we can the military issues involved in each conflict, and who is gifted at the same time with sufficient literary ability to tell his story in straightforward and simple language. The author has visited the battlefields described in this volume, and it is a pity that a book so interesting in itself is not furnished with large plans. The two maps appended are totally useless, the type is too small and confused. The last battlefield, Blenheim, is treated as we would have them all, with a large plan. Every boy has before him now-a-days in his school history a picture of the remote fields of Marathon or Arbelus; these fields which are nearer to us, and in which British troops also took part, should be treated at least not less elaborately. Carlyle's "Frederic," and Colonel Brackenbury's recent and forthcoming works cover the periods which would come for treatment in the succeeding volumes. Colonel Malleon need not hesitate on this account to continue his labours.

It is an axiom in nature that what grows quickly soon comes to an end. And the island of Hayti⁷ shows the same principle at work with constitutions, if, at least, constitutions that were pulled up before they had taken root can be said to have grown at all. Since 1805 there have been ten constitutions, republican, regal, and imperial, without counting sundry revisions. This is what the present one is worth. Article 16 states that "individual liberty is guaranteed." Comment by Sir Spenser St. John:—"Every petty official thinks he has a right to 'flanqué en prison' any one he pleases; and the next article, that accused persons must be sent before the judge named by the constitution is also forgotten, and people have been kept in prison years without redress." The punishment of death for political offences is abolished, and "there is scarcely a city in Hayti that is not red with the blood of men accused or suspected of conspiring against the government of General Salomon." The principle of liberties of worship is better observed, for even the cannibal rites of the Vaudoux are permitted to be held, and the only governments who tried to grapple with the evil, owed their fall to their action. The object of the worship is a serpent. Its cage performs the functions of the delphic tripod, and excites the priestess who stands on it to con-

⁶ "The Battlefields of Germany." By Colonel G. B. Malleon, C.S.I. Vol. I. London: Allen & Co. 1884.

⁷ "Hayti, or the Black Republic." By Sir Spenser St. John. London: Smith Elder & Co. 1884.

vulsive dancing and oracular utterances, which are augmented by the plentiful use of spirits. The ceremony ends with the sacrifice of a white cock or goat, or on special occasions, of the "goat without horns." If this victim was a white, it might be thought that the horrid practice had originated as a revenge of slaves on their masters, but this is not so. In one case which came before the courts of law, the niece of two of the principal performers, a child of twelve, was killed and eaten. And another case was reported of a woman eating her own child. "And who had a better right," she said, "est ce que ce n'est pas moi qui les ai fait?" But enough of these horrors, which seem to justify the author's opinion that the negro has no capacity to hold an independent position. "As long as he is influenced by contact with the white man, as in the Southern portion of the United States, he gets on very well. But place him free from all such influence, as in Hayti, and he shows no signs of improvement; on the contrary he is gradually retrograding to his African tribal customs, and without exterior pressure will fall into the state of the inhabitants of the Congo. If this were only my opinion, I should hesitate to express it so positively, but I have found no dissident voice among experienced residents since I first went to Hayti in January, 1863."

The first volume only of this work has, so far, appeared, and it seems to have been written under very great mental excitement. It is for the most part an attempt to prove three things. First, that Dr. Colenso, the late Bishop of Natal, was right in interfering both with the Home and Cape Governments in the settlement of the affairs of Zululand⁸ after it was conquered, and of necessity broken up. Secondly, that part of a deputation of Zulu chiefs who were to have attended Sir Evelyn Wood's meeting on the 31st of August, 1881, at Inhlazatohe, the head-quarters of the Resident in Zululand, were delayed on account of the wet weather, and did not arrive until after his departure. Thirdly, that the officials, from the Colonial Secretary in England down to the lowest servant connected with the Office for Native Affairs, were one and all concerned in a conspiracy to bring down everlasting misery on those Zulus who professed a desire for the return of Cetshwayo to his own country. Bishop Colenso's correspondence with the authorities, which is very extensively quoted, appears to have been carried out in that temperate spirit which is always expected from a man of his dignity and learning, and it certainly was an unfortunate circumstance that the hand of fate should have cut him off from all hope of guiding the pen of the authoress of this work to more temperate language. The intention of the authoress has evidently been to lay before the world at large the wrongs which she had come to the conclusion this tribe of blood-thirsty savages, whose power had just been broken, were suffering from, but in her attempt to do this she has cursed the people altogether instead of

⁸ "The Ruin of Zululand." An account of British doings in Zululand since the invasion of 1879. By Frances Ellen Colenso. Two vols. Being a sequel to the "History of the Zulu War," by Frances Ellen Colenso and Lieut. Colonel Edward Durnford. London: William Ridgway, 169, Piccadilly. 1884.

blessing them. After the war it was utterly impossible to reinstate the Zulu nation in its former position, and Lord Wolseley's "Settlement of Zululand," which this work condemns in such strong language, was accepted as the basis of the future government of that country. It cannot be supposed for one moment that it was quite perfect, but the principles of it were good, and by acting upon them the troubles of Zululand will soon be no more heard of.

Although the tone of the chiefs who attended on the various deputations seems to have been on the whole temperate, there is a substratum of what appears to be contempt, and a desire to defy all those who were put in authority. The Resident in Zululand was directly responsible for the conduct of those to whom he gave passes to enter Natal; and any breach of faith on their parts would have been visited on him. The whole Zulu nation might have applied for passes, and according to the argument laid down by the authoress, the Resident would not have been justified in refusing their request. Instead of showing a desire to help the authorities, this work clearly shows that there was an attempt to frustrate them, and especially the Resident in Zululand, in their duty to the Government which they had undertaken to serve faithfully. The return of Cetshwayo after his period of detention at Cape Coast Castle, was welcomed by most of the Zulu nation, but it was just as well that his restoration did not occur sooner, as undoubtedly the country was not in a fit state to receive him, and from the following paragraph it appears that excitement must have run very high, if we are to credit it as the feelings of that nation:—"But it is only by assuming universal, senseless, and persistent lying on the part of all the respectable Zulus, and by the exercise of a blind belief in all official statements, however improbable or even contradictory, that we can avoid coming to the conclusion that nearly the whole Zulu nation desired Cetshwayo's return, and that the whole strength and ingenuity of the Natal Government was employed to suppress the feeling and to conceal the fact" (p. 240). Feelings of this kind are sufficient to destroy the peace of any nation, in spite of the efforts of those who are its real well-wishers, and of those who devote their time and experience to the bringing about of its prosperity: the Zulu nation had plenty of champions in Great Britain. It could not be supposed that everything connected with Zululand could be settled without some injustices being done; that injustice was done there can be no shadow of a doubt, especially the appointment of John Dunn as one of the thirteen chiefs, a man whose character is pretty well known in England. It is a universal matter of regret that the Zulu war took place, but the arguments that are used against it in this work do not in any way help to dispel the idea that there were good reasons for it—viz., that Cetshwayo was not responsible for the murders in his country; in other words, that he was not fit to rule it; he also had his *impi* armed to the teeth, and ready to overrun Natal. It is impossible that a book of this kind can do anything but mischief.

The colossal labours of Dr. H. v. Holst, Professor at Freiburg, on the political and constitutional development of the United States since the period of the Union, are scarcely known amongst ordinary readers in this country. Nor is it wonderful that it should be so. The author has set himself the thankless task of collecting materials, forcing the hopeless mass of original sources to yield up its secrets, and therefrom firmly establishing certain fundamental propositions. In a word, Dr. Holst's ambition has been to relieve from all manner of heavy work every possible successor. "My labours," says Dr. v. Holst, "may fatigue the ordinary reader (about 3,000 pages of octavo). My successors, however, will have this great advantage. The propositions which I have been compelled to prove from original sources may be taken by them as incontrovertibly established, and they will be able to set them forth for the future in as many lines as it has required pages from me." There is no doubt some truth in this view. Dr. v. Holst's labours are perhaps indispensable for the student. Almost half the type consists of extracts from contemporary journals, speeches and pamphlets. But to the general reader the manner, the style, the execution of the work is appalling: he rises gasping from the mere length and involution of the sentences, and feels that he must patiently await the arrival of some writer who will relieve him similarly from the unspeakable labour of reading Dr. v. Holst. This is confessedly all that the Doctor would desire.

Carlyle used to quote a saying of Goethe, that on the lives of remarkable men ink and paper should least be spared. Mr. Froude¹⁰ has not fallen short of his duty as a biographer—in this respect, at least. Nine stout octavo volumes is the number now reached on Carlyle and his wife. With the "Reminiscences," the "Letters of Mrs. Carlyle," and the "Life of Carlyle" by Mr. Froude, there is now accumulated so much circumstantial detail, that thousands of readers may feel that they know more of the inner and outer life of the Carlyles than they are ever likely to know of the lives of their most intimate friends. Mr. Froude has been severely censured on almost every hand for delivering up to the world's gaze the most secret details of Carlyle's private life. He has been not a little moved by this overwhelming censure, and in the present volumes pleads Carlyle's express commands. It will be retorted that Carlyle was not in a fit state of mind at the time to be a judge of his own affairs; he was morbidly remorseful on account of his occasional want of consideration for his wife, and extravagantly self-accusatory. He ordered the publication of his wife's letters in order that he might assail his guilty soul by confession before the world, and she obtain the honours of martyrdom, as a posthumous recompense for her sufferings here below. Mr. Froude, it is generally considered, has been indiscreet in carrying out too literally the com-

⁹ "Verfassungs-geschichte der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika seit der Administration Jackson's." Von Dr. H. v. Holst. London: Trübner. Four vols. 1873-1884.

¹⁰ "Thomas Carlyle: a History of his Life in London, 1834-81." By J. A. Froude. Two vols. London: Longmans & Co.

mands of a man recently bereft of his wife, whom solitude and brooding had rendered morbid and unreasonable. As a consequence of this indiscretion, opinion, which has frequently during this century changed with regard to Carlyle, has veered round from the point of high favour to the opposite point of the most chilling condemnation, and set there steadily. It will be instructive to consider these various changes of opinion, as it shifted from point to point; we may then be enabled to estimate the share which Mr. Froude has had in it. It would be difficult to say at what period Carlyle found himself at daggers drawn with the world in general. Go back as far as you will, that was his customary attitude, whether in London, writing "Frederic," or "Chartism," or the "French Revolution," or at Ecclefechan writing "Sartor," or as a student at Edinburgh, or wooing his wife at Dumfries, or even under his paternal roof, proving himself 'gey ill to live wi' to his mother, who worshipped her eldest born. Not that he was necessarily in the wrong: his was not the opposition of the ill-conditioned cub which cannot get all it wants. A certain amount of "ill-condition" was a concomitant of dyspepsia; but his quarrel with the world was never so much through his belly as in his heart. After a short period of wavering and vacillation, he finally, about the time of his marriage—which itself was a triumph against the world—took up his ultimate position, and in "Sartor" issued his manifesto, to the effect that all men are hollow shams, but they cannot cloak their vanity or foolishness before him. In this book he openly threw down the gauntlet to the world. He did more: he became oracular. He—we will not say posed—but assumed the power and the mission of a prophet. And certainly no prophet of the Hebrews met with more dogged, obstinate, stiff-necked resistance. Only amongst a very few chosen friends did he win his way. The world and the world's ways he scorned. His shoes, his hats, and his coats; his butter, his bacon, and his meal; his books, his literature, and his ideas, he obtained not as other men did: he got them all in his own peculiar way. He scorned the world; the world repelled him; he redoubled his scorn. Had the world not resented being called a gigantic fool, it would long ago have admitted Carlyle to have been a superlatively wise man. Very slowly the world came round to this view; and the nearest approach to reconciliation was made, as Mr. Froude points out, at the time of Carlyle's inauguration speech as Rector of Edinburgh University, when he said: "Don't suppose that because people are hostile to you, that they bear you any ill-will. You may often feel as if the whole world was obstructing you, setting itself against you; but you will find that to mean that the world is travelling in a different way, and, rushing in its own paths, heedlessly treads on you. That is mostly all. To you there is no specific ill-will." After that memorable declaration all unfriendly tongues ceased to exclaim, all hostile pens to write, "until," says Mr. Froude, "his death set them loose again." Quite so. But was it his death? Or was it not rather Mr. Froude, in publishing his "Reminiscences?" A flood of hostile criticism welled up against those unfortunate "Reminiscences." The author

of "Obiter Dicta" asks, "What were they?" He answers, the morbid outpourings of a diseased heart, the bilious ill-temper of a solitary stricken spirit. They were written immediately after his wife's death, during the time that Carlyle was also annotating in that morbid way his wife's letters with such extravagant self-accusation. They were not the writings of a man in a reasonable frame of mind. The view of things taken in them is throughout palpably jaundiced. And yet the world has read them, and taken them literally. Mr. Froude is not altogether to be blamed for that: his is a sin of omission rather than of commission. He should have frankly admitted this at first, still the fault lay chiefly with the stupidity and dulness of readers themselves. Where in any other of Carlyle's writings will be found that virulence and ill-nature which characterize them? As to the *severity* of many of the judgments and estimates of things and persons therein contained, that can be easily paralleled elsewhere; and we believe that Carlyle's estimate will be accepted more frequently than not by the next century. But the ill-nature is not natural to him. Not only Mr. Froude, but every one who understood the man, has spoken of his genial inspiring nature in the same enthusiastic terms. "We generally found Mrs. Carlyle alone," says Mr. Froude, "then he would come down, take possession of the conversation, and deliver himself in a splendid strain of monologue—wise, tender, scornful, humorous, as the inclination took him, but never bitter, never malignant, always genial, the fiercest denunciations ending in a burst of laughter at his own exaggerations." People should remember this. Carlyle, like many other men of genius, was often "intoxicated with his own verbosity." He does not soberly mean all that he says, and particularly one's eyes should never be shut to the humorous side of his writings, in which antithetic and picturesque extravagance is a large ingredient. If then, people have gone wrong, since the publication of Mr. Froude's works on the Carlyles, in their judgment, we believe, that in the end, Carlyle's great test, the test of fact, will secure for him the best judgment which he deserves. We do not need Mr. Froude to tell us that few men of this or any century ever had such a powerful, all-spiriting, all-compelling influence on his friends as Carlyle had in actual life, or who has become, as Goethe predicted, a new moral force in Europe. To illustrate that proposition is not fitting on the present occasion. We are concerned not with Carlyle as a writer, but with Mr. Froude as a biographer. He has completed his work on the whole in a way we may be thankful for. He has shown us Carlyle, and not himself. We feel that nothing has been suppressed, not even the most painful details; and for our own parts, we are thankful for being taught these facts.

Mr. Stuart J. Reid has most undoubtedly added a treasure to literature in the production of this biography of the Rev. Sydney Smith,¹¹ which will most certainly be read with great delight. The biographer keeps in view the point which is essentially necessary for the success of such a work as this, and that point is not to wander away too much into

¹¹ "A Sketch of the Life and Times of the Rev. Sydney Smith." By Stuart J. Reid. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington. 1884.

the history of other individuals who are of necessity introduced into the scene. There is not a particle of anything that can be termed tedious in it, as is so often the case in biographies of men quite as remarkable as the Rev. Sydney Smith; there is also an evident desire to state clearly, and to support the statements by good testimony, what the public and private character of this remarkable man were, and that by placing it all in a fair manner before the world, that the wide world, to which he is familiar, will give its opinion that he undoubtedly deserves a higher place amongst the memorials of men, whose abilities have added something to the political and social welfare of their country, than the modest monument which marks his grave in Kensal Green Cemetery. The *Edinburgh Review*, which, for the first twenty-five years of its existence, was to a great extent supported by his great abilities, is a monument which will last as long as any marble, and will explain the power he yielded to some effect, better than any epitaph. His private life is undoubtedly exemplary, and connected with his public life are many recollections which must evoke an amount of thankfulness from no small number of British subjects, as his labours truly had some effect in bringing about the emancipation of the Catholics—it is impossible to say that his labours on that point were in vain—and he most certainly helped to a great extent to confer upon a vast number of his fellow-countrymen a benefit which they are not at all likely to forget. His power was also felt in America in the form of a petition to the House of Congress at Washington, praying it to institute some measures for the restoration of American credit, and the repayment of debts which had been repudiated by some of the States, which had great effect, and many an American now blesses the memory of the man who aided in removing what would have been a blot on that honest country's name to the end of time. His wit, which was of that kind that it seldom hurt the feelings of any one, deserves the true definition of the word—"the association of ideas in a manner natural, but unusual and striking, so as to produce surprise joined with pleasure." His letters are written with few words but are full of meaning. The following extract from one of them shows his delight at the hold Whig opinions had taken on the Scotch people shortly before the great meeting which was held in Edinburgh on the 19th of December, 1820:—"The Tories in Edinburgh are in despair. Some are taking poisoned meal, others scratching themselves to death, others tearing their red hair and their high cheek-bones, and calling on the Scotch gods, *Scabies and Fames*."

International Exhibitions, Penny Postage, and the improvement in the state and custody of the Public Records, were all due to the late Sir Henry Cole,¹³ if we take him at his own valuation. "See what a dust I raise," said the Fly on the chariot wheel. "Mr. Lowe said he was struck with my resources." "Spencer Ponsonby said I made a first-rate master of the ceremonies." "I determined to go out of town and leave such a commission (that for the Exhibition of 1851)

¹³ "Fifty Years of Public Work of Sir Henry Cole, K.C.B." Two vols. London: George Bell & Sons. 1884.

to itself." "I said I must have everything at my disposal." "Mr. Forster said I was the only despot that could have made the procession walk a mile." Lord Granville "asked my leave to take his nieces into the building. It was a fact one could never forget in official life." These traits of self-importance occur throughout the book, and really have the salutary effect of making it amusing. Besides, to those who do not remember the first Exhibition in 1851, the account of the difficulties of getting it up, the squabbles over the building, and the fear of riots (the number of soldiers in London was immensely increased for the occasion), will seem like chapters of ancient history, so common-place is a great Exhibition at the present day.

It is a capital device to make an obnoxious rule ridiculous, and this is one of Sir Henry's successful moves in favour of penny postage. It will be remembered that letters containing more than one piece of paper were charged double postage, irrespective of weight. "Two letters were prepared, one being a large sheet of paper weighing under an ounce. If kept dry it was charged only as single postage, but if it became damp and turned the scale of one ounce even by a grain, it would be raised to fourfold postage. Another letter, weighing under eight grains, was also prepared. It consisted of two pieces of thin paper, and therefore was charged as a double letter. Fifty of each specimens were sent to the Charing Cross Post-office, by a clerk who had some humour. He produced first one of the largest letters. The clerk looked at it suspiciously. He held it before the lamp to see if it were really a single sheet. He summoned another clerk to help his judgment. All this caused a delay, and a crowd began to collect at the window, who watched the process with interest. At last the clerk marked it with the single rate, and the spectators laughed. Then the smallest letter was produced, and the Post-office official turned crimson, became furious, and cursed a little, but he could not help marking it double postage. Roars of laughter came from the crowd. Then fifty more of each letter were produced and marked—the large heavy ones with single postage, the little light ones with double. During the process the crowd impatiently filled up the whole of the pavement and scoffed. No less amusement was produced in the House of Commons when Mr. Wallace exhibited the big and little letters." Specimens of these letters are appended to the book. The single letter measured, when open, 35 inches by 23, and when folded 13½ inches by 9½. The double letter was two pieces of paper measuring 4 inches by 2½ inches, and when folded 2½ by 1½ inches. The specimens of early Christmas cards and art manufactures designed by Sir Henry are very Philistine as compared with similar productions of the present day.

The "Life and Letters of Bayard Taylor"¹³ is a work which cannot be too highly praised, and it is well worthy of the illustrious American, whose whole life was devoted to the causes of poetry and literature

¹³ "Life and Letters of Bayard Taylor." Edited by Marie Hansen-Taylor and Horace K. Souder. Two vols. London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row. 1884.

with so much success. Seldom indeed has such a complete collection of the letters of such a man been placed before the public; and it is to be hoped that the few that still remain unpublished may soon be at their disposal. These letters are certain to be read eagerly by all who have been fortunate enough to make themselves acquainted with Bayard Taylor's works. Americans will take an especial delight in them, and will perhaps feel prouder of him now that they have the whole history of his life before them; they claim him as a poet, and they are always jealous of the claims they possess to such men; a poet he undoubtedly was and as such they are sure to preserve his name as an honour to their country. Bayard Taylor, as appears by this biography, was born in 1825, and was the son of a farmer in Pennsylvania, who was by means well-off; in fact, the prospects of his son receiving a good education were small; but at an early age his natural abilities discovered themselves, and at sixteen we find him far advanced as a scholar in spite of his father's inability to send him to college. In a letter to his mother, dated March 18, 1840, he tells her:—

Having now completed astronomy, I am principally studying the languages, and have made such proficiency in French that I am able to read Voltaire in his native language.

Again, in his autobiographic sketch, he says:—

From my twelfth year I wrote continually—poems, novels, or historical essays, but principally poems. I read Ovid and Racine in the original; Milton, Scott, Byron, and Wordsworth, as well as all the other American and English authors I could lay hands on.

His poetic talent was the one which he desired most of all to cultivate, and it was with great difficulty that he was able to satisfy this desire owing to his want of means, which forced him to obtain occupation first as a teacher, a life which was evidently very distasteful to him, and afterwards, in the year 1842, to become apprentice to a printer and publisher, who owned a small country newspaper, for a term of four years; during this latter period he found time, however, to cultivate his taste for poetry, and several of his poems appeared in print, and his first fifteen were published, by the aid of subscriptions amongst his friends, under the title of "Vimeira; or, the Battle of the Sierra Morena, and other Poems." It was before the publication of this book of poems that he wrote a letter to a friend in which he confessed as follows:—"It is useless to deny that I have cherished hopes of occupying at some future day a respectable station among our country's poets;" and that cherished hope was in after years fulfilled, as, "A Book of Romances, Lyrics, and Songs," "The Poet's Journal," "The Picture of St. John," "Lars," his translation of "Faust" into English, and "Prince Deukalion," appeared in succession, to be admired by all Americans and most Europeans. He was also a "marked man" as an historian, traveller, and novel writer, as besides his letters to the *Tribune*, such valuable works as "Views Afoot," "Eldorado; or, Adventures in the Path of Empire," comprising a Voyage to California,

viâ Panama, Life in San Francisco and Monterey, Pictures of the Gold Region, and Experiences of Mexican Travel; "A Journey to Central Africa, &c." "Byways of Europe," and others were rapidly published and universally read. "A Journey to Central Africa," which describes his journey of about five months' duration in 1851-2 up the Nile to Khartoum, and from thence up the White Nile to the country of the Shilooks, and his return to Cairo, is perhaps the most interesting account of his travels. Very soon after his return from Central Africa he started for Hong Kong to join the expedition under Commodore Perry, which was going to visit Japan. His journey to Hong Kong is best described in his own language; he writes thus to a friend:—

"Southampton, October 28, 1852. I leave here to-morrow in the *Madras* for Gibraltar, where I stop and take three weeks to visit Scville, Cordova, and the Alhambra. Then I take the next steamer direct to Bombay, go overland to Calcutta, *viâ* the old Indian cities of Delhi, Agra, and Benares, and the Himalayas; embark for Singapore, Batavia and Hong Kong; visit Manila and the Sandwiches; and will probably find my way home, *viâ* California, sometime next September."

This plan was carried out almost to the letter, and is fully described in his interesting work, "A Visit to India, China and Japan, in the year 1853." In 1878 he received the appointment as Minister to the Court at Berlin, where the short remaining time of his life was spent in his "duty to his Government and in the interest of his fellow citizens."

People in general like to know something of the life of a man like Doctor Humphrey Sandwith¹⁶ who had so many excellent opportunities of finding out the characters of races with whom this country has had so much to do of late years, and it is by reading the experiences of such men that we can obtain the means of forming a true idea of what our future actions towards those races should be. This biography, which has been compiled by his nephew, Mr. Thomas Humphrey, is deserving of a successful career, and we feel sure that it will be duly appreciated, not only for the very free and open manner in which Doctor Sandwith's vast experiences are given, but for the very excellent example it gives to others of that noble profession of which he was a member to lend their aid in cases where it is so urgently required. It also shows how men may accomplish great things although they may be beset with great obstacles. Doctor Sandwith himself was a man who began life with anything but very bright prospects before him, but he had that natural born idea that his career was not to be gone through without doing some good in the world, and he knew that this could only be accomplished by sheer hard work and the very greatest self-denials. With these thoughts and the feeling that the very lowest of human beings was worthy of his assistance in the time of need, he rose to a position which might well be envied by people of much higher social rank. Very few men have had such ex-

¹⁶ "Humphrey Sandwith: a Memoir, compiled from Autobiographical Notes." By his Nephew, Thomas Humphrey Ward. London, Paris, and New York: Cassell & Co., Limited. 1884.

perience amongst the people whose country has been the theatre of the greatest European troubles during the last forty years, and his opinions can be read just now with profit, as the few years that have elapsed since his death have proved how right his judgments were. His works are well known to the reading public, and they have had their effect on the minds of a great many people with respect to the Eastern Question. Beginning his eventful career at Constantinople in the year 1849, he learnt the characters of the Turkish officials with whom this country had so much to do, and his opinion of them certainly does not give one an idea that they were a very trustworthy lot; recent events have tended more and more to impress this opinion on the British public. His experiences of war were very extensive, as he was present at the great campaigns of 1854, the Franco-Prussian war of 1870, the Servian war of 1876-7, and the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-8, in all of which he rendered great service to the sick and wounded. An extract from his MS. gives an opinion of Osman Pasha, which is not flattering but which is probably the fact:—

Osman is considered a great hero: I think him a great ruffian. He blundered into position at Plevna, and there entrenched himself, and when his troops had repulsed the Russian assault and thrown them into confusion, he stupidly failed to follow up his advantages. Had he done so, the Russians would have been driven into the Danube, for a panic prevailed after the first repulse; but Osman allowed the enemy to recover himself, and gradually to bring up reinforcements in sufficient numbers to hem in the Turkish forces. The Russians so entrenched themselves, where necessary, that the position of the Turks was hopeless long before they capitulated. Meantime, Osman refused flags of truce, or to entertain any measure for mitigating the horrors of the war. After each assault the Russian wounded on the glacis were left to perish slowly of hunger, thirst, and fever. Osman behaved as a sulky savage, and treated his own wounded brutally.*

His personal experiences of the siege of Kars are fully given in his well-known work: "A Narrative of the Siege of Kars," London, 1856, but the account his biographer gives is well worth reading; it is advisable for any one who has not read either to commence with this biography. Lord Beaconsfield's policy with regard to the "Eastern Question" is severely criticized and condemned, and his reasons for such criticism and condemnation are very fully set forth. This work illustrates the great feature of Dr. Sandwith's character, which was his love of humanity and his utter unselfishness. The language he used in the above quoted extract shows how he abhorred Osman for his inhuman action in leaving the Russian wounded to die of hunger, thirst, and fever when such as himself were at hand to render them assistance. To the last day of his life he used his abilities and experiences in the attempt to point out to English statesmen the proper course to pursue with regard to the "Eastern Question."

"A Forgotten Genius"¹⁸ is the title which Mr. Mackenzie Bell gives to

¹⁸ "A Forgotten Genius: Charles Whitehead. A Critical Monograph." By H. T. M. Bell. London: Elliot Stock, 1884.

his monograph on Charles Whitehead, the author of "Richard Savage," and "The Cavalier," the associate and collaborateur of Charles Dickens. "Richard Savage" is still to be seen sometimes on railway bookstalls, but Whitehead's poems are so completely forgotten, that when Mr. Hall Caine included one of his sonnets in "Sonnets of Three Centuries," he was not able to give a correct version of it. The life is a sad one—imaginative talent applied to base objects, such as the lives of highway men and hangmen; and the chances of youth destroyed by intemperance.

But, as he says himself in his principal poem, "The Solitary,"

Judge him not harshly : he is sunk too low
 For thee to exalt thy worthier self upon ;
 The happiness he sought thou canst not know,
 The misery he found thou hast not known ;
 The need of glory was not his alone.
 Bare is the summit of Parnassus' station ;
 And cold the fountain pure of Helicon,
 Thou hast not felt the great, the mad temptation,
 The hell—the heaven—the paradise—the deep damnation.

We suppose that even Mr. Thoms could not dispute the age of Sir Moses Montefiore.¹⁶ The date of his birth, the 24th of October, 1784, at Leghorn, is beyond dispute, no people being more careful than Jews in all that relates to genealogy. He was the first Jew to receive the order of knighthood in England, but it had been offered by George III. to one of his uncles before him, for services in the colonization of the Island of Bulama. This uncle was the first Jew to hold a commission in the army in England. Sir Moses himself began life as a stockbroker, on the safe principle that it is better to earn one pound than toss for two, at a time when only twelve Jews were allowed to practise as brokers in the city, and twelve or fifteen hundred pounds had to be paid for the privilege. His business life did not last long, for he had made his fortune by the time he was forty, and since then all his energies have been spent in helping his people throughout the world. Not caring for what is called public life, for making speeches or sitting in parliament, he was always ready to go to any part of the world where Jews were persecuted, and use his money and influence to obtain redress. Though his scheme for colonizing Palestine was frustrated by the death of Mehemet Ali, the western suburb of Jerusalem, where nearly 4,000 Jews, most of them freeholders, reside, is one result of his efforts. In religious matters he was a strong Conservative, and though he helped to break down the wall of division between the Ashkenazim and the Sephardim, he was very strongly opposed to the formation of the Reformed Synagogue in 1841, though he probably sees now that it has not done so much harm as he anticipated.

Economical history, which forms the connecting link between pure political economy and general history, is becoming of daily increasing interest to us. We have only to call to mind the recent works of

¹⁶ "Sir Moses Montefiore." By Lucien Wolf. London: John Murray. 1884.

Professor Rogers and Mr. Seebohm. Last year, also, Mr. Cunningham published a handbook on the subject. A "study" on Karl Marx,¹⁷ before us, attempts in a brochure of eighty pages to give a résumé of the opinions of the author of "Capital"—a work of equal interest both to the historical student and the student of political economy. Marx's writings are almost universally discredited through his connexion with the cause of communism and democratic socialism. That cause will be long in recovering from the reproach which it brought upon itself in 1873, when on the first occasion upon which its theory was applied to the practical affairs of life, it resulted in the orgy of the Parisian Commune. Karl Marx was ready at that time to shout with the loudest: "Proletariats of all nations, unite together, and free yourselves from the bondage of your oppressors—the capitalists." That ingenuous enthusiasm does not impugn the validity of Marx's arguments; it only shows him to have been a fool in judging the hearts of men. His high-strung manifestoes, like all emotional political writing, are composed of hard words which hurt no one. "The masses will never be roused," as Dr. Gross rightly observes, "by abstract, philosophical criticism of that kind." On the other hand, the significance of such high-class writing as "Capital," should not be depreciated on account of the author's miscalculated enthusiasm. "Capital" is a work which touches questions which are nearest to us to-day, and will be nearer still to-morrow. The history of capitalism, especially in England, therein contained, will guide the student in comprehending the fundamental forces at work and causing the various and conflicting phenomena of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, such as the growth of the farmers and the growth of the towns combined with increased taxation and a poor-law. Dr. Gross treats his theme rather from the economist's than from the historian's point of view; his eye is fixed on the future more than on the past. The brochure, however, is rather a résumé than a critique, though criticisms are not wanting. It is pointed out, for example, that Marx's special value is to be found in his account of the actual state of labour in England, and in his opinions on the "division of labour," and the significance of machinery. Dr. Gross's study, however, does not pretend to be an exhaustive treatise.

The most interesting of Mr. Max Müller's "Biographical Essays,"¹⁸ are those which treat of the founder and leaders of the Brahṃā Samāj, of Rammohun Roy and his successors. Rammohun Roy, a member of the Brahman caste, endeavoured to reform the popular idolatrous religion, by appealing to the Vedas as inspired, exactly as Wicliff and Luther attempted to purify popular Christianity by disregarding mediæval accretions and going back to the Holy Scriptures as the sole rule of faith. At that time his Vedas had been scarcely studied, and a fuller acquaintance with their contents led the Brahṃā Samāj to declare their dethronement from their place

¹⁷ "Karl Marx." By Dr. Gustav Gross. Duncker & Humblot. 1885.

¹⁸ "Biographical Essays." By F. Max Müller. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1884.

of authority. Mr. Müller thinks there is nothing analogous to this in the history of religion, but it is very much what has happened with some of the advanced sects of Christianity, the Society of Friends for instance, and Unitarians. No Christian missionaries would now rebuke an Indian for publishing selections from the New Testament, because it was exercising his private judgment on what was sacred. What Rammohun Roy wanted for India was what many Christians want for England, "a Christianity purified of all mere miracles, and relieved of all theological rust and dust, whether it dated from the first council or from the last." The society has now split in two. The founder did not wish to have religion denationalized, and would never give up the wearing of the Sacred Thread, but Keshub Chunder Sen, who looked further afield than India and sought and found spiritual sustenance in the Christian Bible and the Mahommedan Koran, insisted on the removal of this last sign of the old religion, at which the more conservative party rebelled. The new society is the more active; starts journals, opens schools, and is making great efforts to raise the women of India so as to obtain their co-operation in the cause of social and religious reform.

There are also a memoir of Bunyiu Nanjio, a young Buddhist priest from Japan, who came to Oxford to study Sanscrit, and compiled the catalogue of Chinese and Japanese books and MSS. at the Bodleian before returning to his native country; and appreciative notices of Bunsen, Kingsley, and other Europeans.

The public are indebted to Mr. Boulger for a very interesting collection of General Gordon's letters.¹⁹ They were written to members of his family, and extend over a period of more than four years from the time of his appointment to the Royal Engineers. Mr. Boulger, in his preface, says:—"The historian (*i.e.* Kinglake) has duly recorded and described the progress of events up to the period at which General Gordon's Crimean experiences began; but he has not yet reached that point at which the narrative of events to be found in the following pages really commences. They have, therefore, an intrinsic value apart from that given them by the name of their author." General Gordon was sent out to the Crimea in charge of the huts, and to superintend their putting up. He arrived at Balaclava early in January, 1855. Most of the striking events of the campaign were over by that time, but still there was much arduous work to be done in the trenches, and many a valuable life was to be lost before Sebastopol was ours.

But Gordon was not the man to shrink from hard work. From the first his steadfast resolution of purpose, his unswerving devotion to duty, shine forth as clearly as they did in after times in China and Africa. A life of action was to him a life of enjoyment.

The difficulties to be encountered only strengthened in him the desire of overcoming them, and we find him at the

¹⁹ "General Gordon's Letters from the Crimea, the Danube and Armenia, August 1854, to November 17, 1858." Edited by Demetrius C. Boulger, Author of the "History of China." London: Chapman & Hall. 1884.

close of the war writing regretfully. "We do not, generally speaking, like the thoughts of peace until after another campaign. I shall not go to England, but expect I shall remain abroad for three or four years, which, individually, I would rather spend in war than peace. There is something indescribably exciting in the former." When not on duty he occupied his time in making sketches and plans of the operations. He speaks constantly of the wonderful courage shown by the Russians, but does not commend their sanitary arrangements. "The Russians," he says, "live in a filthy state, and keep their camps in the same. You can detect them a mile off." In May, 1856, he was ordered to join an expedition under Colonel Stanton, R.E., to survey for a new frontier. At the Paris Congress, in 1856, it was determined to eloin the Russians from the Danube and its tributary lakes and streams. Commissioners were sent by France, Russia, Austria, and England to survey the boundary and compare it with the Russian maps. The expedition was quite successful in settling the question, though not greatly to the satisfaction of the Russians. In March, 1857, Gordon accompanied Colonel Simmons, who had been sent out to plan an Asiatic boundary between Russia and Turkey. His descriptions of scenes in the neighbourhood of Mount Ararat are not the least interesting portion of this book.

In the advertisement prefixed to the "Letters of the Rev. J. B. Mozley D.D.,"²⁰ the editress remarks that a series of letters in chronological order insensibly grows into a biography without any such design in the selector. This modest statement hardly prepares the reader for the literary skill with which the editress has woven her loose threads into a complete work, and while effecting this end by a succession of delicate touches, has kept in the back-ground and given to the public what is in effect an autobiography. James Mozley was born at Gainsborough in Lincolnshire on the 15th of September, 1813. On the 1st of April 1826, then being at Grantham Grammar School, he writes to his sister :—

I often think how much more agreeably you spend your time than I do mine, since I'm surrounded on every side by masters (*i.e.*, elder schoolfellows who bullied him). So I think I may complain in the words of the Psalmist, "Heavy oxen come about me, fat bulls of Bashan close me in on every side."

This letter is followed by an amusing correspondence with his brother, Thomas Mozley, the author of the "Reminiscences," then at Oriel, where James Mozley himself entered on his first term in October, 1830. The elder brother abounds in shrewd advice concerning the studies of the younger. At Oxford, James Mozley became the friend and disciple of John Henry Newman, and fought by his side in the early struggles of the Oxford movement until the secession of his leader from the Church of England. Such a defection was a crushing blow to the High Church party, and James Mozley was

²⁰ "Letters of the Rev. J. B. Mozley, D.D., late Canon of Christ Church and Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford." Edited by his Sister. London: Rivingtons. 1884.

forced by a strong sense of duty into controversial differences with his friend. This was evidently a turning-point of his life and the pain he doubtless suffered strengthened both his judgment and the force of his character. To those who doubt whether life is worth having these letters may be commended. They disclose unconsciously a noble mind animated to earnest endeavours by worthy aims, and a pure heart, faithful, if not demonstrative in its affections. No reader will doubt that James Mozley's was a life worth living. There is however, an interest in the volume, apart from its principal subject or literary style, in the sketches and criticisms of men famous in modern history which the letters contain. The first Duke of Wellington and Lord Brougham appear in their old age. Mr. Gladstone, Cardinal Newman, Dr. Pusey and others hardly less interesting, in their youth or prime; and this with all the clearness of a first impression giving the effect of a sketch from life rather than that of a drawing from memory. Humorous touches abound. One or two extracts will give some idea of Dr. Mozley's powers of description. To his sister on the 11th of July 1839 he writes (p.87):—

The Chevalier Bunsen has been here staying with Acland at All Souls. Of course he has been made a lion, and dined and breakfasted at many places; among the rest in our common room with Newman, where I saw him. He is a short corpulent man with a bright red face and sharp eyes, decidedly clever looking, but you would not think him a philosopher. He is a prodigious talker—literally talks unceasingly—and has a most amusing way of silencing others by lifting up his finger. If anyone seems disposed to interrupt him he says "Oh, I'm going to that; I'll tell you that presently;" and goes on swimmingly as before. However he is really amusing and therefore no one complains.

Again, on the 25th of February, 1841 (p. 111):—

I heard rather an amusing account of a young lady's visit to Oxford last term. The young lady who had come to Pusey in such deep distress and religious perplexity, it seems was flaunting about with young gentlemen a good deal of the time, shopping, going down the river, and amusing herself very pleasantly—dear good Pusey all the time being full of pity and concern for her painful state of doubt and anxiety. A certain young kidgloved and scented gentleman of ——— College was a particular favourite of the young lady, but she had several others as well, and used to go about quite *comitata caterva* as we say in the classics, surrounded by a bodyguard of handsome young gentlemen. Pusey had ventured to suggest that she might dress a little more soberly, but had been answered by her sister, "Would he have young ladies go about like nuns?"

In the year 1847 Mr. Gladstone was elected as member for the University; Dr. Mozley took a very prominent part in the contest, and shows a natural delight in the result. In the term subsequent to his election Mr. Gladstone visits Oxford and Dr. Mozley writes to his sister (p. 187):—

Gladstone has been here this week, I met him on Monday at Greswell's. He did his part very well, but had to make a speech which was somewhat gloomy in its forebodings. He talked of changes and movements in a way not gratifying to established institutions, and the difficulties in which men in Parliament would be placed.

The fun of the evening was a speech of Greswell's, who congratulated us on our luck in winning the election; it was a series of the most lucky chances that had got it. He enlarged upon luck and chance to such a degree, as wholly to supersede the merits of the candidate himself or any part of the cause. And he went on so perfectly unconscious of this aspect of his speech that one by one, at last all the table, were loudly tittering, which rose at last into unmistakable laughter. Gladstone who had kept his countenance for a long time at last being forced to give way.

It is characteristic of Dr. Mozley that in 1861, when the famous controversy concerning *Essays and Reviews* broke out, he is by no means eager to join in the attack upon the writers. He writes to Dean Church on the 11th of March (p. 249) :—"I feel much the same with respect to *Essays and Reviews* that you do." It goes against his grain to join an "assailing mass"; and again on the 20th of March while condemning the doctrine of the essays in the strongest terms he writes, "that were it possible the best way would be for everybody to hold his tongue." The criticism of the novel of "Guy Livingstone"—applying as it does to a whole class of novels of which it is a type, in page 246 is too striking to be left unnoticed, but the temptation to quote must be resisted. The book is (to use an old simile) like a garden of choice flowers, where if one is plucked, another yet more beautiful seems immediately to suggest itself. There seem to be a few unimportant typographical errors which might be corrected in a second edition.

"Frank Leward"²¹, in the form of a series of letters, gives us some vivid sketches of events in the world's history during the 30 years succeeding the passage of the Reform Bill. Frank is one of those boys, overflowing with animal spirits, to whom the sea and a career of adventure offer irresistible attractions. He runs away from school and becomes a sailor. His letters home—chiefly to his friend Bampton, who after an exemplary youth passed at school and college rises to eminence at the Bar—relate his experiences abroad. Events passing in England are noted in letters from his friends. The hero's own romance is not lost sight of amid the historic events which he describes; and the free and easy schoolboy style of Frank's letters lends them a touch of nature, though at the expense of grammar. Tasmania as a penal settlement, New Zealand 40 years ago, the great gold discoveries in California and Australia, the Crimean war, and the war of Italian Independence under Garibaldi, are among the principal scenes which this roving spirit saw and described. It was in Van Diemen's Land in 1839 that "there was a man going to be hung, and the man who had got to see him hung properly wanted to go to a picnic or something that day so he went to the fellow who had got to be hung and asked him if he had any objection to be hung the day before the proper time, so the man said as the other had been a good sort to him and if he would let him have a little extra baccy and some grog he wouldn't mind accommodating him, so he was hung a day too soon and the other fellow went to the picnic." Of Garibaldi, Frank writes: "He's not a

²¹ "Frank Leward." *Memorials*. Edited by Charles Bampton. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1884.

big man, rather short, about 5 feet 8, but awfully wiry and strong looking, you seem to be before a giant although he's not big."

An excellent short biography of Johnson,²² by the Rev. James Hay, has deservedly reached a second edition. Readers who are not familiar with that great mine of entertainment—Boswell's Johnson—will find the best things thereof extracted here. The chief merit of Mr. Hay's book is that he gives us Johnson and not himself. In his running commentary, Mr. Hay is as brief as possible, but the greater part of the volume is made up of quotations. At the end of the book are 172 pages of aphorism in alphabetical order, mostly quoted from the first half of the volume, where they have already done service for purposes of illustration. "Johnson," says Mr. Hay, "the dictator of that brilliant circle which contained Burke the greatest orator, and Goldsmith the greatest writer, and Warburton the greatest scholar, and Reynolds the greatest painter, and Garrick the greatest actor of the century in which they lived, still rules the tendencies of our nineteenth century literature, still forms the point of union between our literature and 'the world of busy street and bustling mart.'" With the quintessence of Johnson's wisdom here placed before them, readers will be enabled at any rate to form their own opinions on this matter. However much we may distrust the eighteenth-century philosophy, in general, we may at least admit that Johnson, though perhaps obstinate and limited, was also an honestly limited and very effectual old man. If once his dogmatic sententiousness is graciously overlooked, his wisdom will be found to be based upon the hard and firm rock of experience. "To set the mind above the appetites is the end of abstinence"—is one of a thousand wholesome and broad-minded sayings. But the Doctor's humour "slogs" at one as with a club; we prefer now-a-days the neat thrust of the small sword, or the subtle sting of an electric shock. Mr. Hay complains that the great man is little read: it is because we of this generation are so painfully aware of the doctor's limitations. Music is "a method of employing the mind without the labour of thinking at all, and with some applause from a man's self!" The retort is: we would not exchange one air of Beethoven's for the moralist's collected works. And with regard to the aphorisms we say after reading them: platitudes and commonplaces of irrefragable truth are excellent; they give one the sensation of thinking without the labour of thought.

The Rev. Morris Fuller, in his life of his illustrious ancestor, Thomas Fuller,²³ has not only shown his appreciation of his value as an ideal churchman and model of the true moderation which is the genius of the Church of England, but has inherited something of the raciness of his style and of his wit. He should, however, be careful not to tell the same stories over again quite so often, or if he does, to keep to the same version. It may be true, but it does not seem likely that both Archbishop Sharpe and Dr. South ascribed their success in

²² "Johnson: his Characteristics and Aphorisms." By James Hay. London: A. Gardner. 1884.

²³ "The Life, Times and Writings of Thomas Fuller. D.D." By the Rev. Morris Fuller. London: John Hodges. 1884.

life to the study of the Bible and Shakespeare. The account of some of Fuller's half-forgotten treatises and sermons is valuable, and their counsels for moderation and toleration are by no means obsolete.

Mrs. (or Miss?) Holmden has executed a remarkably good translation of M. Bersier's life of Coligny.²⁴ Its only fault is that it leaves off at a most tantalizing point, at the time when the Admiral's wife had persuaded him that his dread of popular tumult and civil war must yield to the duty of succouring his persecuted brethren, and that it was his duty to cast in his lot with the Prince of Condé and the other Huguenot leaders at Meaux. The ten following years when he was fighting for a principle, and not merely for the King of France against the Emperor, are more worthy of being told than the defence of St. Quentin and the siege of Calais, interesting as they are, and we hope that the same translator will introduce them to the public on this side of the Silver Streak.

A missal containing the ancient liturgy of the Hussites, illustrated with portraits of Huss, Wiclif, and Luther, reminds one of the Roman inscription said to have been discovered in England, bearing the date "B.C., LV." But no doubt it was a good enough illustration for a Sunday evening lecture on "Heretics and Protestantism."²⁵ Dr. Herrick does well to try to interest his young folks in history. His views are rather commonplace, and a little tinged with Protestant narrowness, though he tries to shake it off. "Yesterday" extends from Tauler in the thirteenth century to Wesley in the eighteenth, and the "heretics" include Savonarola, Melancthon and Calvin, as well as the leaders of the Reformation in England.

To all those who take an interest in the history of the discovery, settlement, and progress of the great continent of America,²⁶ this work must be deeply interesting. There is hardly a family in England, Ireland, or Scotland, which has not formed some connection, during the last two hundred years, with the New World, and they cannot but read with delight this most charming work, which treats of its settlement from the time of Christopher Columbus to the present day. Accounts are given of the various "Heroes" to whom we owe so much for their untiring efforts, not only in making these wonderful discoveries but also for the unselfish devotion which they displayed, with few exceptions, in establishing a commercial intercourse, which has added so much to the wealth of many nations both in science and money. Although the author does not dwell long on the fact that America was known to the "Ancients," he does not forget to remind his readers that at a very early period it was known to the Greeks and Romans, and also to the Danes as early as 982 A.D., some of the latter having been settled in Greenland at that date. The history really commences at the end of the fifteenth century when Christopher Columbus, with

²⁴ "Coligny: the Earlier Life of the Great Huguenot." By Eugene Bersier, D.D. Translated by A. H. Holmden. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1884.

²⁵ "Some Heretics of Yesterday." By S. E. Herrick, D.D. London: Sampson Low, Marston & Co. 1884.

²⁶ "Heroes of American Discovery." By N. D'Anvers. Marcus Ward & Co. 1884.

the long conceived idea of the "existence of land to the westward," set sail on the 3rd of August, 1492, and after many difficulties both from the perils of the sea and the cowardice of his crews, reached the West Indian Islands on the 12th of October of the same year. This first "hero of discovery" was brought almost to the depths of despair by the many difficulties which beset his path, but it was chiefly owing to one of them that he was eventually enabled to carry out his long-wished-for enterprise, and that one was poverty. When he was begging from door to door he met with Don Juan Perezde Marchina, prior of a convent in Andalusia, and by his exertions he was enabled to commence that work which has led to such wonderful results. The discovery of North America, the Gulf of Mexico, the Pacific, Florida, the Mississippi, and the St. Lawrence river followed, but not without great hardships and loss of life amongst those who ventured on these voyages of discovery. The adventures connected with the efforts of the "heroes" are told in a manner most fascinating, and numerous illustrations are given which add greatly to the pleasure of reading the book. The part which relates to Canada is not by any means the least interesting, as it is the country with which we are, perhaps, the most familiar, where so many of our countrymen have settled in comparatively late years, and to which there is a rapid emigration going on now, which was commenced early in the present century. Just now nothing could be of greater use than such a history, as particularly graphic accounts are given of the countries through which the Pacific Railroad is making such rapid progress, the engineers who are carrying out the work being now on the banks of the Columbia river, the country through which it flows having only been thoroughly explored by the orders of the American Government as late as the year 1820. Many difficulties came in the way of the "Heroes," chiefly from the natives who disputed the right of the palefaces to appropriate their territories and set up the standard of their different countries wherever they felt inclined. However, these difficulties are now a matter of the past, and the engineers of the Pacific Railway have no more to fear than the hardships of "roughing it" through the heat and cold of a Canadian climate. The Territory which is now in the hands of the Mormons was visited first by Lieutenant Fremont, after crossing the Rocky Mountains and entering the valley of the Utah river, which he followed for some time, and was rewarded by finding the Great Salt Lake, on which he ventured with some of his companions in a small india-rubber boat, and landing on one of the small islands slept near the site of what is now the Salt Lake City. Shortly after this the discovery of gold in California in 1849 attracted emigrants from all parts to the number of 30,000, comparatively few of whom ever reached their destination. Their journey is thus described:—"Half of them entering California by the old Gila route, associated with the Franciscan fathers of the earlier portion of our narrative; the other half literally forcing their way, step by step, across the rugged passes of the Rocky Mountains." The author justly praises the engineers who explored the districts of the Saskatchewan, Athabasca, and other

rivers west of the Great Lakes, through which the Pacific line is to be laid down, for the valuable information concerning the course of these rivers. Mr. Fleming's survey he also mentions as having become "almost as valuable to the geographer as to the statesman and colonist in its results."

A good deal of Mr. Smiles' new book²⁷ is devoted to the history of the progress of ship-building from an early period down to the present day. For several centuries nothing seems to have been done in the way of improving the build of ships, in fact those used in the beginning of Henry VII.'s reign were much the same as those used at the time of the Conquest. In Edward III.'s time the fleet which was engaged with the French and Flemings in 1340, are described as "all of moderate size, being boats, yachts, and caravels, of very small tonnage." Henry VIII. was the first English king who really took the matter in hand and gave the construction of his navy a great deal of personal supervision, as may be seen by the State Papers to which the author has referred in his work. At Portsmouth, Woolwich, and Deptford dockyards were constructed and many great ships built in them, the largest of which was the *Harry Grace de Dieu*, at a cost of £7,708 5s. 3d., and was of about 1,000 tons portage. Nearly all the merchant ships appear to have been very small, in fact the largest ship that crossed the Ocean during the first eighty years of the sixteenth century does not appear to have been more than 100 tons burthen. It was wonderful what an amount of piracy was carried on in these small craft under Drake, Raleigh, Grenville and others, and it must have been a paying business. At the commencement of the reign of James I. there were not above four merchant ships in England above 400 tons burthen, the reason of this seems to have been owing a good deal to the fact that there were no Englishmen, or at any rate, very few, who knew anything of ship-building, the work being carried out by foreigners, chiefly Italians. The author mentions Phineas Pett, son of Peter Pett of "Deptford Stroud," as being the first Englishman who really did anything at that profession, and it is in connection with the *Prince* that he is first mentioned; afterwards he became famous as the builder of the *Prince Royal*, *The Vanguard*, and *The Sovereign of the Seas*, the latter of which carried 100 brass cannon, was 1,600 tons burthen, and the finest ship in the English service for sixty years, serving under James I., Charles I., the Commonwealth, Charles II., James II., and William III. Nothing much seems to have gone on from that time until Francis Petit Smith discovered the screw propeller, the *Archimedes* being the first ship in which it was used with success. After the invention of the screw propeller, the most important discovery was that of the Marine Chronometer by John Harrison after many years of work at his experiments. What adds very much to the charm of reading this work is the chapter by Mr. E. J. Harland, ship-builder and engineer of Belfast, head of the firm of Harland & Wolff. The manner in

²⁷ "Men of Invention and Industry." By Samuel Smiles, LL.D. London: John Murray, Albemarle Street. 1864.

which this gentleman puts before the reader the story of his life and how he brought the ship-building trade of Belfast to such perfection, no one can do amiss in reading—to any one who knows Belfast and how this new trade has kept it from sinking with the linen trade, it is indeed deeply interesting. The end of this chapter (chapter xi.) ought to be studied by every Irishman who cares for the good of his country; it runs thus: “Such is a brief and summary account of the means by which we have been enabled to establish a new branch of industry in Belfast. It has been accomplished simply by energy and hard work. We have been well supported by the skilled labour of our artisans; we have been backed by the capital and the enterprise of England; and we believe that if all true patriots would go and do likewise, there would be nothing to fear for the prosperity and success of Ireland.” There is no man whose opinion ought to have greater weight than Mr. Harland’s. In 1883 this firm launched no less than thirteen iron and steel vessels, of a registered tonnage of over 30,000 tons. Since the decline of the linen trade the ship-building trade has kept Belfast from little less than ruin, but still some new industry is wanted there. In spite of the amount of steam-ships which have lately been built, Mr. Harland gives it as his opinion that there will always be a great demand for sailing-ships.

The work of Charles Bianconi was confined mostly to the South of Ireland, the “car” system, which is in use at the present day, having been established by him. That the author’s opinion as regards the great wealth which the proper fishing of the coast of Ireland would produce is correct there can be no manner of doubt. It abounds in every kind of fish, but until the purse of the country is liberally opened for the purpose of repairing and constructing harbours little or nothing can be done. Some few people on the north-east coast have “smacks” as good as any to be seen in Torbay, but they have no encouragement for winter fishing, not even a harbour. It has been proved over and over again that there would be no loss to the country by their advancing a large sum for improving and building harbours.

Other inventors are given places in this work, the principal of which is William Murdock, the inventor of the condensing steam engine, and gas for the purposes of lighting. To Koenig, a German, is assigned the honour of having invented steam printing. The difficulties with which the *Times* had to deal during its infancy, and how it was raised to be “the most powerful journal of the Old World” under the master-hand of John Walter, who first established “leading articles,” foreign correspondence, “special correspondents with the army,” are fully given in chapter viii. The last chapter contains an account of “astronomers and students in humble life.”

The “orthodox” school of mythology²⁸ has for some years been that which asserts that myths are the result of the confusion of thought arising from a people forgetting their own language. For instance, that the story of Bheki, the frog princess, vanishing at the

²⁸ “Custom and Myth.” By Andrew Lang, M.A. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1884.

sight of water, began with a short saying, such as that "Bheki, the sun, will die at the sight of water," as we should say that the sun will set when it approaches the water from which it rose in the morning; and that subsequently it was forgotten that Bheki meant the sun, and the story was made up to account for the saying. As Mr. Lang says, "what evidence is there that 'frog' was ever used as a name for the sun, or when did a Sanskrit people live where the sun rose and set in the water?" Mr. Lang's method is that of common sense, and far more scientific also. He finds the following parallel story among the Ojibways:—

A hunter named Otterheart, camping near a beaver lodge, found a pretty girl loitering round his fire. She keeps his wigwam in order, and lays his blanket near the deerskin she had laid for herself. "Good," he muttered, "this is my wife." She refuses to eat the beaver he has shot, but at night he hears a noise, *krch, krch*, as if beavers were gnawing wood. He sees by the glimmer of the fire his wife nibbling birch twigs. In fact the good little wife is a beaver, as the pretty Indian girl was a frog. The pair lived happily till spring came, and the snow melted, and the streams ran full. Then his wife implored the hunter to build her a bridge over every stream and river, that she might cross dry-footed. "For," she said, "if my feet touch water, this would at once cause thee great sorrow." The hunter did as she bade him, but left unbridged one tiny runnel. The wife stumbled into the water, and as soon as her foot was wet, she immediately resumed her old shape as a beaver, her son became a beaverling, and the brooklet, changing to a roaring river, bore them to the lake. Once the hunter saw his wife again among her beastkin. "To thee I sacrificed all," she said, "and I only asked thee to help me dry-footed over the waters. Thou didst cruelly neglect this. Now must I ever remain with my people."

Here the meaning of the story is clear. Anything that recalls the old animal life severs the connection, or breaks the enchantment. Similarly the sacred mouse in Apollo's temple, is explained by de Gubernatis, by saying, "The Pagan sun-god crushes under his foot the mouse of night. When the cat's away the mice may play; the shadows of night dance when the moon is absent." Mr. Lang's comment is that when the moon is away, there can be no shadows to play, and the sacredness of the mouse is probably a survival from a savage state, when the little beast was a totem. The etymological school differ disastrously among themselves. Kuhn sees fire everywhere and fire myths; Max Müller sees dawn and dawn myths: Schwartz sees storm and storm myths, while Mr. Lang sees a reference to obsolete savage customs, and laughs at writers like Professor Sayce, who base an argument on such a supposition as that "it is not impossible that the language of the Moschi, about which next to nothing is known, may have been allied to the language of the Cappadocians of which we know next to nothing.

Dr. Garratt²⁹ shows up the absurdities of mediæval medicine and alchemy as a prelude to an attack on homœopathy. He should remember, however, that everything makes such rapid strides now-a-days

²⁹ "Myths in Medicine, and Old Time Doctors." By Alfred C. Garratt, M.D. London and New York: Putnam's Sons. 1884.

that to charge the present school of homœopathic physicians with Hahnemann's absurdities is as unfair as it is for homœopaths to accuse "allopaths" of constantly bleeding and drenching their patients with powerful drugs. He, or rather some one whom he quotes, refers the origin of Hahnemann's doctrine of infinitesimal medication to a story in Van Helmont's "*Ortus Medicinæ*" of an Irishman in prison at Vilvoorden who cured diseases by dipping a pebble in water or oil.

The new Regius Professor of Modern History has "read himself in" to his chair by delivering a lecture on the duties of his post.³⁰ He justly says that he considers his function is not to prepare men for their examinations, but to encourage learning for its own sake, and especially to teach the teachers. He chafes at the rigid ordinances of the new commissioners, and compares them (which the makers of them will not much like) with the strict statutes of the ancient founders, at which modern Liberalism mocks. But why should he complain of having to deliver forty-two lectures a year? Surely there is no hardship in having to give a definite amount of work for a definite amount of salary. All public servants should expect it. And are there no instances of professors taking their pay and doing nothing for it? Modern history, according to his view, is to begin "at the point when Teutonic wandering changes into Teutonic settlement." That is a very sensible limit whoever suggested it, for the new Professor says, "I have never been able to find out by my own wit when ancient history ends and when modern history begins." But the old-fashioned definition is surely as practical, though not so precise. That ancient history is that of which the available sources are mainly historians, while modern history is that which can be mainly studied from contemporary records. One thing we are very glad to see, that he intends to promote the study of mediæval historians, and will commence with Gregory of Tours.

In the contributions to the transactions of the Royal Historical Society³¹ of the year 1884, although most of the papers do not rise in point of style and execution above the low level which seems to be the universal fashion of writing papers delivered before "learned societies," there are some papers interesting from the nature of the subjects treated—on the personal traits of the Mahratta Brahman Princes; a confused paper on the Yngling-saja; a brief, tedious paper on bridges, which is merely an advertisement, by Mr. Corn. Walford of a work on the subject; a statistical paper on the progress of Protestantism in England during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, founded on the evidence supplied by the number of martyrs who suffered respectively for the two religions in the different counties; a paper on Christianity in Roman Britain, consisting mainly of a criticism on Haddon and Stubbs' work; a paper on the craniology of Britain, in which the long head and tall stature prevailing in the Eastern Counties is taken as a proof of a considerable survival of pure

³⁰ "The Office of the Historical Professor." By E. A. Freeman. London: Macmillan & Co. 1884.

³¹ "Transactions of the Royal Historical Society." London: Longmans. 1884.

Celtic blood (a result surely rather due to foreign immigration and increased facility for culture in those counties); a strange paper of the school-boy type on Anglo-Saxon literature. There is, however, at least one paper free from slovenliness, and indeed entirely satisfactory in every respect—"A Historical Sketch of South Africa," by Sir Bartle Frere. This is unfortunately only a fragment and deals with the foundation and government of the Dutch Colony at the Cape under Van Riebeck in the middle of the seventeenth century. But for the untimely death of Sir Bartle, a really important work would have been presented to the public in the pages of this journal.

Mr. Austin Dobson's volume, "Thomas Bewick and his Pupils"³² is a valuable contribution to the history of wood engraving in England, and besides forms a charming table book. The illustrations are well chosen, and the memoir of Bewick is interesting to many who are not "collectors" of Bewick's works, nor even connoisseurs in wood engraving, for it transports the reader, with a little help from the illustrations, into the pleasant, homely, North Country, which has given us so many valuable men.

M. Julian Sée, in his recent and genuine "Journal d'un Habitant de Colmar"³³—his native place—gives many examples of an odd dialect but little known to literature—that of the Vosges, which is conspicuously absent from what ought to be another of its natural habitats, the Erckmann-Chatrion novels, the readers of which, indeed, ought to have M. Sée's book, and so place the photographs of similar scenes side by side with the finished pictures. When the recruits were going to the brief war of 1870, the tearful women cried after the trains, "Gehen, gehen, éhr armi Kaiwe; gehen zuim Tod—Go, go, poor devils; go to your death." One recruit, brazening it out, exclaimed, "Séye z'fréde on klaye ném, éhr Wyver, 's Flaisch word wolf'l, d'gross Metzsig fangt ad—Be contented and don't complain, wives; meat will be cheap, the great slaughtering begins." An aurora borealis in October, 1870, gave rise to the popular saying, "Der Hémmel ésch blüitig, der Kriay d'ôrt noch lang—the sky is blood-red, the war will last long yet." The Complete Letter-writer is further supplemented by a missive in this book from a billeted officer to an inattentive host, from which we find that he claimed coffee in the morning with the usual additions—mit Beilage; at noon there was to be meat soup, with vegetables and a joint; in the evening the same, and daily a litre of good wine and six good cigars. The letter is a very model letter, and winds up with an excellent and thoroughly unsentimental version of *Hodie tibi, cras mihi*.—"You get used to annexation. My own country was annexed in 1866." This eminently practical letter-writer signs himself, "Doctor of laws and referendary—actually, vice feldwebel." The chief political novelty in

³² "Thomas Bewick and his Pupils." By Austin Dobson. With Ninety-five Illustrations. London: Chatto & Windus, Piccadilly. 1884.

³³ "Journal d'un Habitant de Colmar (Juillet à Novembre, 1870)." Par Julien Sée. Orné de trois croquis, et d'un dessin original. Paris: Berger-Levrault & Cie.

this "Journal" is the constant evidence of the bitter religious hatred which was worked up by the priests against the Protestants of the country before and during the war of 1870, which, with a different issue to that war, might well have led to a repetition of the atrocities at Nîmes in 1815, when, as Sir Samuel Romilly declared in the House of Commons, 2,000 men and 200 women were murdered, and 350 houses destroyed. M. Sée, who belongs to neither party, may be accepted as an impartial and competent witness to the facts.

In the life of Coleridge, contributed to the series known as "English Men of Letters,"²⁴ Mr. H. D. Traill has discharged a difficult task with conspicuous success. He has told the story of the poet's life, so far as it may be gathered from his own work, and from the brief memoirs or unsatisfactory lives which have hitherto appeared. The story is at best a half-told tale. Reverent disciples have striven to represent Coleridge as a kind of inspired prophet, the long-delayed arbiter between Reason and Revelation, whose foibles must be spoken of with bated breath, and if possible buried out of sight. Others, and these the more numerous, prefer to treat the "sage of Highgate" as an awful example of neglected powers and of wasted genius, the literary contrast to the heroes of self-help. Between these two extremes Mr. Traill has chosen a middle path, and on the whole he appears to us to have dealt both justly and kindly with the great poet's errors and shortcomings. "Coleridge," says his earliest and ablest biographer, Mr. H. N. Coleridge, "was a frail mortal," and it would be impossible to write his life without dwelling on his frailties and seeking to account for them. For some of the charges brought against Coleridge, Mr. Traill, while he thinks they may not be evaded, finds a palliation in grievous ill-health, not wholly due to self-indulgence. Of the unhappy relations between the poet and his wife, he can only guess the cause, nor does he attempt to discuss this difficult question in all its bearings. It is often urged against Coleridge that the possession of great genius is no excuse for the neglect of the ordinary duties of life. This is true; but it is also true that the inheritance of a peculiar temperament combined with genius may make the fulfilment of duty extremely difficult. It stands to reason that where the imaginative powers are highly developed, there the prudential faculties are in danger of being weakened. It has been pleaded for Coleridge that he was more sinned against than sinning. It would be true to say that he sinned much but suffered more, and that considering the nature of his errors, whose seed was in themselves, it is a memorable fact that he never gave up the battle with himself but won a doubtful victory at the close of day. With Mr. Traill's estimate of S. T. Coleridge as a poet and philosopher we are less in accord. As a critic he places him in the first rank, but he appears to regard even the greater poems rather as a splendid promise than an actual fulfilment. "Admirable as much of that work is," he says, "and unique in quality as it is throughout, I must confess that it leaves on my own mind a stronger impression of the unequal and

²⁴ "Coleridge." By H. D. Traill. London: Macmillan & Co. 1884.

imperfect than does that of any poet at all approaching Coleridge in imaginative vigour or intellectual grasp." The "Ancient Mariner" and "Christabel" have left on our mind the impression of absolute perfection, and within themselves of unvarying excellence. From first to last they are pure gold. Of "Kubla Khan," Mr. Traill writes: "As to the wild dream-poem, 'Kubla Khan,' it is hardly more than a psychological curiosity, and only that perhaps in respect of the completeness of its metrical form." Lovers of poetry think otherwise, and listen to those wonderful lines as the voice of Poesy itself. Of Mr. Traill's able *résumé* of Coleridge's philosophical and theological opinions we cannot treat at length. Mr. Traill confesses that he does not understand how it was that S. T. Coleridge occupied so peculiar a position in the literary world, and why he was so surpassingly interesting to the men of his time. It was surely because it was surmised that he had discovered a mode of reconciling the free exercise of the human reason with a full acceptance of the profounder mysteries of faith. Apart from his general reputation and his marvellous powers of speech, he was regarded as the Hierophant of a new religion. It is all a matter of opinion. To those who hold that metaphysic is a creation of the fancy, the speculations of Coleridge are valueless except as literary curiosities, while to others who believe that the mind bears witness to a mind-world peopled with realities at once potent and entrancing, his philosophy will ever possess a wonder and a charm. Here and there with a kind of sudden remembrance that he is pledged to be popular, Mr. Traill lapses into a facetious style which does not become the author or his subject. To say of S. T. Coleridge, "Deeply as his criticism penetrates it is yet loyally recognitive of the opacity of millstones," is very poor fooling indeed. And these blemishes are all the more conspicuous from the general lucidity and dignity of style which are natural to the author.

BELLES LETTRES.

MR. BROWNING'S new volume, "Ferishtah's Fancies,"¹ will be read by his admirers—by all, that is, who have read him before—with pleasure, and a reverent admiration. It will hardly gain him new readers. The style is of that far-fetched, intricate and allusive kind, which must either fascinate or repel the reader. For us Mr. Browning's fancies "faint revealed, yet sure divined," are always fascinating, and we are ready to follow him into whatever quagmires he may pipe us. In some opening lines, in which he outdoes himself in grotesque abruptness, Mr. Browning compares the composition of his new volume—alternate blank verse, and lyric—to an ortolan spitted on to toast with an intermediary sage-leaf to give the "gust" to the whole. The Fancies put into the mouth of the Dervish

¹ "Ferishtah's Fancies." By Robert Browning. London: Smith, Elder & Co., 15, Waterloo Place. 1884.

Ferishtah are apologues intended to set forth Mr. Browning's views on such subjects as the existence of evil, the efficacy of prayer, the morality of anthropomorphism. We will take the Fourth Fancy—one of the simplest—and interpret the reading. A certain woman is sick unto death by reason of a serpent's bite in the foot. The physician recommends amputation. To this the father, wisely acquiescent, assents. The eldest son prays that some other means may be adopted in the first instance; the second son hotly opposes the employment of the surgeon's knife; but the youngest, the third son, is all on fire for the experiment. "The physician knows best," he says; "out with the knife." Now for the application. The wise physician, the Hakim, is God. Man is the youngest son, who, foolish and ignorant, should *not* acquiesce in God's decrees, but earnestly entreat Him to stay His hand. Were he wise, then indeed would prayer be superfluous; but as it is, weak and foolish, let him pray.

No, be man, and nothing more:

Man who, as man conceiving hopes and fears,
And craves and deprecates, and loves and loathes,
And bids God help him, till Death touch his eyes,
And show God granted most, denying all.

Then follows one of the delightful lyrics:—

Man I am, and man would be, love—merest man and nothing more.
Bid me seem no other! eagles boast of pinions—let them soar!
I may put forth angel's plumage, once unmanned, but not before.
Now on earth, to stand suffices,—nay, if kneeling serves, to kneel:
Here you front me, here I find the all of heaven that earth can feel:
Sense looks straight,—not over, under,—perfect sees beyond appeal.
Good you are and wise, full circle; what to me were more outside?
Wiser wisdom, better goodness? Ah, such want the Angel's wide
Sense to take and hold and keep them! Mine at least has never tried.

In his preface to "Vagabunduli Libellus"² Mr. Symonds tells us that it is no easy task to tell a song in a series of sonnets, and he admits that the sonnet does not readily become a link in a continued narrative. In accordance with this canon of taste which we hold to be absolute, we prefer the sonnets on distinct subjects, of which this volume mainly consists, to those which are linked together under the name of "Stella Maris." These, Mr. Symonds explains to us, belong to the character of *Animi Figura*, as set forth in an earlier volume, and render it intelligible and complete. The technique is skilful and laborious, and the play of language extraordinary. But the subject is an unwholesome one, and the motive strikes us as inadequate. A lover is about to obtain his will from his mistress, when he suddenly discovers that passion and love do not always go together, and in petulant astonishment he turns away from the girl. The situation is depicted from the earlier point of view, and before the lover had begun to repent. We cannot commend work of this kind, however cunning the hand of the artificer may be. Of course no sensible

² "Vagabunduli Libellus." By John Addington Symonds. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1, Paternoster Square. 1884.

reader expects that Phyllis should keep her marriage lines in her pocket, but we repeat what we have urged before, that there are moods and phases of sexual passion which do not lie within the domain of art. We give, as a specimen of Mr. Symonds' delicate fancy, and a proof that he can write love poetry which does not leave a bad taste in the mouth, the following beautiful sonnet.

LOVE'S IDOLATRY.

How do thine eyes excuse idolatry ?
 My saint, to whom at rise and set of sun,
 Thus on my yearning spirit's bended knee,
 With purest vows I pay mine orison !
 Thine eyes the temples are of holiest love,
 Whereto my soul makes hourly pilgrimage ;
 Saving for wings to lift her flight above
 This house of flesh, that clips her like a cage.
 Thine eyes are fountains of perennial health,
 To which in sick and weary mood I fly ;
 Thine eyes are priceless mines of heavenly wealth,
 Stored with high truth, and sweet divinity.
 Then call me not idolater, but see
 How firm my faith who kneel and worship thee.

From the pen of the same gifted writer there appears a little volume entitled "Wine, Woman, and Song,"² which has given us so much delightful instruction, and has revealed to us so fresh a mine of beauty that we are almost fain to repent of having spoken any harsh words in our former criticism. The book consists of a number of translations of the *Carmina Vagorum*, or songs of the Wandering Students, and an Introductory Preface giving a brief but clear account of this little known branch of Mediæval literature. These songs, which are written in rhyming Latin, and bear the doubtful name of Goliardic verses, date from the latter half of the twelfth century and the beginning of the thirteenth. They appear to have sprung into existence as the natural outcome of a body of wandering and irresponsible youths seeking knowledge and enjoying life, knowing no restraints of nationality, or family ties, and singing out of a light heart. Those which Mr. Symonds has translated are to be found in a MS. of the thirteenth century, preserved at Munich. The collection attributed to Walter de Mapes is of a similar character. Possibly these songs owe something of their charm to the Elizabethan dress in which Mr. Symonds has so daintily arrayed them. But no doubt the scent of the spring is in the original verses. Where all or almost all deserve to be quoted it is hard to select, but we choose the opening stanzas from the "Invitation to the Dance."

Cast aside dull books and thought ;
 Sweet is folly, sweet is play :
 Take the pleasure Spring hath brought
 In youth's opening holiday !

² "Wine, Woman, and Song." With an Essay by John Addington Symonds. London : Chatto & Windus, Piccadilly. 1884.

Right it is old age should ponder,
 On grave matters fraught with care ;
 Tender youth is free to wander,
 Free to frolic light as air.
 Like a dream our prime is flown,
 Prisoned in a study :
 Sport and folly are youth's own,
 Tender youth and ruddy.

If Mr. Barlow⁴ could only be induced to accept that old world maxim concerning the superiority of the half to the whole, and that other maxim against excess in anything, if he would reflect that not Homer, nor Shakespeare, nor another, could write good verses without pause to take breath, he might turn the gift of song which he possesses to some lasting purpose. If above all he would learn to be "innocent, steady, and wise," his numerous volumes of verse would gain more readers than we hope they do at present. Or does Mr. Barlow's inspiration begin and end with a monotonous defiance of virtue and religion? To be able to say the Lord's Prayer backwards is no great feat after all.

There is nothing to find fault with in Mr. Charles James' "Poems and Fragments,"⁵ and but little to awaken any great interest. The sketches in blank verse consist of facile moralizings on death and other well-worn themes. Indeed, the fact that "all men die once" is quite a favourite subject with the worthier and duller type of minor poet. Mr. James expresses himself neatly, and his sentiments are excellent. But then he has so little to say. The verses on a "Belfry" are pleasantly written.

Mr. Douglas B. W. Sladen, whose earlier volumes we have already noticed, sends us another batch of verse from Australia. In a "Summer Christmas"⁶ the guests at a station in Western Australia beguile the time in telling stories in verse. A large portion of this volume consists of mere doggerel.

"A Sheaf of Ballads,"⁷ by J. J. Britton, contains work of a very different order. Mr. Britton possesses the gift of narrative, and tells a stirring tale with force enough to compel the reader to finish what he has begun. Mr. Britton's style is somewhat intemperate, and he too often makes use of phrases which should be left to the lady-novelist; but he is never dull, and he always finds something new to write about. In the ballad of "Sunnefa," Mr. Britton conveys very successfully the sense of mysterious glamour which belongs to the old Northern Legends. "Carrella" is very clever, but of all forms of composition we

⁴ "Poems, Real and Ideal." By George Barlow. London: Remington & Co., 18, Henrietta Street, Covent Garden. 1884.

⁵ "Poems and Fragments." By Charles James. Alex. Gardner: Paisley, and 12, Paternoster Row, London.

⁶ "A Summer Christmas." By Douglas B. W. Sladen. London: Griffith, Farran, Okeden & Welsh, West Corner of St. Paul's Churchyard.

⁷ "A Sheaf of Ballads." By J. J. Britton. London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row.

care least for the "Idyll of Modern Life." This poem contains some good lyrical stanzas.

"Sonnets and other Verse,"⁸ by Samuel Waddington, belong to the higher order of minor verse writing. The workmanship of the Sonnets is scholarly and delicate, and they express the graver and wiser thought of the age. We recommend to our readers the sonnets named "The Schoolmaster," "Faith and Love," "What Gospel?" Of the other poems "The Inn of Care" is by far the best.

"Waifs and Strays,"⁹ by Lady Florence Dixie, is a metrical record of a "Child's Pilgrimage Abroad," which was taken after the death of her brother, Lord Francis Douglas, who was killed on the Matterhorn. The "In Memoriam" stanzas are graceful and touching.

Young writers before they rush into print would do well to reflect that in turning their own minds inside out, so far from disclosing a hidden treasure, they are merely calling attention to the familiar if not the commonplace. Mr. Paul Hermes¹⁰ having made the startling discovery that youth and love are convertible terms, and being moreover perplexed by the conflict between faith and reason, proceeds to declare the same in more or less striking verse. In his preface Mr. Hermes (why not Mr. Mercury?) says that the "striving for utterance is Poetry." On the contrary poetry is the attainment of utterance. It is better to remain in the bath than to run naked through the town *before* the problem is solved.

Mr. J. A. Coupland, as his title "The Valley of Idleness"¹¹ betrays, is not a strikingly original poet. He is content to imitate, and he often does so very prettily indeed. "The Spirit of Poesy" contains some melodious lines, and "The Valentine" has something of the ring of Elizabethan verse. But the following question put by a lover to his mistress is neither polite nor pretty:—

Is it to fetch a pearl
From the deep seas, my girl?

Where are Mr. Coupland's manners?

"The Lady of Ranza, and other Poems,"¹² by George Eyre, is not an exciting volume, but like so many of its fellows it contains some readable verses.

In his preface to "Dunbar; or, the King's Advocate,"¹³ the author maintains that "a man may even presume to write a poor tragedy with-

⁸ "Sonnets and other Verse." By Samuel Waddington. London: George Bell & Sons, York Street, Covent Garden

⁹ "Waifs and Strays." By Lady Florence Dixie. Griffith, Farran, Okeden & Welsh, St. Paul's Churchyard.

¹⁰ "The Confessions of Hermes, and other Poems." By Paul Hermes. Philadelphia: David McKay, 23, South Ninth Street. 1884. London: Trübner & Co.

¹¹ "The Valley of Idleness, and other Poems." By J. A. Coupland. London: E. W. Allen, 4, Ave Maria Lane, London, E.C.

¹² "The Lady of Ranza, and other Poems." By George Eyre. Alex. Gardner: Paisley, and 12, Paternoster Row, London. 1884.

¹³ "Dunbar, the King's Advocate." By Thistle-down. Edinburgh: Waddie & Co. 1884.

outdeserving of being held up to ridicule." There is nothing ridiculous in Dunbar, but it is intensely prosaic, and it improves the occasion in a somewhat irritating manner. The *motif* of the drama is to expose the cruelty and superstition of the Roman Church in the sixteenth century, but such is the excellence of the Protestant hero that we are tempted to back the Cardinal, and only wonder at his forbearance in the matter of thumb-screws. "Even in a Palace life may be well led," said Marcus Aurelius; even a cardinal may be supposed to have spoken good grammar. But we have the following lines from the mouth of Cardinal Beaton:—

The Church suspects you as no friend of hers.
And *him* that she suspects is sick to death.

We have read the "Plantation Lays"¹⁴ of Belton O'Neill Townsend, and we give our preference to an ode to Narcissa. This, the author tells us, was "written at college while sixteen years old. Also read from the Euphradian Reading Box." "That is so," as they say where Mr. Townsend "biographs," if we may coin a phrase on strict analogy.

We have to acknowledge Vol. IV. of "In the Watches of the Night,"¹⁵ by Mrs. Horace Dobell.

A translation of the "Sonnets and Lyrics of Camoëns," by Mr. Richard F. Burton will be welcomed by many readers. In the translator's "Foreword" (a vile phrase) Mr. Burton defends the use of "archaïcisms and eclectic style" in translating a poet older than Shakespeare, and he tells us that his aim has been to "English" the style, the idioms, the *ipsisima verba* of Camoëns.¹⁶ We cannot do better than quote the following sonnet as a specimen of the translator's (why not across-carrier's?) "labour of love":—

TO VIOLANTE, THE VIOLET, FAIR AND PURE.

Into a garden verdure-deck't, and dight,
Where varied flowers amell'd floors of green,
One day came pacing Love's own goddess-queen
With the Hunt-goddess whom the groves delight,
Diana straightway pluckt a Rose pure-white,
Venus a Lily of the reddest sheen;
But far exceeding a' the lave were seen
The violets clad in loveliness and light.

Both ask of Cupid, who stood nigh in stead,
Which of those flowrets three he faintest take
For suavest, purest, which the loveliest shows.

¹⁴ "Plantation Lays," and other Poems. By Belton O'Neill Townsend. A.B. Columbia, S. C. : Charles A. Calvo, jr. Printer. 1884. †

¹⁵ "In the Watches of the Night." Vol. IV. "Lost in Iceland." By Mrs. Horace Dobell. London : Remington & Co.

¹⁶ "Camoëns, The Lyrics. 2 vols. Englished by Richard F. Burton. London : Bernard Quaritch, 15, Piccadilly. 1884.

Then the Boy, sily smiling, this wise said,
 "They all be beauties, nathless I make
 Viola anteceding Lily, much more Rose!"

In an appendix to the second volume, in which Mr. Burton discusses at length the metrical technicalities of Portuguese Lyrical Poetry, he goes out of his way to disparage Lord Strangford's well-known translation of Camoëns. "He defaces and degrades the *mécanique* by neglecting pauses, and by taking all manner of liberties; in fact he has vulgarised Camoëns into English Poetry of the Georgium Sidus." All that we can say to this is that when a Victorian poet will write by way of translation or otherwise such enchanting lyrics as are to be found in Lord Strangford's little volume, such as are "Just like love is yonder Rose," and "The heart that warmed my guileless breast," then may we sing a "Gaudemus" lustily, and with a good courage. A word of thanks is due to Mr. Bernard Quaritch for the excellent type and delicate light green binding of these beautiful volumes.

Messrs. Kegan Paul, Trench and Co. add to their Parchment Library a collection of English Sacred Lyrics.¹⁷ The selection, which is evidently the work of a cultivated mind, to which sacred poetry has an especial charm, is made on a new principle. "It has been required," says the compiler, "that they satisfy the demands of lyrical form and expression, and to be infused with religious emotion." Thus we find such hymns as "When I survey the wondrous cross," and "Draw nigh, draw nigh, Emmanuel," together with such an expression of emotion as George Eliot's "Oh! may I join the choir invisible." The earlier part of the volume, which among other little-known pieces contains George Withers' exquisite Rocking Hymn, is more satisfactory than the latter half. We do not see on what principle such hymns as Cardinal Newman's "Lead kindly light," or Bishop Heber's "Thou art gone to the grave:" can be omitted. We presume that the compiler was content to make a selection, and does not pretend to offer a collection, of English sacred Lyrics.

"Annus Sanctus,"¹⁸ selected and arranged by Orby Shipley, is a collection of hymns from the sacred offices, and other sources. This volume, which has the imprimatur of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, is, of course, intended for Roman Catholic readers. It ought to be studied by all lovers of hymnology: hymns which bear the names of Cardinal Newman, and of Mr. Aubrey de Vere, have a literary as well as, perhaps, more than an ecclesiastical value. Among others, we read with pleasure some charming verses by Lord Bray, which might be included in Anglican and other collections. The hymns from the Primers of 1685 and 1706, are remarkable for their superiority over Protestant hymnody of that date.

Mr. Matthias Mull, by no means "recognitive of the opacity of mill-stones," undertakes to emend the punctuation and to amend the

¹⁷ "English Sacred Lyrics." London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1884.

¹⁸ "Annus Sanctus." Selected and arranged by Orby Shipley, M.A. Vol. I. London and New York: Burns & Oates. 1884.

text of Milton's "Paradise Lost."¹⁸ We will give a specimen. In Book II., line 181, Belial warns the hosts of hell against the dangers of renewing hostilities with the Almighty :—

We
Caught in a fiery tempest, shall be hurled
Each on his *rock* transfix'd, the sport and prey
Of racking whirlwinds.

For *rock*, Mr. Mull, oblivious alike of Virgil and Solomon, proposes to read *rod*.

The "First Middle English Primer,"¹⁹ edited by Mr. Henry Sweet, contains the Ancren Riwle, or Nun's Rule, and the Ormulum. There is a grammatical introduction and a vocabulary. Arrangement and method leave nothing to be desired.

Mr. Edgar Shumway, Principal of Chautauqua "Academia," has compiled a very useful hand-book of Latin Synonymes.²⁰ The cloth binding, which is made to represent crocodile leather, is a happy innovation.

Professor Allen has revised and, in part, rewritten, Professor Hadley's well-known Greek Grammar.²¹ This useful work will, no doubt, be welcomed by English students.

Messrs. Macmillan have added to their larger classical series (i.) the *Œconomicus* of Xenophon,²² edited by Dr. Holden. This splendid edition of a school-book contains an Introduction, Notes, an Excursus on the Text; and—invaluable adjunct—a complete Lexical Index. O fortunati pueri, sua si bona norint. And (ii.), the first three books of the "De Rerum Natura"²³ of Lucretius, with Introduction and Notes, by J. H. Warburton Lee.

We have also received, from the same publishers, a new volume of their elementary classics—"Cæsar's Invasions of Britain,"²⁴ by W. Welch, M.A., and C. G. Duffield, M.A. The volume contains not only an Introduction, Notes, and a Latin-English vocabulary, but a series of exercises based on the text of Cæsar, with an English-Latin vocabulary. We need hardly say that Messrs. Welch and Duffield have done their work thoroughly well.

¹⁸ "Paradise Lost." By John Milton. With Notes and Preface by Matthias Mull. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1884.

¹⁹ "First Middle English Primer with Grammar and Glossary." By Henry Sweet, M.A. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1884.

²⁰ "A Handbook of Latin Synonymes." By Edgar S. Shumway, A.M. Boston: Published by Ginn, Heath & Co. 1884. London: Trübner & Co.

²¹ "A Greek Grammar." By James Hadley, late Professor in Yale College. Revised by Frederic de Forest Allen, Professor in Harvard College. London: Macmillan & Co.

²² "The Œconomicus of Xenophon." With Introduction, &c., by Hubert A. Holden, M.A., LL.D. London: Macmillan & Co.

²³ T. Lucreti Cari, "De Rerum Natura." Libri I.-III. Edited by J. H. Warburton Lee, M.A., Assistant Master at Rossal School. London: Macmillan & Co.

²⁴ "Cæsar's Invasion of Britain." By W. Welch, M.A., and C. G. Duffield, M.A., Assistant Master of Cranleigh School. With Notes, Exercises and Vocabulary. London: Macmillan & Co.

"Phœbe, a Novel,"²⁵ by the author of "Rutledge," is certainly clever. It has the merits of presenting, in the narrow limits of a single volume, a distinct idea of each of the persons of whom it treats. Not one of them is, perhaps, profoundly interesting, or entirely sympathetic, but they all play their parts naturally, as people so constituted would act in real life, and the main interest of the book lies in observing how their several idiosyncrasies act and react on each other, and shape the story of their lives.

"The Man from Texas"²⁶ differs in many ways from the ordinary run of American novels. It has far more incident, and far less polish. The style indeed leaves much to be desired, and the diction is frequently incorrect; it seems as though the first word that came to hand had been made use of, when another would obviously have more accurately expressed the author's meaning. The construction too, is inartificial, and, though situations of the most tremendous kind abound, they are not, generally speaking, worked up so as to produce a proportionate effect. Yet, with all these faults, which seem to proceed from want of experience in the craft of authorship, the book has considerable merits, the greatest of all being its air of reality; many of the scenes and most of the characters are, we feel convinced, painted from the life. This is especially true of "Bill Clayton," the guerilla chief; by far the most interesting and the most subtly drawn personality in the group represented. A born student, torn from his learned dreams and peaceful ambitions by the hideous civil war (which, by the way, is now always spoken of by American writers as the Rebellion), William Clayton, son of a wealthy planter, is by his birth and antecedents pledged to the Southern cause. At first he fights hopefully, but soon his clear and powerful mind sees the hopelessness of the struggle. He falls into utter sadness, relieved by flashes of ghastly and grotesque merriment. As one command after another is broken up he has no other means of continuing the fight than gathering together a few gentlemen, heart-broken and embittered like himself, and harassing the hated Yankees by a guerilla warfare. His contempt of danger, his splendid horsemanship, and his marvellous skill with the revolver, point him out as the fitting leader of the band, and as a leader he shows a power over men, and a faculty of combination, which make of him a dreaded adversary. His last adventure, which he achieved alone, is the finest dramatic scene in the book, and though simply told, the situation is made the most of—not frittered away like many of the others. A pretty love-story runs all through the volume, and relieves the grimness and hopelessness which naturally characterize a tale of civil war told by the losing side.

"The Disk,"²⁷ by Messrs. Robinson and Wall, is called by its

²⁵ "Phœbe." A Novel. By the author of "Rutledge." One vol. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1884.

²⁶ "The Man from Texas: A Western Romance." By Henry Oldham. One vol. Philadelphia: T. B. Peterson & Brothers, 306, Chestnut Street.

²⁷ "The Disk: A Prophetic Reflection." By E. A. Robinson and G. A. Wall. London: Griffith, Farran & Co., St. Paul's Churchyard. 1884.

authors "a prophetic reflection." It is as good a name as any other for this singular little work, of hardly more than pamphlet size, which minutely describes such startling inventions, which have never been made, and narrates such tremendous events which have never happened. Still, physical changes hardly less momentous than those described have been brought about by human agency, and inventions not less amazing are in daily use; so that it is difficult for a non-scientific reader to make sure whether he is reading fact or fiction, whether he is to be sceptical, or profoundly astonished, or, again, to take it all as a matter of course. Jules Verne was the originator of this sensational quasi-scientific school of romance, but our "American Cousins" bid fair to "out-Herod Herod" in his own line.

We have received from the "Round Table Series,"²⁰ No. 4, "Walt Whitman, Poet and Democrat," in the main not greatly differing in spirit from what appeared in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW of July, 1883, in a notice of his "Specimen days and Collect."

Studies of morbid psychology seem to be Mr. Edward Bellamy's speciality. In "Dr. Heidenhoff's Process" he illustrated the fatal workings of remorse, which proffered pardon was powerless to allay or even soothe. In "Miss Ludington's Sister"²¹ he broaches the bewildering theory that in the several stages through which man passes from the cradle to the grave, there is no identity of personality. The body is the same, but for each period there is a separate "soul," which, after it has left the body to give place to its successor, has a perfectly real and individual existence in "The Spirit World." Whether the author is in earnest in propounding this fantastic and utterly baseless theory is more than we know; but the whole story turns upon it; it is advocated with much ingenuity, and supported by arguments quite as plausible as those commonly employed in more serious discourses upon immortality. In any case it serves as the basis of an amusing and well-told tale.

The latest addition to Mr. David Douglas's choice series of American authors, "An Echo of Passion"²² is the detailed narrative of a painful episode in the life of a young married couple. The treatment is eminently realistic. The reader cannot help feeling, often against his will, that each step in the march of events is the necessary consequence of that which preceded it—not the arbitrary invention of the novelist, to suit the exigencies of his story. Pages of criticism and analysis could not more accurately express the distinctive excellence both of the story and the manner of its telling, than does one short French phrase, *Comme c'est nature*.

In the little volume of short stories which Mr. David Douglas has recently brought out, by the author of "Rudder Grange," we discern the same felicity of expression which distinguishes Mr. Stockton as a

²⁰ "Round Table Series." No. IV. "Walt Whitman, Poet and Democrat." Edinburgh: William Brown. 1884.

²¹ "Miss Ludington's Sister: A Romance of Immortality." By Edward Bellamy. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1884.

²² "An Echo of Passion." By George Parsons Lathrop. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1884.

story-teller. "The Lady or the Tiger,"²¹ and the succeeding tales are almost, one may say, made out of nothing, but still they are one and all remarkable for their completeness, and most of them are sufficiently striking to hold the reader's attention, either by amusing or interesting him. "The Wreck of the Thomas Hyke" is especially well told. It is as marvellous and thrilling as Jules Verne's *Vingt mille lieues sous les mers*, with the additional advantage of being not only possible, but matter of fact as a ship's log.

"Dr. Sévier,"²² though undoubtedly a clever novel, has not to our minds quite the same charm as "Old Creole Days." There is a want of variety, or rather, perhaps, of light and shade. The lives of the most prominent characters are too uniformly overshadowed. We remember no other romance so persistently and monotonously sad, except Theuriet's "Mademoiselle Guignon." "Dr. Sévier" has not the poetic pathos of that masterpiece—its pathos is for the most part less touching, and there is far less of poetry in the treatment. But still there is a sort of likeness between the two works, produced, probably, by the unvarying bad luck which, in both haunts, the people on whom the reader's interest is centred. The only relief from the prevailing sombre hue of Mr. Cable's book is the admirably rendered broken English of the French Creoles, as also of the Germans, Italians and Irish who figure in his scenes. All these diverse races are well imitated, not only in their speech, but in their bodily and mental peculiarities and tricks. The aspect, physical and moral, of the old Creole town of New Orleans, as it was before the war, is wonderfully well conveyed. As to the portrayal of character, some of the secondary personages seem to us better drawn than Dr. Sévier and John and Mary Richlin, who constitute the primary group. The Doctor is too exceptional—too much what on the stage is called a "character part;" while, as to the other two, the uneasiness and distress inspired by their unmerited misfortunes, distract the reader's thoughts from anything like analysis of their characters.

The new volume of selections from the notes of Thoreau, edited by Mr. H. G. O. Blake,²³ has the same charm as its predecessors. That charm consists in the sights and sounds of out-door sylvan life, not by any means photographed, but modified and humanized by the poetic medium through which we see them. It is the poet more than the naturalist, the thought rather than the observation, that constitutes the particular attraction exercised by Thoreau's writings.

"Foxglove Manor"²⁴ is one of the many works of fiction wherein religion and irreligion are pitted against each other. The shades of opinion put forward vary, and the victory inclines to one side or the

²¹ "The Lady or the Tiger, and other Stories." By Frank R. Stockton, author of "Rudder Grange." Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1884.

²² "Dr. Sévier." A Novel. By George W. Cable, author of "Old Creole Days," &c. Two vols. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1884.

²³ "Summer," from the Journal of Henry D. Thoreau. Edited by H. G. O. Blake. London: T. Fisher Unwin, Paternoster Square, E.C. 1884.

²⁴ "Foxglove Manor." A Novel. By Robert Buchanan. Three vols. London: Chatto & Windus, Piccadilly. 1884.

other, according to the precise shade of belief or of unbelief at which the author has arrived. In the present instance the combatants are a very worthy Agnostic—of scientific tastes and habits of mind—and a most flagitious but fascinating high church parson. The Agnostic has, for once, by far the best of it, both in argument, and in the more convincing logic of deeds. He is an honest man, and in every sense a strong man; while the clergyman is a pitiful, hysterical scoundrel, with nothing to recommend him but his seraphic beauty, and the unctuous charm of his priestly grace and eloquence. Mr. Buchanan explains, in a short preface, that he is aware of the exceptionalness of such a character among English clergymen, and he disclaims any intention of attacking the Church in the person of his saintly *jeune premier*; nevertheless Foxglove Manor must be accounted a damaging book to the Church, and if, as we believe, the "Rev. Charles Santley" is a most rare exception in the Anglican Priesthood, it seems to us hardly fair to gibbet the English clergy in his person. If we make this protest it is only from the love of fair play. There is no lack of indictments which might with perfect fairness be brought against all Priesthoods, Protestant or Catholic, Christian or heathen; but to paint an English clergyman as something little better than a satyr, is as unfair as it would be to select, as a flagrant example of cowardice, a British soldier or sailor. Unfortunately the book bears marks in the third volume especially of being hurriedly written. There are several glaring discrepancies which lessen the *vraisemblance* of the story and are an offence to the reader.

"The Poison Tree"²⁵ by Bankim Chandra Chatterjee, is a romance of native Hindu life, written, as the author's name implies, by a Hindu. The preface by Mr. E. Arnold, is, in itself, the best of critiques on the work, which amply justifies all the praise he bestows on it. The tale is interesting in itself, though the *entrée en matière* is prolix. But the greatest merit of the book, especially for Europeans, is the minute and intimate knowledge which it imparts of native domestic life, modes of thought and sentiment.

In "Teresa Marlow, Actress and Dancer,"²⁶ we have a novel of three volumes with a "sensation" in every chapter. There are Attempted Murders, Abductions, Ambushes, Imprisonment of rightful Heirs in lonely Towers, A renegade Priest—in fact all the *matériel* of a romance of the last century, and yet the book is not entertaining because it is not well put together. We hear less of the heroine, the music-hall dancer, than of any other character. The scene is laid partly in the country and partly in London. Challingham Towers is the name of the disputed estate, and is the scene of three or four triumphal home-comings—the rightful owner and the usurper, arriving and ousting each other by turns. The "Grand Old Woodman"

²⁵ "The Poison Tree: A Tale of Hindu Life in Bengal." By Bankim Chandra Chatterjee. Translated by Miriam S. Knight; with a preface by Edwin Arnold, C.S.I. London: Fisher Unwin. 1884.

²⁶ "Teresa Marlow, Actress and Dancer." A Novel. Three vols. By Wynter Frore Knight, B.C.L. London: Wyman & Sons, Lincoln's Inn Fields. 1884.

is invited on more than one occasion, and bringing his axe with him, cuts down a tree! After a series of incredible misfortunes the chief personages, actress and all, wind up with "aesthetic evangelism" somewhere in the City.

"John Herring"³⁷ stands out among the ruck of commonplace novels, like Gulliver among the Liliputians. Its prevailing characteristic is power. The descriptions of scenes, and places, and atmospheric conditions, though seldom elaborate, have the power of conjuring up definite pictures before the reader's eyes. The story, again, is powerful, and quite unhackneyed. But most powerful of all is the delineation of character, of which there is a wide range, as to age, rank, and personal idiosyncrasy. The tone is somewhat sombre, and the author's view of life is evidently pessimistic, but the glow of poetic feeling, and the justness and originality of thought which permeate the whole work, prevent it from being gloomy, while dulness is a word which does not apply to a single line in its 445 closely written pages.

The less said the better of the tedious and interminable novel of "The Doom of Doolandour"³⁸ by Mrs. F. West. The ignorance, pretentiousness and folly of the book are not to be fathomed.

"Otterstone Hall"³⁹ is a pleasant story. It contains a multiplicity of characters, and plenty of incident. Most of the characters have a certain well-sustained individuality, though none of them attain to being memorable creations. So too, the incidents, though never exciting any intense or poignant interest, are varied and entertaining. In a word, "Otterstone Hall" cannot justly be called a first-rate novel, but it is pleasant reading from the first page to the last, which many first-rate novels are not.

We do not think that the translation of Professor Hausrath's "Antinous"⁴⁰ is likely to excite the same enthusiasm in England which, as we are told in the preface, greeted the first appearance of the original in Germany, some three years ago. If his 'historical romance' had no other defect, the choice of Antinous as its hero is in itself a just and adequate cause of distaste and prejudice. It is true that Dr. Hausrath presents his hero as a thoughtful, innocent, and intellectually earnest youth, but, on the other hand, he does not disguise the damning fact that his position as favourite of the Emperor Adrian exposed him to the scorn and aversion of the Roman people—nay, even of the flower-girls and courtesans. Yet this is the "soul" in whose religious doubts and distresses we are called upon to sympathize and whose disillusiones, as to the reality of the gods and the virtue of mankind,

³⁷ "John Herring: A West of England Romance." London: Smith, Elder & Co., Waterloo Place. 1884.

³⁸ "The Doom of Doolandour: A Chronicle of Two Races." By Mrs. Frederic West. Three vols. London: Wyman & Sons, Lincoln's Inn Fields. 1884.

³⁹ "Otterstone Hall." By Urquhart A. Forbes. Two vols. London: Alexander Gardner, Paternoster Row.

⁴⁰ "Antinous: An Historical Romance of the Roman Empire." By George Taylor (Professor Hausrath). London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1884.

are supposed to have darkened his *innocent* life, and driven him in despair to suicide. This is no doubt the radical defect of the book, which has, in other respects, much to recommend it: thus the character of Adrian is finely portrayed; the mingled vices and virtues of the representatives of the various warring creeds, their simplicity and their astuteness, their trickery and their credulity, are skilfully depicted. On this subject Dr. Hausfath shows unusual clear-sightedness and impartiality. He does not make one sect white, and all the others black. If we are shown the contrivance by which the heathen oracles were worked, we are also made to assist at the stormy debates of the Christian Church, over the vexed question of the selection of edifying myths to be inserted in the accredited edition of the Gospels. Finally, the constant attention to accuracy of historical and archæological detail imparts to the work an atmosphere of reality and of extreme antiquity. The only anachronism is the devouring sadness of Antinous, caused by the loss of Faith. This we are inclined to think, is a nineteenth-century malady.

Mr. Ashton's two volumes of "English Caricature and Satire on Napoleon I."⁴¹ are both amusing and instructive. Indeed the instructive element predominates, for a collection of caricatures and lampoons relating to a state of things long since passed away is hardly provocative of mirth, but it may be eminently instructive, when, as in the present instance, it forms a key to the state of public feeling, and of the mode in which it found expression, during a most eventful period in the history not only of England but of Europe.

The earliest English caricature of Napoleon which Mr. Ashton has been able to discover is called "The French Bugabo frightening the Royal Commanders." It was published on April 14th, 1797, and is not signed. The latest reproduced in the present volumes is by George Cruikshank—"Fast colours—Patience on a monument smiling at grief, or the Royal Laundress washing Boney's Court dresses." It bears date Oct. 26, 1815. The intervening series, numbering more than 300 designs, contains engravings by Ansell, Gilray, Rowlandson, J. Cruikshank, and his illustrious son G. Cruikshank, Woodward, J. Smith, J. Sidebotham, besides many by unknown artists.

In the letterpress, frequent quotations are made from "The Life of Napoleon—a Hudibrastic poem, by Dr. Syntax" (George Combe), and a vast number of the broad sheets and other contemporary squibs both in prose and verse are given. In these the most remarkable feature is the extreme crudity and uncompromising directness of the language in which they are couched. Another noteworthy fact is that all the most outrageous and dishonouring attacks on Napoleon were of French origin, and merely echoed by his English satirists. Mr. Ashton connects and elucidates his quotations by a serious narrative of such passages in the life of Bonaparte as principally attracted atten-

⁴¹ "English Caricature and Satire on Napoleon I." By John Ashton; with illustrations by the Author. Two vols. London: Chatto & Windus, Piccadilly. 1884.

tion on this side of the channel. This part of the work is extremely well executed ; it is short, clear and impartial.

"The discourses of Sir Joshua Reynolds,"⁴³ in their pretty antique dress, form a choice table-book. The discourses themselves, too, are to our thinking very pleasant reading. Mr. Edmund Gosse in his preface, while qualifying them as "graceful and perspicuous," in some sort apologizes for them as more or less *arriérés* in their art teaching, and "a little formal" in their style. In the matter of art teaching we bow to Mr. Gosse's superior technical knowledge, though Sir Joshua seems to contrast favourably with many modern art lecturers, especially in the total absence of affectation and *préciosité*. But as regards the literary merits of the "Discourses" we confess that in our judgment they lose nothing by comparison with other writings of the same age ; their formality does not strike us, and there is certainly less mannerism than in the style of most of his contemporaries.

The purport of "Shakespeare and Montaigne"⁴⁴ by Jacob Feis, be gathered from the following extract (p. 64). "In 'Hamlet,' Shakespeare personified many qualities of the complex character of Montaigne. Before all, he meant to draw the conclusion that whoever approaches a high task of life with such wavering thoughts and such logical inconsistencies, must needs suffer shipwreck." Such is Mr. Feis's theory which he endeavours to prove, first, by an analysis of the spirit and tendencies of Montaigne's writings ; his oscillations between natural scepticism and slavish obedience to the dictates of dogmatic theology. Second, by giving evidence of the profound sensation created in England by the essays of Montaigne both in the original, and afterwards through Florio's translation published in 1604. Having thus shown that the analogy between the vacillating spirit of Montaigne, and the theorizing, fitful, and unpractical mind of Hamlet "like John a dreams, unpregnant of his cause"—may have been due to something beyond mere coincidence—he further labours to affirm his theory by attempting to prove that the contemporaries of Shakespeare recognised Montaigne as the prototype of Hamlet. To this end the plays of Dekker, Marston, and more especially of Ben Jonson, are ransacked for allusions—for the most part too dark to be convincing—to either Hamlet or Montaigne. There is a long chapter on Hamlet which, though written in support of a predetermined theory, contains much sound and acute criticism. On the whole we cannot honestly say that, in our opinion, Mr. Feis has proved his point. For that matter, what similar point ever has been proved ? But he has thrown additional light on the most interesting period in our history, by his minute investigation of the inter-relations subsisting among the Elizabethan dramatists : and though we may fail to arrive at the conviction that the final cause of "Hamlet" was to combat and confute the ener-

⁴³ "The Discourses of Sir Joshua Reynolds." Edited and annotated by Edmund Gosse. Parohment Library. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1884.

⁴⁴ "Shakespeare and Montaigne." An Endeavour to explain the tendency of *Hamlet* from allusions in contemporary works. By Jacob Feis. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1884.

vating and self-contradictory ideas of Montaigne, we can hardly deny that so remarkable a thinker as Montaigne must have left his mark in the writings of his English contemporaries and immediate successors.

"Much Ado about Nothing"⁴⁴ is published in fully recovered metrical form. With all respect for Mr. W. W. Lloyd's special study of the subject, "the metrical form," on which he lays so much stress, seems to us a distinction without a difference; for though the lines may be written in metrical form, they will infallibly be read or acted solely in accordance with the sense; and if they were read or spoken on any other plan, the spirit and reality of the scenes must suffer.

At the head of our Christmas books, deservedly stands the graceful and clever little volume entitled "Y^e Gestes of y^e Ladye Anne."⁴⁵ We are given to understand that it was conceived and written by a young lady scarcely out of her teens, and that most of its inspirations have truth and reality behind them. However this may be, the result is eminently successful. We have read it with the greatest pleasure and amusement. Pleasure, at its elegance and ease of style (the ballads and songs of the olden time are really *hors ligne*) and amusement, at the strokes of satire and the sly twinkles of humour which are continually cropping up, and the archaic quaintness of the language. The book is beautifully put out of hand by Messrs. Field & Tuer—the illustrations are abundant and admirably drawn. We only hope that Evelyn Forsyth will not be content to repose upon her maiden laurels, but that "Y^e Gestes of y^e Ladye Anne" may be followed by other works from her brilliant and witty pen.

"He—She—It,"⁴⁶ by C. M. Seyppel, is a most extraordinary production, purporting to be an ancient MS. recently found in one of the tombs of the Egyptian Kings, and filling up a hiatus in the history of his country. It is wonderfully got up to imitate ancient papyri, and from its aspect might have been shut up with a mummy for thousands of years. The drawings are excellent burlesque imitations of Egyptian pictorial inscriptions. No Ginsberg is needed to prove the unauthenticity of this "Shapira," nor is it difficult to find the key to the MS. in the Egyptian policy of our own Government. Perhaps—should this absurd pamphlet outlive the ages—it may be discovered in some ancient library by a future Dousterswivel—and no Edie Ochiltree to "mind the biggin o't!"

"True Tales of Travel and Adventure, Valour and Virtue,"⁴⁷ do not form such an exciting volume as the somewhat sensational and

⁴⁴ "Much Ado about Nothing." A Comedy. By William Shakespeare. Now first published in fully recovered metrical form by W. W. Lloyd. London: F. Norgate, King Street, Covent Garden. 1884.

⁴⁵ "Y^e Gestes of y^e Ladye Anne: a marvellous, pleasaunt and comfortable tale." Edited by Evelyn Forsyth. Illustrated by A. Hennen Broadwood. London: Field & Tuer. Y^e Leadenhalle Presse, E.C.

⁴⁶ "He—She—It. Egyptian Court Chronicle B.C. 1302." By the Peerless Poet Laureate of his late Majesty Rhampainit III. London: Designed by C. M. Seyppel. 1884.

⁴⁷ "True Tales of Travel and Adventure, Valour and Virtue." By James Macaulay, M.A., D.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton, Paternoster Row. 1884.

highly coloured cover might lead one to anticipate. On the contrary, the *recueil* is pervaded by a slight but perceptible missionary flavour—a sort of “odour of sanctity”—which imparts to the tales of adventure and valour something akin to the sickliness of the well-remembered spoonful of jam, which in one’s childhood served as a vehicle for salutary but nauseous powders. It is, we presume, a boy’s book; but boys would like it better if it were less obtrusively didactic.

“Queen Amethyst; or, The Lips of Snow,”⁴⁸ is a confused little tale—a cross between a fairy tale and a religious story—but lacking the gaiety and lightness of the one, and the seriousness and solidity of the other. Though very prettily got up and illustrated, we question its attractiveness either in the nursery or the drawing-room. As a gift book we fear it would fare no better than to be relegated to the shelf.

Mrs. Houghton’s “Herrick’s Content,”⁴⁹ is as attractive as any of the Christmas books of the year. The drawings are admirable, peculiarly graceful, and pleasing, with a spice of grotesqueness which is quite irresistible.

“Play”⁵⁰ is a fine coloured book for babies. There is no stint of pictures, and the drawing is undoubtedly good. But there is something raw in the colouring—we miss the tender tints of Kate Greenaway—and the faces of the children are expressionless, not to say foolish. The uncoloured drawings are far the best.

We have to acknowledge the handsome volume of “Costumes,” from the Conquest to the Regency,” by the Hon. Lewis Wingfield. The work is splendidly mounted—the illustrations are from chromo-lithographs, executed by the ladies of the Female School of Lithography, under the tuition of Sir Cunliffe Owen. Mr. Wingfield prides himself on the correctness of the costumes. On looking them through, the idea is borne in upon us that the much-abused dress of the Victorian era suffers nothing from comparison with the *défroque* of any past age.

We have also a handsome little handbook: “Suggestions to China Painters,”⁵¹ by M. Louise McLaughlin, which, while no doubt most useful to experts, would prove the despair of beginners. We should, therefore, advise the latter to study the first work by this author, which is more elementary, and therefore more really helpful in learning the art.

⁴⁸ “Queen Amethyst: or, the Lips of Snow.” By Henry Blunt. London: Marcus Ward & Co. 1884.

⁴⁹ “Herrick’s Content: His Grange and his Book of Little Verses.” By Robert Herrick. Illustrated by Ellen Houghton. London, Belfast and New York: Marcus Ward & Co.

⁵⁰ “Play.” A Picture-book for Boys and Girls and Babies. Drawn by Edith Scannell. Marcus Ward & Co.

⁵¹ “Notes on Civil Costume in England from the Conquest to the Regency, as exemplified in the International Health Exhibition, South Kensington.” By the Hon. Lewis Wingfield. London: W. Clowes & Sons, Charing Cross, S.W. 1884.

⁵² “Suggestions to China Painters.” By Louise McLaughlin. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1884.

Also a new edition of a very old friend—"The Boy's Own Book."⁸³

"The Adventures of Six Young Men in the Wilds of Maine and Canada"⁸⁴ is as pleasant a record of a summer vacation trip as need be read. An air of youth, gaiety, and light-heartedness, pervades the volume. The illustrations are numerous and unusually good.

"Zig-zag Journeys"⁸⁵ is a similar work, but adapted to the use of more youthful readers; here, too, the illustrations are a prominent and admirable feature.

"Under the Meteor Flag,"⁸⁶ by Harry Collingwood, is a capital sea story—the very thing for boys, and good reading for many of riper years.

Among the new periodicals for the current year, few have met with such universal commendation as "The English Illustrated Magazine."⁸⁷ The first volume has recently been brought out by Messrs. Macmillan: a handsome volume, exquisitely illustrated, and containing a goodly assortment of matter suitable to all readers. Where there is so much to admire, it is difficult to limit our comments, and if sufficient space were at our command we should like to notice each subject *in extenso*. Miss Yonge leads the van with one of her fascinating historical romances, "The Armourer's 'Prentices." Walter Besant has contributed a pathetic story, in which even the humblest models become transfigured and glorified under his magic touch. "The Unsentimental Journey through Cornwall," by the talented authoress of "John Halifax, Gentleman," is quite perfect in its way. The verbal descriptions helped by the excellent illustrations, give a most faithful picture of those well-known scenes. Bruges and its "Belfry, old and brown," are admirably and faithfully described, as also the famous and delicate craft of the Flemish lace-makers. Indeed, we hardly know where to stop, so much is there in the book to interest, to instruct and to amuse.

Mr. James Payn's "Literary Recollections,"⁸⁸ recast from the *Cornhill Magazine*, are to all intents and purposes an autobiography, though the author speaks of them as "after all rather a string of literary anecdotes" than a history of his own life. The chief impressions derived from reading the book, are that Mr. Payn has worked very hard for the "moderate success" to which he has attained, and that he speaks of himself and of his talents with the utmost modesty. His genuine reverence for the great authors of his own time, now dead, rings out through his pages like a chord of true harmony. Anecdotes about literary men are not, for the most part, either striking or funny, but Mr. Payn has made these interesting by his clever

⁸³ "The Boy's Own Book." A complete Encyclopædia of Sports and Pastimes; Athletic, Scientific and Recreative. London: Crosby Lockwood & Co., Ludgate Hill. 1885.

⁸⁴ "The Adventures of Six Young Men in the Wilds of Maine and Canada; or, the Knockabout Club." By C. A. Stephens. London: Dean & Son, Fleet Street.

⁸⁵ "Zig-zag Journeys in the Western States of America." By Hezekiah Butterworth. London: Dean & Son, Fleet Street. 1884.

⁸⁶ "Under the Meteor Flag. The Log of a Midshipman during the French Revolutionary War." By Harry Collingwood. London: Sampson Low, Fleet Street. 1884.

⁸⁷ "The English Illustrated Magazine." 1883-1884. London: Macmillan & Co.

⁸⁸ "Some Literary Recollections." By James Payn. London: Smith, Elder & Co., Waterloo Place. 1884.

sketches of character, and of little points of eccentricity in his personages. Some of them are very vivid, those for example which relate to Harriet Martineau, Dickens, Thackeray, and several others. We have not space to give any of them *in extenso*, but we recommend Mr. Payn's book to our readers, and can promise them a pleasant hour over it.

We have received Part XII. of the Rev. J. Stormonth's English Dictionary.⁶⁰ This admirable work is now complete, and forms a book of reference almost ideally perfect, and that, too, within a very moderate compass and at a reasonable price. The present and final part contains the preface, and four appendices. The first is a list of prefixes; the second, a list of common abbreviations used in writing and printing; the third, a large collection of Latin, French, and other phrases and quotations (this is an invaluable feature in the work); the fourth appendix consists of a complete list of Scripture proper names, with a selection of common, historical, and classical names phonetically re-spelt for pronunciation. The last page contains a scheme of phonotypes, or sound-symbols, for the pronunciation of words.

The Rev. Walter W. Skeat's "Etymological Dictionary"⁶¹ is a special work of great value. It is an important contribution to a great national work. Not even the "Dictionary of the Philological Society," the first issue of which, under the able editorship of Dr. Murray, we recently announced, occupies entirely the same ground as that which Professor Skeat has made his own. Though its primary use is as a work of reference for the student, Mr. Skeat's "Etymological Dictionary" will do good service to the general public, and more especially to authors, by teaching the real and original meaning of words, and thereby promoting the use of a correct and undegraded English.

From "Blackwood's Educational Series"⁶² we have "The Vicar of Wakefield" in cheap form, for the use of schools, and from "The Clarendon Press Series," Alfred de Musset's "On ne badine pas avec l'amour" and "Fantasio, comédie en deux actes,"⁶³ with a prefatory note by Mr. George Saintsbury, and with Introduction and Notes by Mr W. H. Pollock.

"Anecdota Oxoniensia;"⁶⁴ Aryan Series. Vol. I., Part III., is a most beautifully executed transcript of the "Ancient Palm-leaves," &c., chiefly from MSS. in the Bodleian and other Oxford Libraries, edited by F. Max Müller and Bunyin Nanjio, with an appendix by G. Bühler. The contents can be intelligently appreciated by Aryan scholars only.

⁶⁰ "A Dictionary of the English Language." By the Rev. J. Stormonth. Part XII. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood.

⁶¹ "An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language." By the Rev. Walter W. Skeat, M.A., Professor of Anglo-Saxon in the University of Cambridge. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1884.

⁶² "The Vicar of Wakefield." By Oliver Goldsmith. Adapted for use in schools. Blackwood's Educational Series. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons.

⁶³ Alfred de Musset's "On ne badine pas avec l'amour" and "Fantasio." Edited by Walter Herries Pollock. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1884.

⁶⁴ "Anecdota Oxoniensia." Texts, Documents and Extracts, chiefly from MSS. in the Bodleian and other Oxford Libraries. Aryan Series. Vol. I. Part III. Edited by F. Max Müller and Bunyin Nanjio. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1884.

Mr. Hamerton's volume of *Essays on "Human Intercourse"*⁶⁴ can be confidently recommended. Any one who likes essays must be charmed by these. They enter into every department and variety of human intercourse, surveying each from different standpoints. They are by turns grave and gay, instructive and entertaining; but they always give proof of good sense and right feeling.

"*City Echoes; or, Bitter Cries from Glasgow,*"⁶⁵ by the Author of "*Spero and Celestus,*" &c., is written, as its name indicates, to awaken sympathy and practical interest on behalf of "*City Outcasts,*" and is largely sown with anecdotes of the same.

"*Literary Impostures,*"⁶⁶ by H. R. Montgomery, is an entertaining little volume, giving the details of five of the most famous (or infamous) literary impostures in English literature—viz., Chatterton and the Rowley Poems; Macpherson's Poems of Ossian; The Shakespeare Forgery; Psalmanazar and the Formosa Imposture; Bentley and the Epistles of Phalaris.

"*The Algonquin Legends of New England,*"⁶⁷ brought together by Mr. Leland, are a valuable contribution to the Folk-lore of a fast dwindling race, and will no doubt, as he suggests, form highly useful "raw material" for future ethnologists.

Mr. William Hodgson has made an agreeable little book out of a variety of "*Sketches,*"⁶⁸ which he calls "*Personal and Pensive,*" "restored out of a pile of newspapers twenty years old." The "*Personal*" ones are interesting as tributes to many remarkable men; they are in truth *tributes*, for our author is somewhat of a hero-worshipper. We prefer his "*Pensive*" sketches on the whole. The one describing his day's angling in Loch Leven, and his *One fish* that he caught; "*The Brick Brotherhood,*" "*The St. Andrews Golfers,*" "*The Newburgh Pears,*" have all of them the "touch of Nature," which knits together the sympathies of author and reader.

"*Jones, on the World,*"⁶⁹ is too vast a subject to be entered upon at the fag end of our *belles lettres* review; especially as we learn from the preface that the large and handsome volume which lies before us is but the first of a projected series of fifty similar volumes, whose publication is delayed because "there is not a publisher living with sufficient insight or moral courage to take it in hand." We confess that we would rather defer any expression of opinion until this preliminary difficulty has been surmounted.

⁶⁴ "*Human Intercourse.*" By Philip Gilbert Hamerton. London: Macmillan & Co. 1884.

⁶⁵ "*City Echoes; or, Bitter Cries from Glasgow.*" By the author of "*Spero and Celestus,*" &c. Paisley and London: Alex. Gardner. 1884.

⁶⁶ "*Literary Impostures.*" A Series of Essays. By, H. R. Montgomery, Author of "*Memoirs of Sir R. Steele and his Contemporaries,*" "*Thomas Moore,*" &c. London: E. W. Allen, Paternoster Row. 1884.

⁶⁷ "*The Algonquin Legends of New England: or, Myths and Folk-lore of the Micmac, Passamaquoddy and Penobscot Tribes.*" By Charles G. Leland. London: Sampson Low and Co., Fleet Street.

⁶⁸ *Sketches, Personal and Pensive.* By William Hodgson. Edinburgh and London: David Douglas. 1884.

⁶⁹ "*Allegories, Discourses, Dissertations, Disquisitions, Episodes, Legends, Fables, Problems, and Proverbs on Fact and Fiction, Past and Present, and the World.*" By Ben. Charles Jones (Capt.). First Series. London: Williams and Norgate, Henrietta Street, Covent Garden.



WESTMINSTER

AND

FOREIGN QUARTERLY

REVIEW.

APRIL, 1885.

ART. I.—THE OTTOMAN TURKS IN EUROPE.

FOR the past four hundred years, some of the fairest portions of the south-east of Europe have been subject to a race alien alike in origin, character, and religion to the other European States. With this fact, on its practical side, we are to a certain extent familiarized by the continual recurrence of the so-called Eastern Question. We have heard much and often of the weakness, the corruption, and the decay of the Turkish Empire. Its ever-impending yet ever-delayed disappearance has been constantly before the eyes of the European world. It has provided a never-failing material for diplomatic arrangements and re-arrangements, which have, however, left the problem still unsolved; it has again and again proved a disturbance to the peace of Europe, now by its apparent weakness, and the consequent aggressions of powerful neighbours; now by its reckless misgovernment and the resulting insurrections of its subject provinces. Indeed, the present position of Turkey has engrossed so much of our practical consideration, that we have perhaps ceased to wonder at the strangeness of the phenomena which Turkish history presents. We do not always realize that regions, the seats, in former ages, of Greek enterprise and civilization, and the centre for centuries of the eastern division of the Roman Empire, are held now by a race which, six hundred years ago, was a nomad horde still ranging the table lands of Asia. Nor on the other hand, perhaps, do we always bear in mind how immense a contrast between its former energy and force and its

present paralysis and degradation the history of this race suggests. We shall attempt, therefore, in the following pages, not to trace the history of the Ottoman Turks forward step by step with minuteness, but, if possible, to point out some of the causes which have made that history so unique and remarkable; to explain the wonderful rapidity of their earlier successes and their recognition as an integral power of Europe; to show the inherent sources of weakness; to determine the causes which ultimately led to decrepitude and decay; and finally to advert to the wonderful vitality which, like so many of the lower organisms, it has in spite of all displayed. To this end we shall use the more concrete facts of history as the joints and framework necessary for the consistency and clearness of our subject.

The migrations of races have usually followed the course of the sun, and the historian must cast his eye eastward to discover the original domicile even of the civilized nations of Western Europe as well as of those nomad hordes which have from time to time devastated its south-eastern provinces, or penetrated to the bleak shores of the Northern Sea. High Asia has not inaptly been termed "the mother of nations," but with almost equal appropriateness it might be called the fertile parent of Western revolutions. From its widely extended table-lands there have issued, from prehistoric ages, successive irruptions of barbarous and nomadic tribes impelled from their seats by movements of new national life to the Eastward, and in their turn passing on the shock, now with less now with more momentum, to the West, and causing there some of the most remarkable crises and revolutions of history.

After the Indo-European or Aryan race had made its passage from Central Asia towards the West, depositing on its way the seeds of future civilizations, there seems to have been a pause, perhaps of centuries, in the migratory transits described above. When they recommenced, they represented the movements of a different and a less civilized race—the Turanian—and of this the most numerous as well as the most historically important division were the Turks. To this race, in all probability, belonged, though space forbids us to enter into the question here, the succession of invading tribes which, under the names of Huns, Avars, Bulgarians, Khazars, Patzinaks, and Uzi, penetrated into Europe north of the Black Sea, passed over the steppes of Southern Russia, and broke in successive waves upon the northern frontiers of the Eastern Empire.

Fierce, sometimes irresistible, however, as these invasions were, the barbarous tribes in no case founded any permanent settlements in Europe. They disappeared after a longer or a shorter period of success, sometimes all but annihilated by the hideous

carnage of those barbarous battle-fields, sometimes no doubt amalgamated with the surrounding nationalities, often dispersed, and in scattered bands retracing their steps towards the north or east. Meanwhile the Eastern Empire, often tottering to its foundation through the rude shocks thus received, still maintained its ground, and to some extent its old prestige. From the same Eastern region and by the same race, but by a different route, a more formidable and, in the end, a more fatal attack was being gradually prepared. Towards the close of the tenth century there crossed the Jaxartes, a numerous horde of Turks expelled from their more eastern homes, and led by a chieftain named Seljuk. He, after encamping some time in the neighbourhood of Samarcand, embraced with his tribe the Mahomedan religion, and fired with religious zeal, or its semblance, handed down to his successors a power soon to be developed into an empire. Advancing westward from Persia, the tribe, called from its original leader, the Seljukians, gradually overran the whole of Asia Minor and founded the seat of its empire at Nicæa; not one hundred miles from Constantinople. Frequent were the collisions during the next hundred years with the Roman Empire, which, when almost at its weakest and most hopeless state, was granted a brief respite by the first crusade, which compelled the Seljukians, in the beginning of the twelfth century, to remove their capital to Iconium. It was at this period that the Mongol invasion of Zenghiz Khan and his successors convulsed both Europe and Asia Minor, and when the hordes of Tartars at last dispersed, they left the Seljukians wrecked and helpless, and the road lay open for a fresh migration of another division of the same race—the Ottomans. Starting from the same region as the Seljukians, following a similar course, and like them imbued, but in a still greater degree, with Mahomedan fanaticism, they, under the lead of Ertogrül, now entered upon the heritage of the Seljukians. If the northern Turks had, throughout their migrations, remained uncivilized and barbarous, the case was far otherwise with the Seljukians and Ottomans. The more southerly direction taken by them had made their history very different from that of the tribes already mentioned. The steppes of Russia were as suited to nomadic tribes as the plains of Asia, and the various north-Danubian races had received no more than the elements of civilization. But south of the Euxine all was different. The course from Persia to Constantinople was no uncivilized tract of country which barbarian hordes could traverse at pleasure. In the northern portion there was the civilization and military power of the Eastern Empire; southward there were the political organization and religious enthusiasm of the Saracens. Barbarians could hardly make the

passage unchanged and unaffected by these new conditions of life. Hence their history becomes more complex; causes and conditions are multiplied, and the affiliation of results is more momentous but more difficult.

It was in 1356 that the Ottomans first crossed the Hellespont into Europe, but we should ill understand their subsequent successes if we did not briefly advert to their career across the Straits, which furnished the antecedents of much that was peculiar in their history. For 300 years before the final passage into Europe the Turks of Asia Minor had been engaged in wars from which they learned the military discipline and tactics of European armies; for the Crusades, into which were thrown the chief martial energy of Western Europe from the eleventh to the fourteenth century, were mostly, as Latham points out, not against Saracens but Turks. It is true that these great conflicts were fought farther to the south than the Seljukians or Ottomans penetrated, but between the different Turkish tribes of Asia Minor there were constant relations either friendly or hostile, and the military improvements of one would soon find their way to all the rest, just as we find that the degree of civilization and warlike skill possessed by the Turks of Iconium was at once appropriated by their Ottoman successors. But besides the Crusades there had been other wars with Europeans, which had affected in the closest way the more northern Turks—wars with the very Power which guarded the entry into Europe. From opposite sides, from Constantinople and Trebizond, the Seljukians, and after them the Ottomans, found constant and formidable instructors in the arts of war. Hence, when the band of Turks under Ertogrulh descended from Khorasan, and passing westward of the Euphrates and Mount Taurus, sought fresh seats in Asia Minor, they found themselves amongst kindred races, whose heritage of warlike experience as well as of actual dominion they were not slow to make their own. And this double appropriation as well as their rapid progress towards Europe was rendered easy and natural by the circumstances which marked the period of their appearance. The Seljukian empire had had its short and brilliant day of barbaric conquest and barbaric civilization. The causes to prolong its natural term were wanting; it was stricken by a complete "moral palsy" within, and by the terrible flood of Mongol invasion from without. The Ottoman nation was fresh, receptive, and as yet uncorrupted, barbarous indeed, but aided by the moral force and rising order which their zealous profession of Islam gave them. Their first possession in Bithynia expanded with rapidity in all directions,¹ and they soon found themselves face to face with the empire which had endured so many shocks from their northern kinsmen. Constantinople

had now entered into a settled decline. Shattered and divided by the events which led to the Latin dynasty, no longer protected on the north by the now threatening kingdoms of Servia and Bulgaria, and utterly enfeebled by political and moral corruption, she was quite unable to make head against her resolute and persistent enemies on the eastern frontier. A chance of recovery presented itself when the Russian power and the Seljukian Empire were simultaneously broken by the Mongol invasion, but her weakness amounted to a paralysis and the opportunity went by.

Against this tottering power there was opposed all the freshness of a youthful nation, all the fanaticism of a conquering religion. The dominions founded by Othman were soon increased by his son Orkhan, under whom the first passage into Europe took place. Nicomedia, Nicæa, Pergamus, successively fell into his hands, and in 1356 he crossed the Straits into the imperial territory, first as a paid ally of the Emperor Catacuzene, but to abide there as the possessor of the Thracian Kallipolis. But the importance of Orkhan in Ottoman history lies in more lasting though more intangible actions than the capture of cities or even the passage of the Straits. He appears as a great legislator and as a great political organizer, more prominently even than as a conqueror.

Before a European empire could be founded, it was necessary for an invading army to have a secure standing-ground in Asia. The safety of Constantinople had long consisted in its double territory; the success of the Turks depended on the same condition. Accordingly, the great work of Orkhan was the consolidation of the Turkish possessions in Asia. Unlike a purely barbarian conqueror, he deliberately entered on this task, and performed it with consummate skill. Communes were established, mosques erected, schools founded, and the whole country, which at that time owned his supremacy, welded and compacted by a system of civil administration which left his successor free to pursue fresh conquests westward. But with all his administrative talent, he probably owed much of his success to more general causes. It must never be forgotten that he had not to begin *de novo*. A code of laws for his subjects was provided for him by the Mahomedan religion, a code, too, which had been expressly adapted by its founder to the necessities of a conquering nation. This law was not only provided for him, but obedience to it was ensured by sanctions stronger than he could have invented. The importance of this assistance to the ruler of a newly rising dominion, in holding together his subjects and tightening the reins of authority, can hardly be over-estimated, and a judicious ruler like Orkhan

would not fail to make good use of it. Besides his civil organization, the beginnings at least of that military system, peculiar to the Ottomans, date from his reign, and the levy of tribute-children systematized by his son Murad is generally assigned to the invention of his vizier Tschendereli. By this institution, of which more will be said in the sequel, the standing army of Charles VII., as Von Hammer points out, was anticipated by 100 years. From what has preceded it appears that causes general and personal had been at work on the Asiatic side of the Straits, all tending in the direction of Ottoman rule in Europe. It is now necessary briefly to look at the resistance to be expected there.

From the first entrance of the Roman power into the south-eastern provinces her civilization and that of Greece had remained side by side, unabsorbed and unabsorbing. If either had acted alone, it is possible that a common type similar to that in the west might have arisen, and the diversities of race in the empire have grown fainter or disappeared. As it was they neutralized one another. Constantinople became a Roman capital, with Greek language and Greek mode of life, and the minor races maintained their own nationality almost untouched. How many of these races there were, we have already partly seen. The northern parts of the empire lay close to the high road from Asia and Central Russia towards the west, and tribes repulsed from the west found easy settlements here. Thus arose the separate kingdoms of Croatia, Servia, and Bulgaria, of Slavonic race, scattered amid the older races of Albanians, Illyrians and Thracian Roumanians, whom the Romans had found in the land. Thus the empire was surrounded by or consisted of heterogeneous nationalities, each remaining so separate and distinct in manners, interests, and sympathies, that a common union against an invader was almost impossible.

And so it proved when Amurath I. began to extend his father's foothold in Europe. Bulgaria had again become a hostile power. Servia, under Stephen Dushan, had founded a threatening kingdom over Macedonia, Albania, and Northern Greece. This fell with the death of the king; but it weakened the empire while it lasted, and was significant of the disunion which was to aid the Turk.

The conquests of Amurath, notwithstanding some diversions created by insurrections in the East, were rapid. Adrianople became his European capital, and the capture of Philippopolis marked his advance on the Balkans. Then began his conflicts with the more warlike Slavonian kingdoms, but a petty crusade, promoted by Urban V., and consisting of Servian, Bulgarian, and Hungarian troops, failed to stop his advance, and after the

battle of Marizza, Servia and Bulgaria paid tribute to their conqueror. But the Servian king Lazarus, mindful of the power of his predecessors, not long after organized a more formidable coalition. Bulgarians, Servians, Bosnians formed its Slavonic elements, aided by Hungarians, the Albanian Skypetars, and the Roumanians of Wallachia. A petty success at the outset did not prevent the deliberate annexation of Bulgaria, unopposed by the forces of the league, and in 1389 the Slavonic power was finally broken by the battle of Kossova, and Servia reduced to the position of a vassal State.

The Ottomans were now firmly established in Europe, and ready for fresh conquests, which indeed were guaranteed to them by Amurath's civil and military policy, with which we have now to deal. The system of confirming one conquest before the prosecution of the next, was applied in Europe no less than in Asia, but in one point it was extended. Amurath commenced the custom, followed by Mahomet II. after the capture of Constantinople, of introducing amongst the inhabitants of conquered countries Oriental colonies of Turkomans or Arabs, while the original residents were often transplanted elsewhere. By this well-known device of barbarian conquerors, insurrections were checked and submission ensured. Nor was it without a sagacious purpose that the Ottoman conquests were gradual, not sudden. Complete subjection was preceded by a period of vassalage or semi-dependence, during which the vassal State was used as an instrument for reducing others to a similar condition. Christian troops fought against their kinsmen at Kossova, and during the reign of Bajazet, the Servians, who had to provide 1,000 horsemen every year, sent contingents to the Ottoman armies. Thus concert was prevented, demoralization and paralysis engendered; no breathing space for recovery was allowed, and, when the occasion suited, vassalage was exchanged for subjection, and their right to bear arms taken from the conquered Rayas.

But the institution by which more than by any other the Ottoman government proved superior to contemporary powers remains to be described. The Ottomans, though a warlike race, would hardly by their own resources have defeated so often the armies of western Christendom, or worked out with such consummate skill the civil institutions of their religion. To attain these ends, the military and intellectual qualities of the Rayas themselves were used as instruments, applied and guided by a more than Machiavellian astuteness. It was above all things necessary if the central government was to be strong, for it to consist of members working in unison for a common end under a single direction. This ideal could be best realized by the employment of slaves, and it was accordingly the aim, perhaps of Orkhan, cer-

tainly of Amurath, to take the members of his government from the slaves of his palace. But they were slaves of no ordinary kind. A fifth of all the booty taken in war belonged to the sultan. Of this his choicest portion was the tribute-children levied from his Christian subjects, sometimes from prisoners of war; sometimes, when these did not suffice, from the vassal States. These children, brought up with monastic severity, severed from every tie of family or nation, instructed in the strictest tenets of the Mahomedan religion, underwent within the palace walls a continued training adapted to develop to the greatest extent their latent powers of mind and body. To the sultan, as their only patron, they were bound by ties and motives stronger than any that a Loyola could invent. By lifelong custom, by pampered appetites, by hope of the highest honours, by the terror of immediate death, they were reduced to tools, planning or executing the sultan's designs. The purpose and employment of these household slaves was a double one. Those whose mental gifts raised them above the rest went through a separate and higher education, passing at last into the civil administration of the empire, either as judges, secretaries, or viziers, but whatever their ultimate rank or power, they remained slaves whom a word from the sultan could degrade or destroy. The rest were elaborately trained in military tactics and discipline to be drafted into the famous corps of Janissaries, which for centuries constituted the main strength of the Ottoman army. They formed a military caste, cut off by descent and character from the fluctuations of popular feelings, always providing security for the sultan at home, and in war an organized and disciplined infantry force, which was especially important at a time when the continental armies overlooked the value of this branch. For centuries the Janissaries continued to be the military mainstay of the empire. From the original 1,000 instituted by Orkhan, they had increased to 12,000 under Mahomet II., and to 20,000 under Solyman, and were generally levied from the hardy populations of Albania, Bosnia, and Bulgaria. The history and influence of this second and more formidable Varangian Guard almost bears out the remark of Von Hammer that their institution was more terrible in its consequences for the tranquillity of Europe than the invention of gunpowder.

It was to the organization of their armies that Amurath and his successors owed much of their wonderful success. In addition to the Janissaries and a large body of lightly armed and unpaid troops, retained in the service by the hope of unlimited plunder, the cavalry, always a numerous and important part of an Ottoman army, was provided for by a feudal system, wisely

regulated to the needs of the empire. Its object was twofold, the preservation of conquered territory, and the supply of efficient troops for the army. For this purpose, part of the domain land was divided into military fiefs called Ziamets and Timars, the holders of which were bound to equip one horseman (Spahi) for every multiple of 3,000 aspers. But ample precautions were taken that no landed aristocracy should grow up as a possible check on the absolute power of the sultan. All fiefs were held directly from him; the rule against subdivision was fixed and undeviating; though practically hereditary, re-investiture was necessary after the death of the former holder; but the son of the possessor of a Ziamet only entered upon a Timar, and a Timar falling below a certain value was *ipso facto* vacated. In case of death without issue, or the neglect of feudal duty, the fief was escheated to the crown. These precautions carried out by energetic sultans and aided by the counter-influence of the Janissaries and by the constant requirements of war, kept the feudal system of the Ottoman true to its intent and purpose, until the decay of the empire fairly set in.

Nor was the care of the sultans for the efficiency of their army confined to general organization; it was even more remarkable for the completion of details. Up to the reign of Solyman the Ottoman armies were ahead of Europe in discipline and equipment. Their artillery was numerous and well-appointed, provided with every latest improvement, and the arts of fortification and engineering were carefully studied. Their commissariat was skilfully attended to, and its transport facilitated by the systematic construction of roads along the line of march; and all this at a time when European armies, instead of being disciplined machines, were mere agglomerations of individual knights and their retainers, brave indeed, but too little amenable to discipline, and often from want of organization insufficiently provided against the hardships of a campaign. Nor was it only that the Ottoman army was an efficient one, but war and its preparation was the sole employment of the whole nation. Apart from the political significance of the phrase, they were literally an army of occupation, encamped in a country, the produce of which was theirs by the labour of the subject Rayas. There were therefore no agricultural or commercial needs to draw them away from war, nor at this period was there any cause for apprehension from risings of their subjects, among whom national vigour was entirely drained away by the dreadful tribute of their children.

With these instruments and in these conditions Bajazet found no difficulty in extending Ottoman power. Wallachia submitted, Greece was overrun, Hungary threatened, and the

formidable coalition of Bavarians, Styrians and Hungarians, aided by knights from France and Rhodes, whom Boniface IX. had summoned against the infidel, was broken by the promptitude and vigour of the sultan. With the defeat and capture of Bajazet by Tamerlane the Ottoman power seemed to have reached its final point. A civil war raged between rival claimants for the throne, the Seljukian princes revolted, and recovery seemed hopeless. But no second Crusade appeared from the west; Constantinople was too enfeebled to strike a timely blow, the vassal States were drained of their manhood, and above all the political system, which the early sultans had organized, proved strong enough to bear the strain even without a directing hand. Hence, it happened that after a breathing space under Mahomet I., the Ottoman power had regained its vigour and cohesion under Amurath II. Hungary was now the barrier of Christendom towards the north, and Huniades, adventurous knight and prudent general, maintained the struggle during the whole of this reign and part of the next. Unassisted from the west, except by volunteers, he penetrated across the Balkans, wrested Servia and Wallachia from their conqueror, and only failed of glory and victory by the perjury which led to the disaster of Varna. Meanwhile, another check was placed on Amurath by the obstinate resistance of Scanderberg in Albania, who for twenty-five years withstood the attempt to rob him of his father's kingdom. In a single campaign he caused the loss of 20,000 of Amurath's best troops. But the end of the Greek empire was at hand. Its last important stronghold was lost, when Amurath captured and sacked Thessalonica. Mahomet II., one of the greatest and worst of the house of Othman, fulfilled the destiny of his race and the Ottoman sultan entered the city of the Greek emperors.

The importance of this event to the fortunes of the Turks in Europe, it would be hard to exaggerate. They succeeded to one of the most famous capitals in Europe, which seemed to admit them by their right of possession into the number of the great Powers. The empire, they pretended, had only changed hands; its continuity was not broken, but its vigour recruited by a younger and less effete tenure. More tangible was the strength supplied by the central position of their new capital, which finally cemented their hitherto divided territory in Europe and Asia. It in fine gave them a rallying-power and starting-point, which assured to them their European empire against any Power which at that time could have threatened their ejection.

It is impossible to proceed further without adverting to the negative conditions of Ottoman successes to be found in the apathy and indifference of Western Europe. This apathy was

possibly caused in part by the fact that Mahomedan intrusion was no new phenomenon. The Mongol invasion of Russia and the Moorish power in Spain took away the sense of novelty from the event. But in truth, other causes, general and particular, rendered any decided concert against the intruders impossible. The last disastrous crusade had terminated in 1291, and with it the motive power which had animated religious warfare began to decline. Moreover, the Pope's central power, through which the earlier Crusades had been organized, was now diminished, and his spiritual influence weakened by the forced secession to Avignon. Of the particular States, at the time of Amurath's first successes, each was absorbed in its own internal matters. In England popular forces were rising to the surface under Wat Tyler; in Germany marauding barons were harassing the burghers; Spain was prostrate under Moorish rule. Even the abortive crusade which ended at Nicopolis owed its formation to the personal relationship of the king of Hungary, who commanded the co-operation of the empire, which was one day to be his own. The gallant Huniades, notwithstanding his heroism, only received the voluntary assistance of a few French and German knights. Hence the prostration of the Ottoman power by Tamerlane had been watched with indifference, and the immediate danger of Constantinople called forth no effort to save it. For this indeed there were reasons, political and religious. Geographically isolated from the Western Powers, the empire had but small communion with them from the reign of Heraclius, and therefore its gradual fall created no marked void in European politics. In the tenth century religious disputes had cut it off from the sympathy and assistance of the Latin Church. So high did religious controversy rise that in Constantinople the opinion was freely expressed that the Turkish turban would pollute St. Sophia less than the hat of the Cardinal. After the actual capture of the city, followed by the annexation of Greece and the landing at Otranto, there was indeed some uneasiness aroused, but the successful repulse from Belgrade by Huniades, the resistance of Scanderberg, and the unsuccessful attack on Rhodes served to calm it, and the respite given to Europe by Selim's Persian and Egyptian campaigns tended in the same direction with yet greater force.

Hence when Solyman ascended the throne in 1520, the Ottomans were all but one of the recognized powers of Europe, a position which his long and memorable reign confirmed. Under this prince Ottoman importance reached its zenith. The whole world was changing its face, and in Europe particularly the political and religious revolutions which mark the period of modern history were working themselves out. Almost every

nation was directed by some great ruler. Henry VIII. in England and Leo X. at Rome were respectively directing the Reformation and the Renaissance. Francis and Charles V., both powerful sovereigns, were each looking at Italy as an addition to their dominions; and in Russia and Poland Vassilji Iwanowitsch was laying the first foundations of his northern power, while Sigismund I. was already a formidable neighbour. But for the time each was absorbed in his own interests, while Hungary lay exposed to the attack of her powerful enemy, through the anarchy in which the minority of Louis II. plunged her. Solyman was not slow in taking advantage of his opportunity. Having captured Belgrade, he resolved on the conquest of Rhodes, which was necessary as a medium of intercourse between Constantinople and Alexandria. After a gallant resistance the knights of St. John retired to Malta, and Solyman was left unimpeded to pursue his Hungarian campaigns. The disaster at Mohacz left Hungary a prey to two rival claimants, Ferdinand, brother of Charles V., and Zapyola, a native noble. Solyman supported the latter and marched against Vienna, to meet with the first signal repulse to the Ottoman arms. That and the threatening attitude of Charles V. caused him to turn his attention to the East. Indeed, it was not the least significant feature in the policy of the early sultans, that, unlike the Roman empire, they undertook one great war only at a time, taking care to cultivate friendly relations with all but their immediate enemy. Thus when events rendered a European invasion dangerous, they would convey their unruly Janissaries to quell the constant petty insurrections in the East, or to humble the power of Persia. They were aided in this policy by the fact of having a weak kingdom like Hungary at their northern frontier. Though capable of a stubborn resistance, this nation was never able to repeat the exploits of Huniades. Nor was an understanding possible for her with the subject States of Servia or Bosnia. At this period the Ottomans owed much to the partial toleration of their religion. Under a Mahomedan rule the members of the Greek Church exercised their religion without much interference; under a Hungarian or Austrian domination they knew well that persecution and intolerance would make their entry. After the Reformation had taken place, similar considerations tended to incline the Hungarians themselves to prefer Turkish rule and freedom of worship to Austrian bigotry and persecution.

Under Solyman we have still to mention two territorial extensions, and a change of attitude by the Western Powers, which was more important still. Under Khairaddin Pacha or Barbarossa, the Ottoman navy became a formidable means of

offence. The power of Venice was permanently checked, and the connection of the Algerine stations with the sultan's government promised to revolutionize the relations between the naval States of the Mediterranean. Across the Danube, Hungary was at last annexed, and divided into the "sanjaks" of the Ottoman provincial system, while the event was marked by the first treaty with Austria in which Solyman was treated as an equal sovereign, and, by virtue of the subsidy paid to him, as a victorious one.

But before this he had been recognized by a stronger Power than Austria as a leading member of the European State-system, which was now first growing up. Modern international policy sprang from the mutual jealousy of France and Spain. The Pope's weight was thrown now into one scale, now into the other, but the equipoise which this influence had once produced was disturbed by the new forces of the Reformation. Diversity of creed no longer was a bar to cordial alliances; national interests became the key-stone of international relations, and the balance of power intervened as a principle which first guided and ultimately led the State-craft of Europe. Hence it was that France saw in Solyman no longer the infidel intruder on European territory, but the formidable sovereign who had threatened Vienna and confronted Charles V. In 1536 a treaty of friendly alliance was struck between France and the Porte, and Solyman was enabled to boast that the kings of France, Venice, Poland and Transylvania had sought refuge in the shadow of his might.

On looking back at this unparalleled advance of Ottoman power and influence in Europe, it is impossible not to assign a very high importance to the abilities and personal career of the early sultans. It is scarcely too much to assert that no European nation has produced so long a series of great though unscrupulous rulers as the sultans, with but few exceptions, from Orkhan to Solyman. During reigns, long in years and eventful in results, they seemed to possess almost every quality by which ambitious ends are gained by well-calculated means. Plans of conquest successfully carried into execution, new ideas of government introduced and worked out, though due in part to the creatures and instruments of their will, yet bear upon them the imprint of their directing minds. The tribute-children of Orkhan, the organization of the imperial slaves by Amurath I., the military promptitude of Bajazet, the legislation of Mahomet II., and the crowning administration of Solyman, signify an amount of intellectual force with which no other two centuries of rulers will afford material for comparison. The restrictions on their absolute power were merely nominal and were comprised

in the observance of religious law, interpreted by the chief Mufti. But this religious law was too useful an ally to be weakened or violated, and the fetva of the Mufti only on rare occasions opposed the will of the sultan. But if their power was not restricted by ministers, their choice of ministers was a wide one. No privileges of birth barred the way to advance; no jealousy limited the selection.* Though they were always kept in the background, there is no doubt that the early sultans were assisted by generals and advisers of more than ordinary ability. Amurath owed not a little of his success to Khairaddin Pacha, and Solyman's friend and vizier Ibrahim Pacha greatly eased his burden of government. In fact, there was at Constantinople a school of politicians and generals at a time when the political action of the rest of Europe was incoherent and vague. While the training of ministers was not neglected, the initiation of the royal princes into their future duties was excellent and complete. From their earliest manhood they were entrusted with the administration of the provinces, and when they ascended the throne, they were generally mature alike in age and experience. Nor was the choice of ministers and generals confined to slaves or subjects. Ottoman history is full of the names and successes of renegades from other nations, who were attracted to Constantinople by the free scope for their ability and the rich prospect of rewards and honours: out of the ten grand viziers of Solyman, eight were renegades, and among his generals, the proportion, if less, was doubtless great. Their importance in introducing fresh ideas of government or military tactics increased after the period in which the Ottomans lost their early precedence of Europe in these respects.

From Solyman's death is to be dated the gradual decline of the Ottoman power. Externally it remained unbroken for another century, though its encroachments were henceforth checked by the power of Austria, now conterminous with it on the north. For the next 140 years the warlike relations of Constantinople were chiefly with Venice and Austria; with the other States of Europe she was either at peace or in actual alliance. Against the former, in spite of Lepanto and the prolonged resistance of Candia, she had the advantage. Towards the north, in spite of the diversion in her favour caused by the Thirty Years' War, her power fell back. It was at about this time that the Porte began to abate some of its haughty con-

* Von Hammer remarks that while the highest offices were not by law hereditary, they were often in effect confined to particular families for long periods. He mentions as examples the three families of Tschendereli, Timour-taschi, and Eurenos.

tempt for international usages,* a fact signified in the sixteenth century by the employment for diplomatic purposes of the more subtle and versatile intellects of the Fanariote Greeks. In fact, the era of treaties had commenced, treaties by which the Ottoman power was successively curtailed, first by Austria and then by Russia. The equality of Austria was recognized by the treaty of Sitvatovok in 1606, after the reverses of Mahomet III. in Hungary, and half a century later, a turning-point in Ottoman history was reached at the battle of St. Gothard, where its power was shattered by Montecuculi. Wars with Poland followed, marked by several Turkish defeats, though resulting in the gain of Podolia. During the Thirty Years' War, the Porte was engaged in a vast struggle with Persia, and when in 1682 Vienna was once more reached by the Janissaries of Kara Mustapha, the army of Sobieski inflicted, not the first, but the greatest of the reverses received from Poland. The opportunity was seized by Venice; Greece was wrested from the Porte, and notwithstanding the exertions of the Kiuprili family, disaster followed disaster in Hungary, and Turkish discipline and generalship were proved manifestly inferior to the army and skill of Prince Eugene. In the middle of the century Russia had for the first time ranked among the enemies of the Porte, and the position of the Crimean Khanate had been the scene of continual struggles. In 1699 was signed, in full European conclave, the memorable treaty of Carlowitz. The pretensions of the Porte were set aside; Transylvania and most of Hungary and Sclavonia were ceded to Austria, Podolia to Poland, and while the Morea and Dalmatia were retained by Venice, in the next year the important town of Azoph was given to Peter the Great.

From the date of this treaty, the importance of Turkey has been diplomatic. Its strength and reputation were broken, but its very weakness caused an interest to be taken in its political fortunes which had been absent before, and accordingly we see the strange sight of the great States deliberating in common over each fresh stage in Ottoman history. In the great struggles of Western Europe the Porte took no share. Its influence was mostly confined to Poland and Russia, and through them to Sweden. We can do no more than mark the steps of her decline, a decline interrupted at intervals by the favourable treaties extorted by her obstinate resistance. Austria, raised to an undue predominance by the treaty of Passarowitz, received a severe check by that of Belgrade, and her last war with Turkey at the close of the century was only important in its con-

* Von Hammer remarks that the barbarity of their diplomacy was only equalled by that of their treatment of their prisoners and subjects.

sequences for Servia. As Austrian influence waned in south-eastern Europe, that of Russia rose. The easy terms granted by the Porte on the Pruth were due either to treachery or to a short-sighted contempt for the danger which threatened them from their new enemies. This false security, if it existed, was soon dissipated. The Crimea, already ravaged by Count Munnich, became severed from the Porte by the treaty of Kainardji, and the Russian protectorate of the Rayas acknowledged. Although the "oriental project" of Catharine II. was destined to be unfulfilled, the treaty of Jassy extended the Russian frontier to the Dneister, and the present century has seen the northern Power, supported by the cause of justice and humanity, dictate peace at Adrianople. Our short sketch must come to an end. It will better accord with the aim of this essay to trace the internal causes and antecedents of so much material disaster.

We have seen that the great causes of the rapid successes of the Ottomans were the superiority of their military system and of their method of government and administration, aided by the backwardness of the European nations in these respects. But the necessary condition of continued prosperity is progress. A stereotyped system must by the inevitable laws of history become more and more incongruous with ever-changing conditions; and therefore want of adaptive power is the most fatal disease of national life, and however slow its course, must end in dissolution. With this condition Ottoman history has not complied. The other States of Europe have progressed; Turkey has stood still, and therefore their relative positions soon became inverted. At first the Porte had encountered enemies struggling under the disorganization of the darkest period of the Middle Ages, armed herself with the administrative vigour partly supplied by the Mahomedan religion, partly the result of her own native energy. After the death of Solyman the impulse supplied by these forces had reached its limit; no new forces, the outcome of healthy national life, succeeded, and the recoil was accelerated and the contrast heightened by the marvellous development in religion and politics throughout the rest of Europe.

Ottoman prosperity and stability was founded on a substratum of continual conquest, and this basis once impaired, the superstructure tottered. The rise of Austria checked conquest to the northward; the attitude of Russia soon made precarious the attempt at extension eastwards. The consequences of this pressure were soon apparent. Military discipline, which, as Solyman himself had discovered, could only be maintained in war, began to grow weak. The forces which had been intended for

external aggression, became the cause of anarchy and confusion at home, since there was no national or civic life into which they could become transformed and absorbed. This decay of the military system was most strongly marked in the corps of Janissaries. Even under the strong hand of the early sultans, and with their strict training untouched, their insubordination had often to be met by concession and privilege. These concessions in time made them inefficient in war, and an incubus on the government in peace. The first mistake was committed by Solyman, when he allowed them the right of marriage, which caused their interests to be no longer always identical with those of the sultan. An aggravation of the evil followed in their successful demand that their children should be enrolled as members of the corps. There was now no sort of guarantee that the Janissaries had gone through all the preliminary training, which had made them so unique and formidable. But the extreme of corruption was only attained when the corps was thrown open to the Mussulmen, who, without any discipline, greedily seized on the privileges and rewards, which had formerly been earned by hard fighting in the field. The Janissaries were henceforth stationed in companies throughout the empire. In the provinces they plied trades, received their pay, but rarely mustered under the standard. In Constantinople they formed the most bigoted party of Mahomedans, and as such they placed an effectual barrier against every political reformation; deposed viziers, dictated to the sultan, outraged the population, and in war disgraced their former prestige. The extermination of the whole corps by Mahmoud II. was a barbarous, but almost a necessary, remedy for the gigantic evils which they produced. The other portions of the army were in no better condition. The feudal system was ruined by the most flagrant corruption. In order to ensure a trustworthy order of spahis, the law required that the fiefs should be confined either to sons of previous holders, or to soldiers who had rendered good service on the field of battle. They were now sold to the highest bidders, or granted to Court favourites, eunuchs of the harem, adventurers and intriguers of all kinds. Some of these received as many as twenty fiefs, and the feudal duties which they entailed were utterly neglected. The 12,000 fiefs of Roumelia, which used to furnish 40,000 horsemen, with difficulty sent 8,000 to the sultan's standard. Nor was the other object of the feudal system better secured. The provinces which should have been held together and cemented by these feudatories were subjected to pillage and extortion under the pretence of feudal rights, and redress was obtainable only from the grand vizier, who was generally the source of the abuse. While corruption thus ate

into the heart of the military system, there is no wonder that the details of discipline and organization suffered. The Turks no longer kept pace with the latest military improvements, and at the battle of St. Gothard their inferiority to the Austrians was manifest in the very points in which they had once excelled them.

The corruption and enervation of the Ottoman rule involved of necessity the decline of the sultans themselves. Personal influences are helpless against the full stream of adverse conditions, and brilliant rulers in a declining state must necessarily be rare. Nevertheless, their absence reacts on the decline and accelerates its pace. The majority of Solyman's successors were either voluptuaries or imbeciles. They ceased to lead the armies; they no longer directed the administration. They were either the dupes of ambitious viziers, or the slaves of the turbulent Janissaries, or the facile instruments of Court favourites and ambitious and intriguing sultanas. These evils had commenced before the death of Solyman. Kotchi Bey, an Ottoman historian, cited by Von Hammer, attributes to his reign five causes of corruption: (1) the neglect of regular attendance at the Divan, (2) the commencement of the sale of offices, (3) the relaxation of the principle of strict gradation in the public service, (4) the permission of political influence to the women of the seraglio, (5) the corruption of the office of vizier by the increase of facilities for acquiring wealth from it. If the greatest of the sultans failed to resist these sinister influences, his successors were not likely to be more successful. Moreover, from the seventeenth century the excellent preparatory training in provincial government ceased. It was used as a means of securing succession to the throne; and to prevent the constant apprehension of an armed usurpation, the royal princes were confined to a life of seclusion and indolence at Constantinople. By this means health of body and mind was destroyed, and the result was short reigns, marked by weakness, caprice, and monstrous cruelty. The real power of administration fell into the hands of the viziers, whose constant liability to deposition from one of the numerous side-currents of intrigue rendered any steady or generalizing policy impossible.

But the effects of corrupt Courts, and weak and tyrannical Governments, is often remedied by the gradual rise to the surface of popular and national forces. In the Ottoman empire these forces have never existed. Between the rulers and the ruled there has always been a chasm which refuses to be bridged over. At first, as we have seen, this non-amalgamation left the ruling race free to prosecute its conquests, but, when reverses ensued, the unsubstantiality and hollowness of a Government depending upon force became glaringly apparent. Depending only on its

armies and backed by no enthusiasm or patriotism among its subjects, the Porte possessed no power of prolonged resistance. Its armies defeated, there was no resource, save in the acceptance of humiliating terms or the interference of a foreign Power. Hence it happened that notwithstanding the haughty and stubborn attitude of the Ottoman Government, its unsuccessful wars were seldom protracted. National life, however, of some sort was beginning to stir in the Ottoman dominions, and its results were significant. Towards the close of the seventeenth century the tribute of Christian children finally ceased, chiefly in consequence of the new constitution of the Janissaries, which made this means of recruiting them superfluous. The effects of this change, though necessarily slow, were certain. Bosnia, Servia and Greece had furnished the best elements of that now corrupted corps, and by this means their life-blood had been drained away, and their condition rendered hopeless and prostrate. Allowed to retain their children, though still oppressed with all the weight of the Ottoman religious and fiscal systems, they began to experience the stirrings of national hopes and aspirations and to cast about for an opportunity of liberation from their abject position. The opportunity was slow to arrive, but it was used when it came. The Servian Rayas in the last war with Austria ranged themselves on the side of the invaders, acquired military organization and experience, and under Kara George commenced a period of independence and freedom. Wallachia and Moldavia owed a semi-independence to Russian interference, and Greece became a liberated kingdom after the treaty of Adrianople.

Towards the end of the eighteenth century Ottoman administration was everywhere rotten to its core. Complete disintegration seemed imminent; there was no central energy by which individual interests might be generalized and united. What the corruption at Constantinople was we have seen, but even this was far exceeded by the frightful abuses of the provincial system. The Pachalets were sold to the highest bidder; the purchase-money was often borrowed, and the extortions of the pachas equalled or exceeded by the rapacity of the agents of Armenian bankers. The example was followed by all the subordinate officers, and the wretched provincials groaned under an extortion and oppression which the history of the world has never seen equalled. As long as the revenues were received, the Porte never interfered, and indeed interference was beyond its power. Rebellious feudatories and revolted pachas mocked the central government in three quarters of the empire.* **Egypt and Syria**

* Lord Broughton (cited by Creasy) says of Albania that specimens of almost every form of government might be found in it.

became virtually independent; Widdin was for years the independent stronghold of Passwan Oglow; Ali Pacha long defied the sultan in Epirus.

But notwithstanding this long corruption and decay the prophecies of Ottoman dissolution have remained unfulfilled. With the exception of Egypt and the liberated States in Europe the empire of the Porte has retained its integrity; her armies have sometimes gained victories, and even the gloss of European civilization has penetrated to Constantinople. The causes which have contributed to this prolongation of Turkish power are not far to seek. They have consisted in its capacity for resistance (1) to the consequences of internal decay, (2) to destruction from foreign aggression. Earlier barbarian dynasties have usually disappeared with rapidity after the first conquering impulse withdrew its support. The Ottoman empire was founded on conditions so singularly favourable, and aided by an organization so unique, that its work had taken too firm a hold to be more than loosened by the adverse influences which succeeded. Its cohesion refused to be dissolved, though its well-defined symmetry and compactness were lost. It remained a glowing and seething mass which resisted the fires of corruption through the Cyclopean welding which had produced it. It was the complete divergence between the "survival" of former greatness and the new conditions which surrounded it, which caused a pitch of corruption, happily more often anticipated by the disappearance of that which obstructs progress.

More particular circumstances worked towards the same result. By the possession of the Caliphate after Selim's invasion of Egypt, the Sultan became the recognized head of the Mahomedan religion. This was more than an honorary title; it put the influence exercised by emperor and pope into the same hands, and when the authority of the former was weakened and despised, the binding associations of their religion still secured to the successors of the Prophet some remains of his former importance. Without this religious support, the disintegration of the empire must have been inevitable; by its means a bond of union was provided, deriving from the zeal and enthusiasm which characterize Mahomedanism sufficient strength to neutralize to some extent the heavy strain put upon the centre of administration by the decrepitude of the secular power. Another circumstance which warded off a complete state of anarchy was the preservation of the same ruling family. From the commencement of Ottoman history no candidate for the throne ever appeared outside the house of Othman. The sanctity of this line of succession was no doubt aided by the possession of the Caliphate and by the early employment of slave ministers, but

its source seems to lie deeper still in national feeling and tradition, and it was never violated. The possession of the throne never became the goal of successful intrigue, and the strongest motive to rebellion and civil war was therefore wanting. If once the way to the throne had lain open, the already loosely cemented empire would have been torn asunder, and the ambition of the pachas have been more fatal than their avarice.

These influences were felt even under the most imbecile of the sultans, but more personal causes from time to time arrested the course of decay. A high-handed and remorseless sultan like Amurath IV. for the time restored order and repressed corruption. The prudence of Sokolli found too few imitators among the later viziers, but the ability and virtue of the Kiuprilis produced a transformation in the empire, the effects of which must have done something to retard the rapidity of decline. The reformations of Selim and Mahmoud were in the main delusive, but the abolition of the feudal system by the former, and the destruction of the Janissaries by the latter, removed some cause of discontent, and made possible some return to military efficiency. Bulwarks such as these would have offered feeble resistance to a general rising of the subject Rayas, who outnumbered the oppressors by five to one. But the danger arising from such a possibility was averted by the mutual jealousies and divisions which existed among the members of this heterogeneous class. The Albanians would ill have submitted to Slavonic rule, nor would the Slavs have been the willing instruments of Greek aggrandisement. The Armenians were cut off from concert with their fellow-Christians by the Mahomedan province of Anatolia, which barred the way. Hence the forces which might have caused apprehension were disjointed, and selfish interests and national jealousies either maintained their condition unchanged or made the risings partial, and therefore less fatal to the Turkish empire. Thus Servia became independent, but Bosnia and Bulgaria remained beneath the yoke; Greece won her freedom, but Macedonia and Thrace were left in slavery.

It may be doubted, however, whether any favourable circumstances from within could long have retarded the fall of the Ottoman power in Europe, if circumstances positive and negative had not aided it from without. Duration of empire was guaranteed by the geographical position of the imperial city. Situated at the meeting-point of two seas, the nearer shores of which were Ottoman territory, its sources of supply were boundless, and an attack from the north unsupported by a strong fleet would have been an enterprise full of temerity. Fortified thus by its unique situation, and in no small degree by the prestige and glory of its unrivalled career, Constantinople afforded to the

Ottomans the vitality which the rotten Byzantine empire before them had derived from the same source. Floods of invasion had beaten against the walls of the Greek capital, and in their recoil had desolated its provinces, but while the city was untaken, its empire, amid weakness and disaster greater than ever seized the Ottoman power, still remained. When it fell the conquering power came *from the East*, and its Asiatic provinces were subdued, before the invasion from the north was crowned with success. But the Turkish invasion has been followed by no other immigration of barbarous tribes. The provinces of Anatolia have always been the best secured portions of the empire; they have never opened to an invading army the high road to Constantinople. It is in the continued absence of danger from this quarter that Turkish security has in great measure consisted. Constantinople has remained the cementing link between the European and Asiatic parts of the empire, protected by both, and securing the material integrity of the Ottoman dominion.

We have seen how the principle of the "balance of power" had served under Solymán to introduce the Porte at the maturity of its power into the State-system of Europe. It remains to trace its influence in supporting it, after its natural term of life had expired. France made the first Turkish alliance, and the same Power continued for long to be the main European influence at Constantinople. The agents of Louis le Grand were always present there, and the negotiations for the treaty of Carlowitz were secretly modified by their means. At that treaty England and France were the mediating Powers, and from that time either one or both took a prominent part in the negotiations which attended the Porte's foreign relations. Severed alike by religious creed and by geographical position from the great questions of Western Europe, and, though declining, not without power and resources, Turkey was regarded as a possible ally which might by its weight opportunely turn the scale. As the Porte grew weaker, these individual interests of the western states were merged in their common apprehension of the East, and a general policy was developed. Russia was rapidly extending her frontier towards the Danube, and Catherine II. undisguisedly aimed at the possession of Constantinople. The treaty of Kainardji was struck, notwithstanding protests from the west. The annexation of the Crimea gave rise to more serious alarm. France was eager for intervention, but England hung back. Eight years later English interference prevented the independence of Moldavia and Wallachia, although Pitt's proposal to equip a fleet for the Dardanelles was not successful. Jealousy of Russian aggression henceforth directed European statesmanship. By the event which followed the French revolution, and

especially by Napoleon's descent on Egypt, England, became the Porte's chief protector, though France and even Prussia continued to assume at times a similar attitude. A moral support was thus extended to the corrupt and nerveless Government at Constantinople. The "balance of power" became deified by "political fetichism," and the moral basis of international diplomacy was too often overlooked. But whether this policy has been moral or immoral, sagacious or short-sighted, it is not our present question; in any case the result is clear that from the causes which we have traced, Western diplomacy has unnaturally extended the term of Ottoman empire in Europe, which but for this interference must almost inevitably have disappeared.

No explanation of the course of Ottoman history would be complete which left out of account the influences exercised by the Mahomedan religion. Some of these have been already incidentally alluded to, but the importance of the subject justifies and demands a more detailed treatment. Of all the qualities which decide the fate of nations, the most critical and momentous is their power of moral expansion and their aptitude for moral progress. Moral corruption means material decay, and true national welfare is only secured by the unimpeded action and reaction of the finer and coarser tissues of national life. But among the forces which advance or retard morality, religion has always been the strongest, and may in fact be taken as the index and measure of the rest. In treating of the effects of Islam, a distinction must be made between its results on the world's history and its consequences for the particular nations which embraced it. To confuse these is to confuse the abstract and the concrete. Viewed in the former aspect, it was important chiefly for its insistence of the principle of strict monotheism, and in this way doubtless played its part in the development of the religious ideas. But to the historian, the practical effects of a religion are the most important, and the concrete system in which Mahomedanism consists has always given rise to fatalism, polygamy, slavery and intolerance. By fatalism national character was affected individually as well as politically. While it fostered reckless bravery in war, it caused a moral apathy and enervation, a want of enterprise and a false security, which has made that bravery futile. In its political consequences it was, if possible, more disastrous still. Defeat in war and the enfeeblement of the Government were alike the will of Allah. Resignation was the only true fortitude; attempts at reformation were useless, if not impious, for had not the Koran declared that "each nation has its allotted term?" The corrupting effects of polygamy and slavery on that society which recognizes them are certain and inevitable. The slavery may be mild and the marriage

laws severe, but the moral corruption will only be diminished, not prevented. Existing in any shape, they choke the free expansion of important elements of national life, and they open the way for moral degradation, which will certainly not fail to make its entry. But to Turkey these institutions have been politically prejudicial. They have served to mark off the Ottoman nation as a population alien to the rest of Europe, as intruders and barbarians, whereas its only true safety consisted in throwing off all estranging and separating influences, and in becoming assimilated to European nations.

But perhaps the most disastrous effect of their religion on the Ottoman power has been the relations which it has involved between it and its Christian subjects. Islam is essentially an aggressive religion. "In the shade of the crossing scimitar there is Paradise," said the Koran, and between the true believer and the infidel, war could only be suspended by conversion or tribute. Thus a condition of inferiority was at once imposed on the Christians who became members of the Ottoman empire. But this was not all. The payment of tribute might have been rendered insignificant by practical equality, and a gradual fusion of race might have ensued. But again the sacred law rendered such a result impossible, and provided for a continued severance of rulers and ruled. All contact or intimacy with unbelievers was strictly forbidden; the Christians lived in a separate quarter of the towns, wore a different dress, were not allowed to bear arms, and might lawfully be treated with indignity and disrespect.* It is true that their religion was tolerated within certain galling limits, but the toleration was contemptuous, and ill-calculated to conciliate. Once more; prudent statesmanship would dictate to a conquering race a wise and far-sighted adjustment of the national laws, so as to embrace within their scope all the heterogeneous elements of their dominions. Such a task would be always difficult, but for the Turks it was impossible. Their social system, their laws and their government depended on the Koran and the sacred traditions; they presupposed a Mussulman population; where they noticed Christians at all, they aimed not at fusion but at severance. Under Mahomedan law, equality or assimilation between Ottoman conquerors and Christian subjects was an impossibility. External circumstances widened the gulf. The early sultans were constantly at war with the Christian kings of Europe; it was therefore necessary to prevent the subject Rayas from creating an unfavourable diversion. The tribute of children was one way of doing this,

* *Vide* a quotation from the "Malteka-ul-Ubhur," in an article in the *Nineteenth Century* for December, 1877, by the Rev. Malcolm McColl.

but it was not the only way, and the motive was strong for turning "contemptuous toleration into virtual oppression." * Owing to these circumstances, necessarily resulting from their religion, the Ottomans have continued to be an alien population in the European territory which they have conquered; they have never been supported by the strength which national forces only can afford, and they have been under continual apprehensions of the rising of their Christian subjects, who have never failed to make use of any opportunities of severing themselves from their oppressors.

It is thus owing to difference of religion rather than to distinction of race that the Ottoman nation has so signally failed to be amalgamated with its European subjects; it is from the same cause that in the international struggle for existence the Porte has been drawn down by a stagnant morality and retrograde political forms. Nor does the outlook for the future afford any hope of reformation. The Koran is a guide, minute and precise; its directions bind the true believer at all places and in all times. From it and from oral tradition the elaborate system of Mahomedan jurisprudence has been compiled. By Solyman it was constituted an authority without appeal; the last edition of it was published in 1856. † It results from this ossified system of government that political changes are impossible without a modification of religion. Individual sultans may desire them; far-sighted viziers may attempt them; but the dead-weight of national apathy, prejudice and bigotry clogs every forward movement. During the last century the greatest obstacle to change was found in the selfish interests and religious zeal of the Janissaries. But their extermination failed to clear the way. The influential body of the Ulemas, devoted throughout their lives to the study and interpretation of the sacred law, monopolizing education, and comprising almost all the intellect of the country, set their faces steadily against reform. The fanaticism of the wandering Dervishes, if its influence is not immediately political at the present day, serves to leaven the heavy and apathetic populace, and might rouse it into flame. The Government dare not change the letter of the sacred law; they may attempt to transform its spirit; they may profess to return to the true intentions of the Prophet, from the gradual deviations which have hidden them; but in a system, the essential life of which is *obedience to the letter*, they must necessarily fail. Mahmoud II. made the attempt, and he was termed a *Giaour*. The Hatti-Sherif of Gulhaueh proclaimed reformation, but

* The phrase is Mr. Freeman's.

† *Nineteenth Century*, December, 1877.

Europe in vain waited for its effects. As subjects of Christian powers, Mahomedans may be an industrious and well-conducted population, as the Tartars of the Russian empire serve to show. As an independent nation, ruling Mahomedan subjects, they may remain without shocking civilization and humanity, as the Persian monarchy proves; but the European rule of Mahomedans over Christians contradicts every tendency of political, moral, or national progress, and the close of Turkish history in Europe must some day be an illustration of the law that the prolonged life of systems or nations must depend upon the ultimate cohesion and mutual adaptation of their members.



ART. II.—LORD MALMESBURY'S "MEMOIRS OF AN
EX-MINISTER."

Memoirs of an Ex-Minister: an Autobiography. By the Right Hon. the Earl of MALMESBURY, G.C.B. Two vols. Svo. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1884.

IN our last number we reviewed "The Croker Papers;" in our present, we propose to review Lord Malmesbury's "Memoirs of an Ex-Minister." The two books together give a consecutive account of the policy and of the internal councils of the Tory party for sixty years—viz., from 1809, when Mr. Croker was made Secretary to the Admiralty, to the death of the late Earl of Derby in 1869. Mr. Croker was in his lifetime, and Lord Malmesbury still is, a staunch member of the old Tory party, but to Mr. Croker belongs the merit—if such it be—of being the most undeviatingly consistent of the two; he had retired from, if not active, official life more than twenty years before Lord Malmesbury began his Ministerial career, and so escaped the democratic pressure of later days which compelled Lord Malmesbury on more than one occasion to make what David Deans would have called "right-hand defections and left-hand way slidings" from the great and comfortable doctrines of the old Tory creed.

Lord Malmesbury warns his readers that they will not find in his volumes "a continuous narrative, but rather a *Macedoine* of memoranda-diary and correspondence." His principal object is "to sketch the three Administrations of the late Earl of Derby, whose colleague he was, and also some incidents respecting one of the most remarkable men of the century—namely, the Emperor Louis Napoleon, who during all Lord Derby's Governments

played so important a part in his policy and the great game of Europe."* Our review will in the main be limited to the history of these three Administrations. "I will only add," continues Lord Malmesbury, "that of men, events, and common things I wrote as they appeared to me at the time, and have altered nothing since they were noted."* We agree, however, with a contemporary that Lord Malmesbury has in several passages made "a slight and involuntary confusion between his original entries and the narrative of a later period."† For instance, we find this entry in his diary: "17th March, 1852. Lord Ossulston beat Sir George Grey for Northumberland, and came in with Lord Lovaine."‡ An entry for July 26 following notes that "Lord Ossulston has won his election for Northumberland, beating Sir George Grey by thirty-five."§ There was no election for Northumberland in March, 1852, but at the General Election in July of that year Sir George Grey was defeated by Lord Ossulston. The entry for March 17, therefore, could not have been made at the time at which it purports to have been made. An error on a matter of such general, and to Lord Malmesbury such particular, interest as the defeat of the Home Secretary in the late Ministry by one of Lord Malmesbury's own connections is remarkable. In many cases the accuracy of his statements has been denied by persons equally well informed on their subject-matter as he himself. "Rome and Modena," he narrates, "had sent notes [in 1851-2] suggested by Austria through Count Buol,"|| demanding the extradition of their refugees, which Lord Granville met by throwing them after him when he went out of the room."¶ Lord Granville denies—and every one who knows him will believe him—that he was guilty of so violent and discourteous an act.

In an entry for November 4, 1852, we read, "Sent for Walewski.** He confessed that the French Government paid the *Morning Post*, and that he saw Borthwick, the editor, every day."†† That the *Morning Post* was ever in the pay of Louis Napoleon‡‡ is explicitly and indignantly denied by Sir Algernon Borthwick, who at that time was, and ever since has been, intimately acquainted with the management of that paper. It is, however, clear that there was a close connection between Louis Napoleon and the conductors of the *Morning*

* "Introduction," vol. i. p. i.

† *Saturday Review*, Nov. 8, 1884.

‡ Vol. i. p. 321.

§ *Ibid.* p. 343.

|| The Austrian Ambassador to England.

¶ Vol. i. p. 320.

** Then French Ambassador to England.

†† Vol. i. p. 362.

‡‡ The French Government at this period was that of Louis Napoleon after the *coup d'état* of 1851, and before the Second Empire.

Post.* While Lord Malmesbury was for the second time Foreign Secretary† he wrote to Lord Cowley, then our ambassador at Paris:—

Borthwick, after dinner, told — that when the other day in Paris the Emperor sent for him, and he never saw a man so irritated as he is against Lord Malmesbury. He said, "You must write him down; he has leagued Germany against me, and is entirely opposed to my policy. I have proof of it by his own hand, in which he says that Austria has the same right to Lombardy as England has to Ireland and India." This quotation leaves no doubt as to Borthwick's veracity, for it is the very phrase which I used in my letter to you of December 7th, as you will see. Did you give him a copy of it or read it to him? Since the above orders the *Morning Post* attacks me every other day.‡

A few days later he gives this advice to Lord Cowley:—"You had better not tell the Emperor that I know of his conversation with Borthwick. A man never forgives being *found out* in such a treacherous action. It appears he showed him the extract you gave him of my letter."§ And within a few days he again writes Lord Cowley:—"The Emperor sent me a message by the Duke of Hamilton, expressing his regret for having shown *Borthwick my letter to you*. The Duke says he told him plainly his mind on the subject."||

Lord Malmesbury misrepresents the conduct of the Peelites during the Ministerial crisis of 1855, and has ingenuously confessed his error in this letter to the *Times*:—

Mr. Gladstone having drawn my attention to an inaccurate statement in my "Memoirs" relating to the retirement in 1855 of himself, Sir J. Graham, and Mr. Herbert from Lord Palmerston's Government, I should be greatly obliged to you to allow me a small space to remedy the error. In p. 10, vol. ii., I say that these three statesmen "first refused to join Lord Derby and stopped Lord Palmerston, who was ready to do so, by promising to take office under him. Thus they prevented a strong Government being formed, and, having induced Lord Palmerston to accept the Premiership on the understanding that he would have their assistance, they now leave him in the lurch at a moment of great danger and difficulty." Mr. Gladstone in a courteous letter to me explains that he in no way influenced Lord Palmerston to take or refuse the Premiership, having himself only received an offer from Lord Derby through Lord Palmerston, and that the resignation of the three Ministers was caused by their full belief that the latter would resist the committee on the conduct of the war, as

* The French, if not the English, press was to a great extent in the pay of the Government of Louis Napoleon. *Vide* "Papiers et Correspondance de la Famille Impériale," vol. i. p. 16.

† In 1858-9.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 152.

§ *Ibid.* p. 153.

|| *Ibid.* p. 155.

they had all done, under Lord Aberdeen, and that Lord Palmerston's submission to it drove them out almost as soon as they had joined, which was misunderstood at the time by the public.

Lord Malmesbury has had the misfortune to provoke to an encounter an even more distinguished dialectician and controversialist than Mr. Gladstone. Writing of his Oxford days, he says:—

I went to Oriel College, Oxford, in 1825; Coplestone, afterwards Bishop of Llandaff, was Provost; Tyler, Dean, Dornford—who had served in the Peninsular War—and Newman tutors. Of this last celebrated writer and divine, and now a Cardinal, no one at that time would have predicted the future career. He used to allow his class to torment him with the most hopeless resignation: every kind of mischievous trick was, to our shame, played upon him, such as cutting his bell-rope, and at lectures making the table advance gradually till he was jammed into a corner. He remained quite impassive, and painfully tolerant. I once nearly saw him driven from Coplestone's table when the Provost, who was an epicure, upbraided him for what he called "mutilating" a fine haunch of venison, and shouting out, "Mr. Newman, you are unconscious of the mischief you have done."*

Lord Blachford, an Oriel cotemporary and the life-long friend of Cardinal Newman, at once denied the accuracy of these statements, and asserted that Lord Malmesbury had confused between Newman and another college tutor. Lord Malmesbury did not see, and therefore did not reply to, Lord Blachford's letter. The Cardinal thereupon descended into the arena, and sent to the *Daily News* this letter:—

As Lord Malmesbury has not made any signs of the impression which my friend Lord Blachford's letter was calculated to make upon him, I consider he wishes to receive an answer from myself, which I proceed to give in as few words as I can.

I am sorry that, at the end of nearly sixty years, he should not let bygones be bygones. I have never said a word against him, and his account of me is as discourteous as it is utterly unfounded. If it was as cowardly as he represents I never ought to have been a college tutor. The truth is, when I came into office the discipline was in a very lax state, and I, like a new broom, began sweeping very vigorously, as far as my opportunities went. This roused the indignation of certain high and mighty youths, who, relying on the claims of family and fortune, did their best to oppose me and to spread tales about me. I don't consider that on the whole I got the worst of it in the conflict; and what Lord Malmesbury calls "helpless resignation" and "painful tolerance," I interpret to have been the conduct of a gentleman under great provocation.

Lest I be misapprehended, I add that the bad behaviour I have described was confined to a minority. Most of those whom I came across were perfectly well conducted. I recall the memory of many, both living and dead, with great respect. One of them, shocked at what was brought home to him, had several years earlier taken the unusual step of printing a pamphlet to protest against the compulsory reception of the Sacrament by undergraduates, and one of the tutors answered it in support of the existing rule. My own similar remonstrance to the same effect in 1826-7 had the same unsuccessful issue.

As to Lord Malmesbury's instances, Lord Blachford has disposed of the table-moving, and I, if I must condescend to notice it here, deny it absolutely. As to the "bell-rope," it was not the bell-rope, but the bell-wire outside my room. A clever youth mounted a ladder and performed the feat at midnight, when I was in bed; but I suppose it was an insipid joke, for it was not done again.

Lastly, as to the haunch of venison. I did not recollect that we had such generous fare, even at the Provost's table. Lord Malmesbury says he witnessed—What? That I was "nearly" driven. How could he see me "nearly driven"? He may take my word for it, I should either have been driven out and out, or not driven at all. So much, however, may be true—not that the statement is a fact, but that it is a mythical representation of what was the fact—viz., that I was not supported in my reforms by the high authorities of the college.

This letter shows that in the twenty years which have passed since the Cardinal administered a like reproof to Charles Kingsley his right hand has not lost its cunning. Lord Malmesbury replied to the Cardinal personally. We extract the most important part of his letter:—

I can assure your Eminence, with perfect truth, that I greatly regret that my account of days long past should have annoyed you. They had not in the remotest way any animus of an unfriendly nature, nor is there one word which, as your Eminence says, can imply "cowardice." It was intended as a contrast between the past and the present. We are, if you will excuse a comparison, both changed since the days of Oriel. The too indulgent and patient tutor has since become one of the most vigorous literary athletes of the age and a Prince of the Church, while an idle pupil has in his time incurred duties as responsible as any Englishman can be charged with. Nothing offensive, therefore, occurred to me in the passage that has annoyed you; although, as it has had that effect, I regret having written it.*

This is as true as it is courteous and gentleman-like, but it is no defence of the accuracy of the statements, which are denied not only by the Cardinal, but by Lord Blachford. The result of these various contradictions and corrections of Lord Malmesbury's

* This letter was published in several newspapers.

statements is to raise a doubt how far the accuracy of any of his reminiscences, where not supported by other testimony, can be relied on.

Lord Malmesbury is the great-grandson of "the learned and amiable Mr. Harris, of Salisbury, who laboured to revive the studies of Grecian literature and philosophy"—so Gibbon described him; he was usually called *Hermes*—from the title of his work "*Hermes, or a Philosophical Inquiry concerning Universal Grammar*," which was one highly thought of and much read, and is still to be found in most old libraries, consigned to "the dust and silence of the upper shelf," whence it is rarely taken down.

The grandfather of Lord Malmesbury was, it will be remembered, a distinguished diplomatist and politician; his memory will be preserved in history by the fact that it was he who negotiated the marriage between the Prince of Wales, afterwards George IV., and the unfortunate Caroline of Brunswick. For his public services he was made Earl of Malmesbury. His grandson remembers his occasional visits to him and his brother when at school at Wimborne, Dorset. Those visits caused "a great sensation in the house, as seventy years ago an old Earl would not on any account have driven to an important country town without four horses to his carriage and his star on his coat." One of these visits was extremely opportune; the Earl descended from his carriage-and-four *Deus ex machinâ* just in time to save his grandson from an impending flogging.* The second Earl—our author's father—was for a short period in public life. On March 25, 1807, Lord Fitzharris—as he then was—was anxiously awaiting the announcement of the birth of the first child of his marriage. A messenger arrived bearing, not the news of the arrival of the looked-for heir, but a letter from Mr. Canning announcing Lord Fitzharris's appointment as Under-Secretary at the Foreign Office. Within a few minutes afterwards the birth of the heir, and future Foreign Secretary, was announced.

I have often thought [writes Lord Malmesbury] that if Guy Mannering had been present in Spring Gardens, as he was at Ellangowan, he would have taken my horoscope, as he did for Lady Bertram's boy, and found that the Star of the Foreign Office was hovering over that locality, destining the son forty years after to reign over the same desks to which the father was appointed at the very moment of his son's birth. More than this, that, under so mysterious a coincidence and concatenation of circumstances, I could not avoid my fate in 1852 and 1858-9, and, whatever credit or blame I may

* Vol. i. p. 13.

have acquired during my management of foreign affairs, it is certain that the stars must be responsible for both.*

The new Under-Secretary did not long continue in office, as the "insincerity of politics was little suited to his susceptible feelings of morality and honour." Our Government then contemplated the seizure of the Danish Fleet. The Danish Minister called daily at the Foreign Office to learn, if he could, what our intentions were. Mr. Canning persistently refused to see him, and handed him over to his Under-Secretary, "whose duty it was to conceal, and even to deny, our designs."† This was more than Lord Fitzharris could bear; he therefore resigned, and thenceforth lived the life of a country gentleman of the old school, spending ten months out of twelve at the family mansion, Heron Court, near Christchurch, Hants. The house is said by its present owner to be "Elizabethan, and was once the residence of the priors of Christ Church"—two statements which mutually contradict each other.‡ It contains a valuable library, collected by three men of totally different literary tastes. The first was Lord Malmesbury's great-grandfather—the Mr. Harris mentioned by Gibbon—who collected all the most perfect editions of the ancient writers. The second was Lord Malmesbury's grandfather, who added all the best specimens of European authors of the last two centuries. The third—the late Earl—added all the most modern literature of his time. Of the late Earl his son records that

When in the country, during the game season, he hardly missed a day's shooting, and kept a journal with a column of every shot killed and missed during forty years. This curious book I showed to Lord Beaconsfield, who was extremely struck with it, declaring it to be the most extraordinary example of patience and a sturdy character he ever saw.§

At the same time "he read everything, ancient and modern," and the diaries of Lords Colchester and Ellenborough show him to have been a not unfrequent attendant at the House of Lords, and to have taken part in debate. He was a Tory as thorough and unbending as John Wilson Croker himself, and to the last helped to resist the first Reform Act.

When [is his son's reflection] I used to hear all around me denunciations and prophecies against the Reform Act, I little thought that, thirty years later, I should be taking the initiative, as a Cabinet Minister, in framing another reform of the franchise far more demo-

* Vol. i. p. 2. It is Lady Bertram in the book; should it not be Lucy?

† Vol. i. p. 2.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 6. A print we have seen of Heron Court shows little trace either of monastic or Elizabethan origin.

§ Vol. i. p. 11.

cratic than the first, and of which Lord Derby confessed, when he proposed it in 1867, that it was "a leap in the dark."*

At the school at Wimborne, our reminiscent and his brother underwent much persecution at the hands of their schoolfellows, who were all Hampshire or Dorsetshire boys. The grounds of this persecution were that the brothers had a decided French accent—for, contrary to the habits of that day, the first language they were taught was French—and a false report that their father killed foxes. To be either a Frenchman or a "vulpecide"—as it was called—was in the eyes of provincial English boys of 1814–15 an unpardonable sin. What, then, was their opinion of those who were suspected of uniting in themselves both these characters? From Wimborne the brothers went to Eton, and were put in the remove presided over by "Ben Drury, a clever man, and a great scholar, but wild in his habits. . . . He made beautiful Latin verses, and drove four-in-hand better than any whip between Windsor and London." While still at Eton, our reminiscent, on the death of his grandfather, took the courtesy title of Viscount Fitzharris. During a holiday visit to Bowood he formed what proved to be a life-long friendship with his future political leader, Mr. Stanley, afterwards Lord Derby, "then quite young, but looked up to by the Whigs as full of promise," and wearing "the old Whig dress, a blue coat with brass buttons and a buff waistcoat."† From Eton Lord Fitzharris went to Oxford, where, on his own showing, his career was not distinguished. He took his degree in 1827, and in 1828 he went on a Continental tour; for a travelling companion he had one who had been with him at Eton and Oxford—a Devonshire squire of small reputation, but who obtained a fleeting fame by defeating Lord John Russell at the memorable bye-election for South Devon in 1835.‡ The travellers reached Rome; of the society there we have this sketch:—

There was a great deal of dining out and some balls. Having just come from England, when George IV. made black satin cravats, then called "waterfalls," *de rigueur* at his Court, I went to M. de Chateaubriand's [the French ambassador's] party in one of these, and was desired to change it for a white one. Other Englishmen who had done the same were very angry, and refused, believing that our King was infallible on subjects of dress, and he had declared that a man in a white neckcloth must be a dentist. There was a great deal of gambling at Rome amongst the English and other foreigners, and, as it was principally at *écarté*, a great deal of cheating.§

* Vol. i. p. 12.

† *Ibid.* pp. 15, 16, 17.

‡ Rendered necessary by Lord John taking office in the second Malbourne Ministry.

§ Vol. i. p. 26.

At Rome Lord Fitzharris was introduced to the Countess Guiccioli, "of Byronic memory," who courted the English, and with whom he became great friends. He found in her a charming "companion, with a cultivated mind, yet with all the natural *bonhomie* of her race, and fond of fun."* She was very proud of her conquest of Byron, and delighted in relating stories of his eccentricities.† This lady married the well-known Anglophobe Le Marquis de Boissy, at whose house Lord Malmesbury, as he had then become, dined at a magnificent banquet, but found "the *bonhomie* of the Italian altered for the artificial manner of a *grande dame*, and not to its advantage; although she retained the kindly instincts of her nature."‡ At Rome, also, Lord Fitzharris made the acquaintance of a far more distinguished character, with whom in future years, and when both held very different positions, he was much engaged—Louis Napoleon, then just of age.

Nor would [he writes] anybody at that time have predicted his great and romantic career. He was a wild harum-scarum youth, or what the French call *un crane*, riding at full gallop down the street to the peril of the public, fencing and pistol-shooting, and apparently without serious thoughts of any kind, although even then he was possessed with the conviction that he would some day rule over France. We became friends, but at that time he evinced no remarkable talent, or any fixed idea but the one I mention. It grew upon him with his growth, and increased daily until it ripened into a certainty.§

When Louis Napoleon came to live in London, Lord Malmesbury renewed friendly relations with him—an accident which some years later was beneficial both to England and France. Lord Malmesbury records that, two evenings before Louis Napoleon went on what was then thought his mad expedition to Boulogne, "he was standing on the steps of Lady Blessington's house, after a party, wrapped up in a cloak, with Persigny by him, and I observed to him, 'You look like two conspirators,' upon which he answered, 'You may be nearer right than you think.'"

Lord Fitzharris, as he still was, returned to England in 1829, and on April 13, 1830, married Emma, only daughter of the Earl of Tankerville, of whom her husband records that, "for forty years she unceasingly deserved the epitaph which is

* Vol. i. p. 27.

† *Ibid.* pp. 31, 39.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 35; and see her letter to Lord Malmesbury, *ibid.* p. 306.

§ Vol. i. p. 33. At the lowest depth of Louis-Philippe's fortunes he avowed his conviction that before he died he should become King of France. *Vide* "Leaves from the Diary of Henry Greville," First Series, pp. 156, 157.

|| Vol. i. p. 120.

written on her monument in the Priory Church at Christ Church."

From her it never was our fate to find,
A deed ungentle, or a word unkind,
The mildest manners with the bravest mind.*—ILIAD.

It was not for sixteen years after Lord Malmesbury's succession to the earldom that he took any prominent part in political life, but soon after his marriage he learned something of its arcana. He visited Lord Grey at Howick, where the old earl lived in patriarchal retirement amidst his numerous sons, daughters, and sons-in-law. He was [adds Lord Malmesbury] one of the most striking figures I ever saw, the very type of a *grand seigneur* and of an intellectual man.

Whilst I was at Howick [he continues] I was struck with two peculiarities of the family, one of which was that all the sons and daughters called their parents by their Christian names, "Charles" and "Mary," which had a strange effect; the other was the taste of the whole family for argument. They were always in a state of discussion, even as to the distance between Howick and Alnwick, and the shortest road to and from each, which one would suppose they had verified long ago.† As I suppose, I was looked upon as a mere boy by the party, politics and future onslaughts on the Tory Government were freely spoken of without *gene* in my presence; and I remember one day Lord Grey breaking out and declaring that the three greatest rascals in the world were Lord Castlereagh (then dead), Brougham and Talleyrand, and I recollect this explosion the more, because when he formed his Government three months later he was obliged to make Brougham his Chancellor, and to receive Talleyrand as the ambassador of France.‡

At this time Lord Malmesbury saw much of two of Lord Grey's sons-in-law, Lord Durham, and he who was commonly called "Bear Ellice," both "clever and ambitious men, who had great influence with Lord Grey, and used it without mercy." "Their talk" (so Lord Malmesbury relates) "was chiefly as to the coming change and of the re-arrangement of the boroughs and franchise; their great object being to 'cook' them (as they themselves called it) so as to expel as much as possible all local interests belonging to Tories."§

In later years, when the Tory Cabinets of 1858 and 1866 were deliberating how to "dish the Whigs," Lord Malmesbury no doubt profited by his reminiscences of the Whig schemes of "cooking" the franchise.

Though taking no active part against Lord Grey's Reform

* Vol. i. p. 35.
† *Ibid.* pp. 36, 37.

† *Ibid.* p. 36.
§ *Ibid.* p. 37.

Bill he did not escape the vengeance which the people wreaked on those who opposed it. Lord Tankerville, his father-in-law, was one of the majority of the Peers which, in October, 1831, threw out the Bill. Shortly afterwards Lord Tankerville, accompanied by his son-in-law and his daughter, travelled down to Chillingham Castle, and Lord Malmesbury relates that as they passed through Darlington,

a storm of stones assailed the carriage, and a furious mob tried to stop us. The post-boys behaved well, and ran the gauntlet at full gallop till we cleared the town, but in what a condition! The coach was full of stones, the front part of it was smashed, and the panels stove in, yet we all escaped with a few scratches. When I saw what was coming I pulled my wife under the seat, which saved her from a large paving-stone that struck the place where she had been sitting.*

Lord Malmesbury professes that he "never had any liking for the stormy life of politics," but we think his parliamentary career would have begun earlier but his father, who disliked political life not only for himself but for his son, "took such a decided line against his coming" into Parliament, that although in 1834 he received a strong requisition to stand for the Isle of Wight, and might have "walked over," at Christ Church, he found it impossible to risk a serious quarrel with his father, and had for the time to renounce all hope of being in the House of Commons.† Either his father's opposition to his coming into Parliament ceased or, in spite of it he, in 1837, unsuccessfully contested Portsmouth, "being thrown over by many of the men who had signed the requisition to him"‡ and his fellow-candidate. Again in 1841 we find this entry in his Diary:—

June 16.—I received a letter from Sidney Herbert desiring me to start immediately as a candidate for the borough of Wilton. He says he has consulted precedents, but cannot find that in the memory of man anybody has ever put out an address for that borough, but that I must canvass it as exactly as if it were Birmingham, and I had Lord John Russell standing against me.§

The illness and subsequent death of his father barred his entrance to the House of Commons. Up to the time of his succession to the earldom these "Memoirs" contain little reference to politics, but many incidents are recorded, one of the most interesting of which we transcribe:—

March 9, 1832.—Breakfasted with the old Duke de Gramont,||

* Vol. i. pp. 37, 38. † *Ibid.* p. 58. ‡ *Ibid.* p. 82. § *Ibid.* p. 133.

|| Lady Tankerville (Lord Malmesbury's mother-in-law) was the Duke de Gramont's daughter, and was sent over to England to escape the Reign of Terror.

who had been a *garde du corps* of Louis XV., and was on duty at Versailles on the day on which he arrested the Cardinal de Rohan. He told us many anecdotes of Louis XV., and gave us a dish which he said the king had every day of his life on his table, and which he seldom omitted to eat. It was of chicken or pheasant *écharpé* with a *Bechamel* sauce, with truffles, or *chicorée* and *gratiné*. I got the receipt from the duke's cook, and found it very popular. The duke said that "La Du Barry étoit peinte comme mon carrosse." We afterwards drove with him to Versailles, and I never spent a more interesting day, walking over this famous palace with this old man, who had known it in all its glories. It was like listening to one from the dead to hear his anecdotes and legends about events in which he had acted a part. Although eighty-two years of age, his memory was perfectly good, and he was as gay as a man in the prime of life. He showed us the room in which he had arrested the cardinal, and amongst other places, the immense flight of stone steps down which, when the palace was invested by the bloodthirsty mob in 1792, he and his guards had to ride to save their lives. Three men were killed when their horses fell and rolled to the bottom, the rest escaping by this desperate feat. The mob had stopped every other issue, and thought this one impassable.*

In 1844 Lord Malmesbury published "The Memoirs, State Papers, and Correspondence" of his grandfather, the first Earl.

For two years I was employed [he tells us] in reading not only my grandfather's public despatches to Ministers at home, but also to his brother diplomatists abroad. I went through over 2,000 of these, embracing the period between 1768 and 1809, as if I had been an Under-Secretary at the Foreign Office for forty years, arranging and collating them and investigating their contemporary history.†

By this means he gained a thorough knowledge of the routine work of the Foreign Office, and all the *verbiage* of the diplomatic profession which astonished the permanent officials when he became Foreign Secretary. Without this "accidental education" he would have been as great a novice in political business as were (he admits) most of his colleagues in the first Derby Ministry.

In 1845 Louis Napoleon, then a prisoner at Ham, requested Lord Malmesbury to see him on a matter of vital importance. With some difficulty Lord Malmesbury obtained the necessary permission. What passed at this interview he shall tell in his own words:—

I found the prince little changed, although he had been imprisoned

* Vol. i. pp. 46, 47.

† *Ibid.* pp. 41, 319. There is a difference in the two passages as to the period over which this correspondence extended—at p. 41, 1800 is named as the limit, at p. 319, 1809.

five years, and very much pleased to see an old friend fresh from the outer world, and that world London. He confessed that, although his confidence and courage remained unabated, he was weary of his prison, from which he saw no chance of escaping, as he knew that the French Government gave him opportunities of doing so that they might shoot him in the act. He stated that a deputation had arrived from Ecuador offering him the presidency of that republic if Louis Philippe would release him, and in that case he would give the king his parole never to return to Europe. He had therefore sent for me as a supporter and friend of Sir R. Peel, at that time our Prime Minister, to urge Sir Robert to intercede with Louis Philippe, to comply with his wishes, promising every possible guarantee for his good faith. The prince was full of a plan for a new canal in Nicaragua, that promised every kind of advantage to British commerce. As a precedent for English official interference, I was to quote Earl Grey's in favour of Prince Polignac's release in 1830. I assured the prince that I would do my best, but added that Lord Aberdeen was our Foreign Secretary, and that there was nothing of romance in his character. At this time Prince Louis was deeply engaged in writing the history of artillery, and he took an hour in making me explain the meaning of several technical words in English, which he wished translated. He gave me a full account of his failure at Boulogne, which he declared was entirely owing to the sudden illness of the officer of the day, whom he had secured, and who was to have given up the barracks at once. The soldiers had mostly been gained, and the prestige of his name in the French army was universal. To prove this, he assured me that the cavalry escort of Lancers who accompanied him to Ham made him constant gestures of sympathy on the road. He then said, "You see the sentry under my window? I do not know whether he is one of mine or not; if he is he will cross his arms; if not, he will do nothing when I make a sign." He went to the window and stroked his moustache, but there was no response until three were relieved, when the soldier answered by crossing his arms over his musket. The prince then said, "You see that my partisans are unknown to me, and so am I to them. My power is an immortal name, and in that only; but I have waited long enough, and cannot endure imprisonment any longer." After a stay of three hours I left the prison deeply impressed with the calm resolution, or rather philosophy, of this man, but putting little faith as to his ever renouncing* the throne of France. Very few in a miserable prison, isolated and quasi-forgotten, would have kept their intellect braced by constant studies and original compositions, as Louis Bonaparte did during the last five years in the fortress of Ham.†

Lord Malmesbury lost no time in laying the prince's request before Sir Robert Peel, "who seemed to be greatly interested,

* *Sic* in original, but is not "*renouncing*" meant for "*remounting*," or some such word?

† Vol. i. p. 158, 159.

and certainly not averse to apply to the French Government in the prince's favour on his conditions, but said he must consult Lord Aberdeen, which of course was inevitable. That evening he wrote to say Lord Aberdeen 'would not hear of it.'*†

Little more than a year† passed, a man ran over the street and stopped Lord Malmesbury's horse. It was Louis Napoleon who had just escaped from Ham. On the same day Lord Malmesbury met at dinner one of the attachés of the French Embassy. "I said," he notes, "across the table to him, 'Have you seen him?' 'Who?' he asked. 'Louis Napoleon,' I replied; 'he is in London, having just escaped.' The attaché dropped the lady who was on his arm, and made but one jump out of the room, for it seems that the news had not yet reached the French Embassy. I never saw a man look more frightened."‡

The great disruption of the Tory party caused by Sir Robert Peel's conversion to Free Trade views was, as in the case of Lord George Bentinck, the occasion of Lord Malmesbury first taking any leading part in Parliament. Bentinck was desirous of avenging Canning on Peel, who, he thought, had "hounded his illustrious relative to death," but no doubt he held the sincere conviction, which was Lord Malmesbury's sole reason for descending into the political arena, that the abolition of the Corn Laws would be the ruin of all who depended upon land, and they both looked on the "landed interest"‡ with the same feelings as did the old Duke of Wellington and John Wilson Croker. Early in 1839, Peel, at a meeting of the Conservatives, "implored them to be united and not to split upon minor differences *with respect to the Corn Laws, declaring himself in favour of the present system against fixed duty or any alteration whatever.*"§ When, therefore, in 1842, Peel, by his new Corn Law, took off more than half the impost duty, Lord Malmesbury's confidence in him received a rude shock. "Nobody expected," he writes, "such a sweeping measure, and there is great consternation amongst the Conservatives. It is clear Peel has thrown over the landed interest as my father always said he would."§ A year further on, he records, "that many Conservatives think that Peel truckles to the Radicals, and throws over his friends."||

At this time he first made acquaintance with one to whom he afterwards became an opponent:—

* Vol. i. p. 160.

† See the entry for May 27, 1846, vol. i. p. 173, which says Lord Malmesbury had left the prince in Ham "two months before," but at p. 157, April, 1845, is fixed as the date of the visit to Ham. This is an instance of the variation in the entries, to which the *Saturday Review* refers.

‡ Vol. i. p. 99.

§ *Ibid.* p. 139.

|| *Ibid.* p. 145.

1844, Nov. 7.—Dined with the Cannings and met Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Phillimore. We were curious to see the former, as he is a man who is much spoken of as one who will come to the front. We were disappointed at his appearance, which is that of a Roman Catholic ecclesiastic, but he is very agreeable.*

Some years later he writes: "I cannot make out Gladstone, who seems to me a dark horse."† Both the late Bishop Wilberforce and Mr. Henry Greville mention Mr. Gladstone's musical accomplishments. Lord Malmesbury gives us a remarkable illustration of them: "Gladstone, who was always fond of music, is now (1860) quite enthusiastic about negro melodies, singing them with the greatest spirit and enjoyment, never leaving out a verse, and evidently preferring such as 'Camp Down Races.'"‡

Here is another interesting entry recording Lord Malmesbury's first impression of the present Earl of Derby, afterwards his colleague and now an opponent. In January, 1845, he mentions his arrival as a visitor at Heron Court, and adds: "A good conversation about politics took place in the evening. He argued with great acuteness and good temper, possessing a remarkable fund of information, seeing that he is only nineteen. I am greatly mistaken if he does not distinguish himself much some day. He is of rather advanced opinions."§ The same entry mentions that some important and ominous changes have taken place in the (Peel) Government within this week, and on the 11th December of that year Lord Malmesbury notes "the extraordinary and unexpected event" of Sir Robert Peel's resignation. In his brief record of the abortive attempt of Lord John Russell to form a Cabinet, he gives as the reason for his giving up the attempt that "Lord Palmerston" insisted on being Foreign Secretary, to which Louis Philippe objected.|| It was the present Earl Grey's objection to Lord Palmerston, not Louis Philippe's, which made it impossible for Lord John Russell to form a Ministry. This is clear from the letters of Lord Macaulay, who was to have been one of Lord John's Cabinet, and was intimately acquainted with all the proceedings of that time.¶

Peel resumed office, and proposed the total repeal of the Corn Laws; this brought Lord Malmesbury to the front rank of the Protectionist Opposition. He mentions that on the first night of the session "the Duke of Richmond and I spoke in favour of protection, and were both cheered; rather an event in the House of Lords."** He also mentions as an instance of the

* Vol. i. p. 155. The Mr. Phillimore here mentioned afterwards became Sir R. J. Phillimore, and lately died. † *Ibid.*, p. 369.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 231.

§ Vol. i. p. 156.

|| *Ibid.*, p. 162, 163.

¶ See "Macaulay's Life," vol. ii. p. 166 *et seq.*

** Vol. i. p. 165.

then violence of party feeling, that Sidney Herbert, who had always been like a brother to him, "came up to me in a state of great excitement, saying my conduct in leaving Peel was unworthy a gentleman; that the whole Protectionist party were a set of fools, and Lord Stanley the greatest fool among us, and that Peel was delighted at having got rid of us."*

Another illustration of the curious state of parties then existing was, as Lord Derby observed, "that a Liberal like Lord Bessborough whipped up the bishops to support the Duke of Wellington on a Free Trade question."† For the next thirty years Lord Malmesbury continued to be one of the leaders of the Conservative party, and an adviser in all their secret councils. From his "Memoirs" we learn something of the difficulties which Lord Beaconsfield met with when he aspired to become a Conservative chief.

In the beginning of 1848 Lord George Bentinck resigned the Conservative leadership in the Commons because he supported the admission to the House of Commons of a gentleman who unfortunately, to use Lord Beaconsfield's periphrasis, "believed only in the first part of the Jewish religion."‡ Lord Granby was thereupon elected leader, but he refused the office and threw the party into confusion.

It appears strange [is Lord Malmesbury's comment] that in these proceedings Disraeli's name was not put forward, but whoever may in future take the lead in the House of Commons by election, he must virtually and practically hold that office. There can be no doubt that there is a very strong feeling among Conservatives in the House of Commons against him. They are puzzled and alarmed by his mysterious manner, which has much of the foreigner about it, and are incapable of understanding and appreciating the great abilities which certainly underlie, and as it were are concealed, by this mask.§

Lord Beaconsfield was too clever for "the party of stupidity," and they were at first anxious to get rid of him. In the March following Lady Alice, the wife of General Peel,|| came to Lady Malmesbury—who seems to have intrigued much in politics—to sound her on the subject of a reconciliation between the Protectionists and the Peelites. The object of Lady Alice, or rather of those who sent her, was to form a Protectionist Government, with Lord Derby at its head, and to throw over Lord George

* Vol. i. p. 169. The Lord Stanley here mentioned was the late Earl of Derby.

† *Ibid.* p. 171.

‡ "Life of Lord George Bentinck," p. 481. Baron Lionel de Rothschild is here referred to.

|| Sir Robert's brother, M.P. for Huntingdon, and Secretary for War, 1866-7.

§ Vol. i. p. 205-7.

Bentinck and Mr. Disraeli; but this she was plainly told was out of the question. After the death of Lord George Bentinck, the leadership was vested in a triumvirate consisting of Mr. Disraeli, with Lord Granby and old Mr. Herries, like Caliban and Trinculo, as viceroys over him, "the two latter," says Lord Malmesbury "being in the way of the first."* There now commenced a confidential correspondence between Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Malmesbury. In an early letter from Lord Beaconsfield he says: "The scandal of our provincial movement is great and flagrant, but I hope the evil is more superficial than it seems, and that with tact and temper the ship may be righted. I have spared no effort, nor has Beresford, but we have had to deal with a wrong-headed man." On which Lord Malmesbury makes this note—"alluding to the resignation of Lord George Bentinck as leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons."† With all submission to Lord Malmesbury's superior knowledge, we think his memory is here at fault. The letter plainly refers to some untoward circumstance from which the party was at that time suffering.‡ Lord George Bentinck had resigned the leadership nearly two years before, and had been for twelve months in his grave. The character of him drawn by Lord Beaconsfield in his well-known "Life" is inconsistent with the idea that the biographer thought Lord George "wrong-headed," either generally or on the particular matter of the leadership, and we therefore think it is clear that he was not the "wrong-headed man."

In connection with Protectionist politics Lord Malmesbury relates an amusing anecdote of a parliamentary buffoon of former days:—

In debate on a Protectionist motion, Sir Robert Peel got up and expressed great sympathy for the sufferings of the agriculturists, Colonel Sibthorp lifted up both his hands in a mock tragic manner, exclaiming, "Oh dear, oh dear!" which set the whole House into a roar of laughter. Peel, instead of paying no attention to the interruption, turned to Colonel Sibthorp, and gave him some explanation, adding, he hoped he believed him, to which Sibthorp, replied "I can't say I do."§

While Louis Napoleon was President of the Republic, Lord Malmesbury visited him at the Elysée. The President was more than cordial, and reminded his guest that he had always told him in his darkest days he would some day govern France. He spoke

* Vol. i. p. 239.

† *Ibid.* p. 254 and note.

‡ The date of the letter is Nov. 21, 1849.

§ Vol. i. p. 258.

also of his failure to consolidate and conciliate all French parties, and of a conspiracy then hatching to send him a prisoner to Vincennes, and declared the Chamber was unmanageable. He made no secret of his intention of being beforehand with his enemies, and, adds Lord Malmesbury, “there was no mistaking the means he would take to do so.”*

Early in 1851 it became evident that Lord John Russell’s Ministry had lost the sympathy of the House of Commons. They were defeated on a motion to assimilate the then existing county and borough franchises, and resigned. A Ministerial interregnum followed. Lord Derby attempted to form a Conservative Protectionist Ministry, in which he asked Lord Malmesbury to take the Colonial Office; “which,” says Lord Malmesbury, “I considered a great compliment, as it is one of the hardest worked of places.” The attempt to form this Ministry failed “through the timid conduct of Mr. Henley and Mr. Herries,” which made Lord Derby, as he said, see “they would be of no use. Henley seemed frightened rather than pleased at being in the Cabinet, and appeared paralysed. As to Herries, he looked like an old doctor who had just killed a patient, and Henley like the undertaker who was to bury him.”†

The Russell Ministry, therefore, resumed office. In the course of the Session the present Sir Robert Peel first spoke in the House of Commons. Lord Beaconsfield made this characteristic remark on his speech, “It was very clever and so straightforward and honest, that, had his father been there, he would have disowned him.”‡.

We read in the Diary for May 30th this entry: “We dined with the Disraelis. I sat by Thiers, who, knowing that I was intimately acquainted with Prince Louis Napoleon, asked me a number of questions about him, and ended by saying, ‘Je l’ai beaucoup étudié de près et de loin, et c’est un homme absolument nul.’ To me Thiers seemed the incarnation of vanity.”§

The *coup d’état* of the following December ought to have convinced M. Thiers that Louis Napoleon was not “un homme absolument nul.” At that time it was seen on all hands that a Conservative Ministry was inevitable, and probably Lord Malmesbury was already fixed on as its Foreign Secretary. For he seems to have communicated his ideas on the situation to Louis Napoleon through M. de Persigny. The Prince President, as he was then called, agreed with Lord Malmesbury that the object of both Governments should be to “cement more and

* Vol. i. p. 269. This interview took place in April, 1850.

† *Ibid.* pp. 278, 279.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 280.

§ *Ibid.* p. 284.

more the alliance which ought to exist between the two great peoples."*

In consequence of Lord Palmerston's precipitate recognition of the Government of the *coup d'état* he was dismissed from the Foreign Office. In the Session of 1852 Parliamentary Reform for the second time became a Ministerial question,† and Lord John Russell brought forward a Reform Bill for which Lord Derby was unprepared, and by which "he seemed quite knocked down." Lord Malmesbury was anxious that he should meet it by a counter-bill or resolution, but he would not hear of it, and "treated Disraeli coldly when he proposed it." "A mutual dislike between them," adds Lord Malmesbury, "might have serious consequences, but the two men are so different in character that it can hardly be otherwise; yet they cannot do without one another at present. I have great confidence in Disraeli's good temper and ambition to see that such is the case."‡ This confidence was soon and amply justified. Lord Palmerston avenged himself for his dismissal by dexterously defeating Lord John Russell, who thereupon resigned, and Lord Derby undertook the government, and requested Lord Malmesbury to take the Foreign Office, which, not without reluctance, he agreed to do. He describes Disraeli's delight at the idea of coming into office. "He said he 'felt just like a young girl going to her first ball,' constantly repeating, 'Now we have got a *status*.' With all his apparent apathy when attacked in the House of Commons, he is always when out of it in the highest state of elation or the lowest depth of despair, according to the fortune of the day."§

Lord Derby was anxious that Lord Palmerston should join him, and Lord Malmesbury reveals what, to us at least, was before unknown, "that the Queen agreed to Lord Palmerston taking office again, but not to lead the House of Commons," and she renewed this condition when later in this year she gave full power to Lord Derby to form a fusion Government.|| The revelation of these acts of personal government will surprise those who reckon the Queen to be a mere cipher in the country. Protection was not yet openly abandoned by the Tories, and for that reason Lord Palmerston refused to join them.

* See M. de Persigny's "Letter to Lord Malmesbury," vol. i. p. 294. We regret we have not space available for quotations from this very able letter.

† *Vide* Mr. Disraeli's speech of Feb. 28, 1859.

‡ Vol. i. p. 303. And see Lord Derby's Letter, in 1856, to Lord Malmesbury, vol. ii. p. 54. "As to Disraeli's unpopularity, I see and regret it, but they could not do without him, even if there was any one ready and able to take his place."

§ *Ibid.* p. 305.

|| *Ibid.* p. 368.

In the new Cabinet there were ten or eleven members entirely new to office of any kind. “I have been driving a team of young horses this morning,” remarked Lord Derby to Lady Malmesbury; “not one had ever been in harness before, and they went beautifully, not one kicked amongst them.”*

The new Ministry gave rise to a volley of jokes, mostly of a Biblical character, of which the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Disraeli) was especially the subject. It was said that he was ignorant of finance, and that “Benjamin’s mess would be five times as great as the others.” “Never mind,” it was observed, “Exodus comes before Numbers.”† During the second Derby Ministry, Mr. Disraeli first appeared in Parliament as a parliamentary reformer. We remember a story was then current that one of the Premier’s supporters said to him, “You are all in a mess.” “Yes,” was the reply, “and Benjamin’s mess [his Reform Bill] is five times greater than any of his brethren.” Of Lord Derby himself many interesting particulars are given by Lord Malmesbury which verify the truth of the remark concerning him attributed to his son, the present Earl, that his father could be the first man in the country when he took pains. Lord Malmesbury describes him as writing an elaborate memorandum on the titles of Louis Napoleon. “One of the best papers I ever read. Addington and Mellish, the oldest and ablest *rédacteurs* in the Foreign Office, said that neither Canning nor Palmerston could have done the like, being written straight off without a single erasure in copper-plate hand.”‡

In the spring of 1855, when the Crimean War was at its height, Lord Malmesbury writes:—

Lord Derby returned to-day from Newmarket, so full of his racing that he could think and talk of nothing else, and knew nothing of the last week’s events; and when I alluded to our propositions at the Vienna Conference having been rejected by Russia asked, “What propositions?” evidently not having looked at a newspaper for the whole week. Such is the character of this remarkable man, who has the power and habit of concentrating his whole mind upon the subject which occupies him at the moment and dismissing it with equal facility. He is very fond of using the expression “one thing at a time.”§

One of Lord Derby’s defects as a party leader is very frankly admitted by Lord Malmesbury:—

Lord Derby has never been able to realize the sudden growth and power of the political press, for which he has no partiality, which

* Vol. i. p. 312.

† *Ibid.* p. 309. Henry Greville, p. 417.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 363.

§ Vol. ii. p. 21. It will be remembered Lord Derby was not then in office.

feeling is reciprocated by its members. In these days it is a fatal error in men who wish to obtain public power and distinction. Lord Derby is too proud a man to flatter anybody, even his greatest friends and equals, much less those of whom he knows nothing. His son with greater wisdom (for the day) has taken the opposite line, and with benefit to his popularity and advancement.*

Lord Derby himself was equally candid as to his faults. "The fact is," notes Lord Malmesbury, "as he himself confessed to me, that he is much too honest and brusque to make a good diplomatist, and go through the necessary humbug of the profession."†

On Lord Derby's oratory his friend and colleague remarks:—

I never saw an equal impression made by any other speaker there [the House of Lords] excepting Lord Lyndhurst. There was a peculiar charm in Lord Derby's voice, which was a pure tenor, and in the brilliancy and English character of his diction. If he has been called the Rupert of Debate, it must be from the vigour of his charge alone, for he had none of the rashness of his prototype, but, on the contrary, much reflection and calmness before action, and was very nervous before making a prepared speech.‡

This nervousness before speaking, which was felt by Canning and Lyndhurst, was felt by Lord Derby throughout his life.

I was surprised [writes Macaulay to his sister in 1831] to hear Stanley say, that he never rose without great uneasiness. "My throat and lips," he said, "when I am going to speak, are as dry as those of a man who is going to be hanged."§ Tierney [he elsewhere says] used to say he never rose in the House without feeling his knees tremble under him, "and I am sure [adds Macaulay] that no man who has not some of that feeling will ever succeed there."

Lord Malmesbury himself, on his first coming into office, is described "as being modest and diffident."¶ This disposition made him acceptable to the Queen and Prince Consort, by whom we know, on the authority of Lord Palmerston, that subserviency of demeanour was thought the most useful qualification in a Minister, and by whom Lord Derby on account of his "off-hand sarcastic manner," was much disliked.** "They early showed

* Vol. ii. p. 73.

† *Ibid.* p. 163.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 412. It was Mr. Disraeli who described Lord Derby "as the Rupert of Debate, who, when the charge was over, was generally found in the enemy's ranks."

§ "Life of Macaulay," vol. i. p. 241.

¶ *Ibid.* p. 204.

¶ "Leaves from the Diary of Henry Greville," First Series, p. 415.

** See Lord Palmerston's "Correspondence," as published by Mr. Evelyn Ashley. We have not the book to refer to, and rely on the authority of Mr. Harrop. See his "Bolingbroke, a Political Study and Criticism," p. 207 note, who quotes the expressions marked in the text with inverted commas, but does not give any reference.

their appreciation of the new Minister by giving him in the kindest and most gracious manner a great deal of private information, of which he could know nothing as to foreign, especially German, Courts.* Lord Malmesbury's appointment was particularly disagreeable to the Peelites. “They,” he writes, “have got it into their heads, most absurdly and erroneously, that I was the principal in causing Lord Derby's secession from them in 1846; nor do they forgive my sudden elevation to the Cabinet, without having ever previously laboured as they had done through preparatory grades.”†

Lord Malmesbury's foreign connection, his knowledge of foreign countries and their languages, especially of France, and the diplomatic education he had given himself by his study, and editing of his grandfather's papers qualified him for his new office. His fault as a statesman was that, like all the old Tory party, he thought more of the “balance of power” and foreign policy generally, than of the well-being and good government of the people of this country. In one respect Lord Malmesbury's appointment was specially fortunate. The *coup d'état* had produced suspicion of Louis Napoleon's motives and policy in the English mind, and it was “the ruling feeling at Court.”‡ One of the many invasion panics to which we are subject was then prevalent, and the alarmist language of the English press was irritating to Louis Napoleon and the French people. The presence at our Foreign Office of one of his old and intimate friends tended to calm this irritation. Louis Napoleon, on his part, expressed his gratification at Lord Malmesbury's appointment, and “at the good relations which ought to result from it to the two countries.”§ And Lord Malmesbury replied: “I shall enter upon my duties with the most complete conviction that amity between France and England is not only necessary to the prosperity of both these countries, but also to the general interest of civilization.”|| He also gave Lord Cowley, our ambassador at Paris, some hints as to the Prince President's character, most useful to the ambassador when “future events depended on the single will of one man.”¶ Our mention of Louis Napoleon as “Prince President” reminds us of a characteristic proceeding of Mr. Croker. Lord Malmesbury officially styled Louis Napoleon by that title; whereupon Mr. Croker,

having [to use his own words] some private acquaintance with his lordship, and feeling strongly for both the credit of the Administration.

* Vol. i. p. 319.

† *Ibid.* p. 373.

‡ On the authority of Lord Palmerston, *vide* vol. i. p. 318.

§ *Ibid.* p. 308.

|| *Ibid.* p. 309.

¶ *Ibid.* p. 311.

and the dignity of the country, I took the liberty of observing to him that this was an irregular denomination which might lead to embarrassing consequences. "To this [he adds] Lord Malmesbury made me (as perhaps my officiousness deserved) a very short dry reply."*

Lord Malmesbury does not mention this correspondence, nor throughout his "Memoirs" does he in any way allude to Mr. Croker. We therefore conclude that the "private acquaintance" between them was of the slightest, or that Lord Malmesbury did not admit its existence. It was owing to Lord Malmesbury that the second Empire was recognized in spite of the grudging hesitation and objection of the Great Powers to follow England's example. The Protectionists had raised hopes in the farmers' minds, which in office they could not satisfy, and as early as May, Lord Malmesbury anticipated the new Government would be turned out before December.† It appears that Mr. Disraeli was prepared to anticipate Mr. Cobden's commercial treaty with France, for in the month of August he sent Lord Malmesbury this remarkable letter:—

I return you Lord Cowley's confidential despatch. I am not disposed to reduce our duties on French brandies to obtain a reduction of their duties on our coals. We had better leave our mutual tariffs as they stand, unless the French are willing to treat these matters on a much more extensive scale. If they would reduce their duties on linen, yarn, cottons, or iron, I should recommend our meeting them with reductions on their brandies and silks. The latter would be a great card for France. We ought now to be for as complete free trade as we can obtain, and let the English farmer, and the English landlord too, buy the best and the cheapest silks for their daughters.

In case anything is to be done in this respect, it should be done with as little knowledge by the Board of Trade as practicable; that office is filled with our enemies. Lord Cowley therefore should conduct the business entirely; or we should send some confidential and circumspect agent of our own. It is useless now to vex ourselves about the Protectionist rock ahead. If this section exist, it can do nothing until the financial statement is made. Every expression of opinion on their side will be suspended until they have heard our financial measures. I confess I have no great fear of them, and I think they and their constituents will be satisfied.

The same letter contains also this remarkable passage:—"These wretched colonies will all be independent too, in a few years, and are a millstone round our neck."‡ Had Mr. Disraeli at that time had the sagacity and courage to approach Mr. Cobden,§ whose ties to the Whig leaders were then extremely loose, and

* "The Croker Papers," vol. iiii. p. 264. † *Ibid.* vol. i. p. 332.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 344.

§ We have often heard Mr. Cobden express his regret at the defeat of the Derby Government in December, 1852.

sent him to Paris on the same mission on which he went there seven years later, Mr. Disraeli might have averted the fall of Lord Derby's first Government, and by giving free trade between France and England seven years' longer duration, so accustomed the French people to the benefit of the free exchange of commodities, that it would have been more difficult for the present rulers of France to have abrogated the Cobden treaty. Remembering the "Imperial policy" of Lord Beaconsfield the reference to the "wretched colonies" is amusing. The invasion panic continued. "It was spread far and wide" by Leopold I. of Belgium. Lord Brougham also, who ought to have known better, wrote alarmist advice to Lord Malmesbury,* who wrote to Lord Derby: "I believe I stand alone in disbelieving the sinister feelings and intentions of Louis Napoleon."† The Queen and the Prince Consort were extremely anxious for an increase of the national defences.

The autumn Session of 1852 was at hand, and we are told by Lord Malmesbury: "I called on Disraeli just returned from Windsor. He had a discussion of two and a half hours with the Prince upon the national defences. Disraeli, in very low spirits, said it would destroy his Budget, and ridiculed the panic."‡ Many times in Lord Beaconsfield's career "he saw the best and yet the worst pursued." Lord Malmesbury anticipated the fall of the Ministry before December. In fact, it lasted till the 17th of December. Lord Derby, in announcing his fall, paid his colleague at the Foreign Office "a generous compliment," which the ex-Foreign Secretary felt more than compensated him for the excessive abuse which he had from first to last received from a "ribald press." "The expression," he adds, "is not mine, but that of Lord John Russell."§ Not only Lord Malmesbury, but Lord Derby also, must have been gratified by Lord John Russell's frank admission to M. Walewski's "C'est une gloire pour Lord Derby d'avoir gouverné le pays comme il l'a fait ces derniers dix mois. Nous avons trouvés tout en état meilleur état que quand nous l'avons laissé."|| Besides our relations with France, there were many other difficulties in foreign politics during Lord Malmesbury's first tenure of office, which on the whole he satisfactorily adjusted.

Our contracting space compels us to pass lightly over the period which elapsed between Lord Malmesbury's retirement from office in 1852 and his resumption of it in 1858. During this period he kept up his friendly relations¶ with Louis

* Vol. i. p. 350. † *Ibid.* p. 356. ‡ *Ibid.* p. 362. § *Ibid.* p. 377.

|| *Ibid.* p. 378.

¶ March 18, 1853, Malmesbury is at Paris, and has been received *à bras armés* by the Emperor.—"Leaves from the Diary of Henry Greville," Second Series, p. 47.

Napoleon, who had become Emperor of the French; their conversation on political topics seems to have been unreserved, and their intercourse had a beneficial effect on the Anglo-French alliance. While we were drifting into the Crimean war, Lord Malmesbury paid one of his visits to the Emperor. "No one," he says, "could be more friendly and kind to me than the Emperor during this visit; but he is evidently very nervous as to the heartiness of Lord Aberdeen's Government, as he has good reason for knowing his personal and political dislike of him. But what makes the most impression on me is the undisguised indifference, if not distaste, of the French people and army to the impending war."* When the Prince Consort was accused "of giving audiences to the Ministers privately, and thus substituting himself for the Queen," Lord Malmesbury bore this testimony: "My own experience would testify to the fact that on no single occasion did I have any audience upon matters of State except with the Queen in person, the Prince standing on her right hand; and if he wrote to me, it was in her Majesty's name that the opinions or criticisms were given. His information on the wheels within wheels which revolved in the northern Courts of Europe was invaluable as being out of the reach of our diplomatists." But he adds this pregnant admission: "His (the Prince's) heart is naturally German."† With the Prince, Germany was ever first—England second.

Having regard to the events which happened sixteen years later, this entry is noteworthy: "The war is decidedly unpopular here in Paris, as the French think they have no direct interest in it, and care little for being our allies. A war against Prussia would be popular, as they have still a great hankering after the frontier of the Rhine."‡

In the protracted Ministerial crisis of 1855, the Queen was reduced to choose between Lords Palmerston and Derby, both of whom she disliked; but Lord Malmesbury testifies: "However much her Majesty may dislike a Minister, she will always do what she believes to be her duty to the country, and sacrifice private feelings to patriotism."§ This is satisfactory—not so the following passage: "I have positive proofs that the French ambassador, Walewski, throughout the late events has been most active in the intrigue which placed and kept Lord Palmerston, both as against Lord John and Lord Derby. The

* Vol. i. p. 413.

† *Ibid.* p. 422. Under date June 15, 1854. At that time Lord Malmesbury had had only ten months' official experience. Is not this a subsequent addition to the original entry?

‡ *Ibid.* p. 432, under date April 21, 1854.

§ Vol. ii. p. 6.

Emperor has a great admiration for him, and told me once, 'Avec Palmerston ou peut faire des grandes choses.'"*

We read also of a conversation between Persigny and Lord Malmesbury, in which the French Minister said: "The Emperor consults no one; he is incapable of seeing different sides of a question; his judgment is good when he does hear them. The Crimean war began without any plan—everything done by himself. . . . Everything done with ignorance and carelessness. The Emperor does not work two hours a day, and yet will order everything."† If this testimony be true, and no doubt it is, it is wonderful that the Empire lasted so long. A letter to Lord Malmesbury during the progress of the Crimean war by the late Lord Herbert contains a passage worthy of all attention: "The public are right in thinking of Russian aggression, but wrong in attributing to it a wonderful foresight, skill and design. The Russians are just as great fools as other people, but they encroach, as we encroach in India, Africa, and everywhere—because we can't help it." He adds: "I, from my Russian connection, have heard and know more of their interior and exterior policy than the generality of people."‡

We also read with interest this interesting criticism on Lord Beaconsfield by the French Emperor: "The Emperor talked to me in the most friendly and confidential manner. His opinion of Disraeli was that he has not the head of a statesman, but that he is like all literary men, as he has found them from Chateaubriand to Guizot, ignorant of the world—talking well, but nervous when the moment of action arises. The Emperor is evidently very sensible of Disraeli's peculiarities without doing justice to his genius."§ We assent to Lord Malmesbury's criticism on the Emperor—nervousness in action was no characteristic of Lord Beaconsfield.

Of the manners of the Imperial Court we have this account:—

The English ladies who went to Compiègne for the fêtes have just returned, and seem to have been greatly amused. The Emperor as much occupied with Madame Walewski as ever. They were struck with the freedom in conversation and manners of the Court, which is most remarkable in Princess Mathilde. Their forgetfulness of all *convenances* is quite incredible, and in more than one instance excited the disgust of the Empress as well as her guests.||

"Madame Walewski," Lord Malmesbury tells us, "was a

* Vol. ii. p. 12, under date March 23, 1855.

† *Ibid.* p. 15, under date April 13, 1855.

§ *Ibid.* p. 66, under date April 19, 1857.

|| *Ibid.* p. 87, under date Nov. 15, 1857.

‡ *Ibid.* p. :

Florentine, a beautiful woman,"* who did the honours of the French Embassy to perfection. She used to have frequent *mandats* on the Emperor's running account with Barings.†

Early in the Session of 1858, the Palmerston Ministry met with an unlooked-for defeat at the hands of Mr. Milner Gibson on their "Conspiracy to Murder" Bill, and resigned. Lord Derby then formed his second Ministry. We learn from Lord Malmesbury that "Lord Grey would have joined it if it had not been for Mr. Disraeli, and that Mr. Gladstone would also have joined had he been offered the leadership of the Commons."‡ Had Mr. Gladstone joined that Ministry the whole course of English history might have been changed. Lord Malmesbury himself resumed his office of Foreign Secretary. It was fortunate for the country that he did so, but he truly said: "In giving me the Foreign Office, Lord Derby imposed a very great responsibility upon me."§ At that moment our relations with France were "in a state of more than tension," arising out of Orsini's attempt on the Emperor's life, which had been plotted in England, and the consequent irritation of the French people, and especially the army. It was therefore fortunate that at our Foreign Office there was a personal friend of the Emperor, and one in whom he had entire confidence. The difficulties were increased by the fact that M. Persigny, the French ambassador, was furious at the Conservative party coming into office, as he was devoted to Lord Palmerston, and instead of assisting Lord Malmesbury to restore the friendly feelings between England and France, did all he could to prevent his attaining that object, not only by relating to Lord Palmerston all that passed between him and the Foreign Secretary, but by writing letters to the Emperor to increase his irritation.|| Thanks to Lord Malmesbury, the quarrel with France was speedily adjusted. Nor was this the only difficulty he had to encounter. A Sardinian ship—the *Cagliari*, with a party on board who intended to land in Calabria and stir up that part of Italy to insurrection—was captured by a Neapolitan ship. The crew included two English engineers, who were with the others confined at Naples.¶ The Palmerston section of the Opposition raised the cry "Civis Romanus," and violently attacked the Ministry for not demand-

* Vol. i. p. 298, *note*. We conclude that Madame Walewski is the person there mentioned as the second wife of Count Walewski, a natural son of Napoleon I. and one of Napoleon III.'s ministers.

† *Vide* "Papiers et Correspondance de la Famille Imperiale," vol. i. p. 141.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 99. It will be remembered that the ground taken by the Opposition was that the proposed change in the law was dictated by the French Government.

§ *Ibid.* p. 97.

|| *Ibid.* p. 103.

¶ *Ibid.* p. 115.

ing the immediate release of the two Englishmen. "I am in a singular position on this question," wrote Lord Malmesbury; "I am made Minister on purpose to resist interference on the part of France with our laws, and I am also expected to keep up a quarrel with Naples in support of interference with their institutions. What a set we are!"* And later in the year he wrote: "Look at the incongruous position of England at this moment, and of its Government on this question. England rose as one man last February because France was supposed, notwithstanding her assurances to the contrary, to interfere with our internal jurisdiction, and here she is quarrelling with Naples, because Naples won't alter her laws at the beck of our Government."† In the end the King of Naples gave up the *Cagliari* and her crew to England and paid £3,000, the compensation demanded by Lord Malmesbury for the two English engineers. It was owing to him that a quarrel, which at one moment threatened a general war, was settled in a manner so satisfactorily.‡ Lord Malmesbury also had to encounter another difficulty. A French ship, the *Charles et Georges*, was seized by the Portuguese as being a slave ship, and taken into the Tagus. The French Government were as indignant at this as the English Government had been at the seizure of the *Cagliari*. Portugal claimed under treaties the assistance of England against France. Lord Malmesbury in this case also took a pacific and conciliatory course, which, however, did not meet the approbation of a self-constituted censor. "The Portuguese affair," wrote the Prince Consort to Stockmar, "has made the worst possible impression here, and the Ministry will find it difficult to defend themselves from the reproach of having left Portugal in the lurch. If they had taken up the cudgels for Portugal in the way the case demanded, we should have been brought to the verge of a general war."§ The Prince Consort's connection with Portugal made him anxious that England should "take up the cudgels for her," even at the cost of a general war. Fortunately, Lord Malmesbury's pacific and prudent policy prevailed, and the complication was peacefully arranged. His conduct was attacked in Parliament, but without success.||

In the following year (1859) Lord Malmesbury made strenuous but unsuccessful efforts to avert the war in Italy; "between France and Austria."

* The truth is [is his entry in his Diary] he [the Emperor] is determined to go to war with Austria to propitiate the Italians and to save his own life from assassination. Cavour worked upon this at their interview at Plombières last autumn, and persuaded him that

* Vol. ii. p. 112.

† *Ibid.* p. 139.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 123.

§ "Life of the Prince Consort," vol. iv. p. 334.

|| Vol. ii. pp. 151-159.

taking up the cause of Italy will save his life, forfeited according to the laws of the Carbonari. If this is so there must be war, for a personal motive is generally stronger than a public one, and everybody agrees this his terror of assassination is very great.*

The friendship between the Emperor and Lord Malmesbury was at this time somewhat overclouded; the Emperor believed that the English Foreign Secretary had encouraged Germany to act against him. The fact being that Lord Malmesbury had written a very strong despatch urging Germany to remain quiet, a fact of which M. Walewski, the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, seems purposely to have kept the Emperor ignorant. †

In the spring Parliament was dissolved, and a general election took place, as to which we read this remarkable entry: "It is said that Lord Clarendon positively refuses to join Lord Palmerston. The same authority declares there is no doubt that Persigny came with orders not to spare money in getting votes against us at the election; that one gentleman received £480, the cost of his election, is well known." ‡

The new Parliament met on June 7, Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell had made up their quarrels, or at least, as was said, "they had shaken hands and embraced, and hate each other more than ever." § A reconciliation which reminds us of that of the two demons in "The Devil on Two Sticks": "They brought us together," says Asmodeus; "they reconciled us. We shook hands, and became mortal enemies." The reunited Liberal party determined to turn out the Tory Government. A vote of want of confidence was moved as an amendment to the Address, and after three nights' debate, carried by a majority of thirteen. Azeglio (the Italian Minister to England) is said to have thrown his hat in the air, and himself in the arms of Jaucourt, the French attaché, which probably no ambassador, or even Italian, ever did before in so public a place." ¶

One of the principal points made against Lord Derby's Government was that they had not prevented the Italian war; on this Lord Malmesbury remarks:—

Thus fell the second Administration of Lord Derby. With a dead majority against him, it is evident that he could not for long have maintained his ground, but it is equally certain he would not have been defeated on the Address if Disraeli had previously laid on the table the Blue-Book containing the Italian and French correspondence with the Foreign Office. Why he chose not to do so I never knew, nor did he ever explain it to me; ¶ but I presented it to the House of

* Vol. ii. p. 157, under date February 16; *conf.* p. 160.

† *Ibid.* p. 176. See the "Despatch," at p. 205.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 188, under date June 12.

§ *Ibid.* p. 120.

¶ *Ibid.* p. 187.

¶ But *conf.* the letter to Lord Cowley, vol. ii. p. 192, quoted *post.* This passage seems to have been written after the event, and not to be strictly accurate.—*Vide* note as to Mr. Cobden, *post.*

Lords at the last moment, when I found he would not give it to the House of Commons, and at least twelve or fourteen Members of Parliament who voted against us in the fatal division came out of their way at different times and places to assure me that, had they read that correspondence before the debate, they never could have voted for an amendment which, as far as our conduct respecting the war was concerned, was thoroughly undeserved, we having done everything that was possible to maintain peace. Mr. Cobden was one of these, and expressed himself strongly to me on the subject.* It may be asked why Lord Derby did not himself order this Blue-Book to be produced; but the fact was that he wished to resign, worn out by repeated attacks of gout and the toils of his office, and was indifferent to continuing the struggle. When a few days after the Blue-Book was read, I received as many congratulations upon its contents as during the past year I had suffered attacks from the Opposition and the "press," and many Members repeated over and over again that had they read it they would not have supported the amendment. And in another place he says, "All my colleagues praised the Blue-Book on Italy except Disraeli, who never said a word."†

This is unlike Mr. Disraeli's chivalrous loyalty to his colleagues. "His real reason for this strange line," so writes Lord Malmesbury to Lord Cowley, "was that *he had not read it*, and could not have fought it in debate."‡ It looks to us as if Mr. Disraeli secretly disapproved of Lord Malmesbury's Italian policy.

The second Palmerston Government was then formed, and Lord John Russell succeeded Lord Malmesbury at the Foreign Office. Lord Derby after two experiences of attempting to govern when in a minority, had no wish to repeat the experiment, and in language characteristically brusque said of his successors to his late colleagues: "We must help to keep these cripples on their legs."§ How this was done Lord Malmesbury with equal candour and indiscretion tells us:—

I was deputed by Lord Derby and Disraeli to tell Lady Palmerston that we meant to throw out the Duty on Paper Bill (for which she thanked us), and further to say, that if Mackinnon's motion for postponing the Reform Bill|| until after the census of 1861 passed, and if Lord John and other Members of Government (meaning Gladstone and Milner Gibson) went out in consequence, and joined the Radicals

* Vol. ii. pp. 188, 189. Mr. Cobden, it is to be observed, was not in a position to vote on the amendment. The Government was defeated on June 11. Mr. Cobden did not return from America till June 29 (see Morley's "Life of Cobden," vol. ii. p. 223), but he expressed to Lord Malmesbury's secretary the opinion attributed to him in the text.—*Vide* vol. ii. p. 245. † *Ibid.* p. 191.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 192.

§ *Ibid.* p. 215.

|| Alluding to Lord John's latest and unsuccessful attempt in 1860 to reopen the Reform question.

against the Government, we would engage ourselves to support Lord Palmerston against them for this Session. Lady Palmerston expressed herself as being very grateful for the offer, but said she did not think Lord John would go out if beaten.*

This reveals a mean and discreditable intrigue between the Tories and Lord Palmerston to defeat the financial policy of his own Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Again :—

I had a satisfactory interview with Lord and Lady Palmerston yesterday. They are as anxious as we are to get rid of the Reform Bill, but do not exactly see their way. It is evident he does not wish to lose Lord John, though he would be very glad if Gladstone resigned. Rumours of Lord John's and Gladstone's resignation continue. Some of the Whigs signed the round-robin, blaming the former for his foreign policy and asking him to resign. His only remark was, "Blackguards!" †

The Italian policy of Lord Malmesbury was as wide as the poles asunder from that of Lord John Russell. Lord Malmesbury's object was to maintain the territorial arrangements of 1815, which he thought had ensured "the longest peace on record." ‡ That of Lord John Russell was "to establish the union, the independence, and the freedom of Italy." § With this end in view, he wrote his memorable despatch to Sir James Hudson of October 27, 1860, in which he—to use his own words—"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.'" || This despatch is of course pronounced by Lord Malmesbury to be "an unjustifiable one." ¶ We think differently, but it certainly well illustrates the acute criticism of the late Mr. Bagehot on the style of Lord Russell's diplomatic correspondence:—

. . . . He wrote as he used to speak in the House of Commons: with a certain cold acumen he "pitched" (there is no less familiar

* Vol. ii. pp. 227, 228. Lord Palmerston thus writes to the Queen as to the anticipated rejection by the Lords of the Paper Duties Bill: "Viscount Palmerston is bound in duty to say that if they do so they will perform a good public service,"—"Life of the Prince Consort," vol. v. p. 100.

† Vol. ii. p. 229, under date June 2, 1860.

‡ "Letter to Lord Cowley," vol. ii. p. 147.

§ Earl Russell's "Recollections and Suggestions," p. 278; and his "Speeches and Despatches," vol. ii. p. 259.

|| The entire despatch is given in "Recollections and Suggestions," p. 279 *et seq.* It will also be found in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW (N.S., No. CXV. July, 1880, p. 114), article "Memoirs of the Prince Consort."

¶ Vol. ii. p. 237.

word adequate) into the foreign Courts as he used to "pitch into." Sir Robert Peel, and not being used to parliamentary plainness the foreign Courts did not like it. Lord Russell hardly conducted a foreign controversy in which the extreme intelligibility of his words did not leave a sting behind them.*

Accordingly, when this despatch was made public, the Emperor of Germany† intimated to the Prince Consort "that the Italian policy of England was viewed abroad with very great regret;" and the Prince Consort, if we rightly understand Sir Theodore Martin, thought this despatch scarcely prudent from the pen of an English Minister;‡ and Lord Malmesbury tells us, that when Brunnow read it, he observed, "Ce n'est pas de la diplomatie, c'est de la polisonerie." Cavour, when Hudson read it to him nearly fainted from joy.§

We must pass over the time which elapsed between the return of Lords Palmerston and Russell to office, and the death of Lord Palmerston in the autumn of 1865. Of his departed friend Lord Malmesbury writes:—

I shall always recollect him as one of the kindest men to me in private life, which I attribute mainly to his affection for my grandfather, the first Lord Malmesbury, who was his guardian. As a Minister, although I often differed from him, I look upon him as one of our greatest, especially in his knowledge of foreigners and their character. He was clear-headed, always knew what he wanted, and was determined to carry it out with great moral and physical courage. We shall be long ere we see his like again. He was *English* to the backbone.||

In a former mention of him, Lord Malmesbury says: "There is no man so pleasant in his private life, and it is extraordinary that he should not be able to exercise the same courtesy in public affairs."¶ Earl Russell succeeded Lord Palmerston as Premier. In January, 1866, Parliament met for the first time after the general election, in the preceding July. The Russell Ministry had a paper majority of seventy, but of these a large number had been returned as "Liberals and supporters of Lord Palmerston," and were therefore opposed to the Reform Bill, which was announced as the principal measure of the Session. The defection of the Adullamites took place. The Government were defeated, and resigned. At the opening of the Session there

* "Biographical Studies," by Walter Bagehot, p. 348.

† Then Prince Regent of Prussia.

‡ "Life of Prince Consort," vol. v. pp. 226, 227. The Prince might have reflected that the Revolution of 1688, to which the Queen owes her crown, was based on the same principles as this despatch.

§ Vol. ii. p. 237. Brunnow was Russian Ambassador at the English Court.

|| *Ibid.* p. 341.

¶ *Ibid.* p. 53.

was an attempt "among a small and unimportant knot of individuals in the Conservative ranks to get rid of Lord Derby, and put Disraeli or Lord Stanley in his place."* It was abortive, and Lord Derby, as head of the Opposition, was for the third time called on to form a Ministry, while he was in a decided minority in the Commons. He undertook the task. The state of Lord Malmesbury's health prevented his resuming the onerous duties of the Foreign office, and he became Lord Privy Seal.†

When the new Ministry met Parliament, three members of Lord Grey's Ministry took part in the debate in the Lords, and presented a melancholy appearance. Lord Derby himself was "evidently enfeebled by illness and nervous" when he rose to address the House, and Lords Russell and Brougham, who followed him, "both looked very old and broken."‡

Lord Derby when first he became Premier announced that it was his mission "to stem the tide of democracy, which threatened to overwhelm our institutions;" but as the Atlantic beat Mrs. Partington, so the tide of democracy was too strong for Lord Derby, and the work of his last Ministry was a democratic Reform Bill. Lord Malmesbury relates fully and frankly the story of the "distracted councils" and "crude action" of the Cabinet, of the resignation of three of its members, "able and honourable men," of the *laissez aller* system followed by the Government, trying to make the best "they could of the Bill, but constantly yielding something;" so that at every Cabinet "the Bill became more Radical," and of "the great condemnation and ridicule" to which the Ministry in consequence exposed themselves.§ After many vicissitudes the Bill came up to the House of Lords, and Lord Derby "moved the second reading without a division, saying it was 'a leap in the dark.' Peers on our side were averse to it, but at a meeting of them Lord Derby said he would resign if it was rejected."|| When the Bill reached the Committee stage Lord Derby was suffering from gout, and unable to attend. Lord Malmesbury, although it has been said, we believe truly, that "in common with the great majority of the peers he utterly disapproved of the Bill,"¶ had to conduct it through Committee. "This" he records, "was no easy work, especially with many of our men against me. Lord Cairns for one, carried an amendment (raising the lodger franchise from £10 to £15), against me by a large majority.**

* Vol. ii. p. 348.

† *Ibid.* p. 356.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 361.

§ *Ibid.* pp. 365-369. The Bill as passed established household suffrage in cities and boroughs. At p. 366 *note*, Lord Malmesbury says of one of the many Government proposals, "it was nicknamed the Six Hours Reform Bill." We thought it had been called the "Ten Minutes Bill."

|| *Ibid.* p. 371.

¶ *Saturday Review*, *ubi supra*.

** Vol. ii. p. 373.

In February, 1868, the continued illness of Lord Derby compelled his retirement from the head of affairs, and Mr. Disraeli (as he then was) for the first time became Premier. What then happened tends to show that he had no great friendship for, or perhaps we should say opinion of, Lord Malmesbury, who tells us:—

Disraeli sent for me, and asked me to remain to lead the House of Lords as Privy Seal. Previously, and foreseeing this event, the Dukes of Richmond and Marlborough and I agreed to stand together and support the Government of Disraeli or Stanley should the Queen appoint either of them to be Premier. I afterwards found that Disraeli had offered the leadership to the Duke of Marlborough, who very generously refused, saying that I had a prior claim, and had filled the place to the satisfaction of the Peers.*

This underhand proceeding, however, made no difference in Lord Malmesbury's feelings towards Disraeli. He speaks of him in these extravagant terms: “His genius rendered his administration one of the great landmarks of English history.”† Lord Chelmsford, *multa gemens* though without any ground of complaint, was gently compelled to descend from the woolsack in order that Lord Cairns might take his place. The result of the first election under the democratic Reform Bill which Lord Malmesbury had, however reluctantly, piloted through the House of Lords, if not as it should, or at least might, have been foreseen by, was mortifying to him. “Sir Henry Wolff,” he despondingly records, “has been beaten at Christchurch. Everything proves what a Radical Bill Lord Derby and Disraeli have brought in, for Sir Henry was supported by every gentleman in the neighbourhood. The elections are going on as badly as possible all over the country, so our fate is decided.”‡ Again, a few days later he notes: “The counties have behaved splendidly, and the *Times* of course says that they must be reformed, grudging us our miserable minority of 272.”§ The borough of Christchurch had been, we believe, as much an appanage of Heron Court as the city of Ripon has hitherto been of Studley Royal, but Lord Malmesbury was now obliged to confess that he was “hoist by his own petard.” “The majority of my people and labourers at Heron Court voted against Wolff, my bailiff telling them, ‘You must vote for Wolff, but you are voting against yourselves.’”|| Another democratic reform—anonymous voting—has abolished what Mr. Cobden called “the record kept against every man how he votes,” and relieved Lord Malmesbury from the pain of knowing that his “people” vote against his wishes, and his bailiff from the trouble of giving self-contradictory commands.

* Vol. ii. p. 378.

† *Ibid.* p. 412.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 386.

§ *Ibid.* p. 387.

|| *Ibid.* p. 388.

Lord Malmesbury, at the close of 1868—why, he does not explain—resigned the leadership of the House of Lords. His resignation was contemporaneous with that of the Disraeli Government. Lord Cairns was unanimously chosen as his successor.* During the session of 1869 Lord Malmesbury obtained a victory over the combined forces of the Ministry and his own party. Earl Russell brought in a Bill enabling the Crown to create a limited number of life-peers, a term which Lord Malmesbury accurately describes as a “singular blunder, for the peers contemplated by the Bill would not really be peers because they would not be *peers* of those who will be their colleagues in the House.”† Lord Derby and Lord Cairns supported the second reading, which passed without a division; but not without opposition from Lord Malmesbury, who reprints the speech‡ he made in the debate. He rested his opposition on this foundation: “I am very much mistaken if it is not one of the first principles of the constitution that a peerage should be hereditary; that, indeed, is the very essence of the peerage. Now the Bill at once sweeps away that principle.” So great an authority as the Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford recently stated a contrary doctrine in these broad terms: “It is the personal summons to Parliament which is the essence of the peerage.”§ And again: “When, in the present reign, Sir James Parke was, according to ancient precedents, created a peer for life only, the Lords, in defiance of law, in defiance of history, in defiance of the clear rights of the Crown, and of the manifest expediency of the case, had the matchless impudence to refuse to Lord Wensleydale, a baron of the realm, as lawfully created as any of them, his lawful seat in their House.”|| But as this learned writer in an earlier passage admits that “after the fifteenth century it would be hard, till the present reign, to find a distinct case of a temporal lord with a seat in Parliament being created for life only,”¶ it seems to us that he has not given its proper weight to the fact that for three centuries this power of creating life-peerages had been disused, which to our minds justifies the resolution of the House of Lords in denying the validity of the patent of Lord

* Vol. ii. p. 388–390.

† *Ibid.* p. 394.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 393 *et seq.*

§ “The Nature and Origin of the House of Lords,” by Edward A. Freeman, D.C.L., LL.D., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford, p. 16. We are glad to see that Dr. Freeman’s views on the nature and origin of the House of Lords substantially agree with those we expressed in our number in October last.—*Vide* article “The Lords and the Franchise Question.”

|| *Ibid.* p. 18.

¶ *Ibid.* p. 16 *ante*. There is a good letter on the question of Life Peerages from Mr. Croker to Lord Campbell in “The Croker Papers,” vol. iii. p. 355.

Wensleydale so far as it gave him the right to sit and vote in Parliament, and certainly does not warrant the very strong expressions in which their action is described by the *Regius Professor*.

On the third reading of Lord Russell's Bill, Lord Malmesbury gained a most unusual victory. "I made," he says, "a deliberate speech* against it, and, to my great satisfaction succeeded in throwing it out by a majority of twenty-nine—106 to 77—converting to my views both my leaders and many others who had supported the Bill. I had returned from Italy on purpose to effect this, and to have done so at the last stage was an unexpected and very agreeable success."† The only similar success of late years which we can call to mind was Macaulay's defeat of Lord Hotham's Bill to exclude the Master of the Rolls from the House of Commons. It had passed unopposed through all its stages but the last. On the third reading Macaulay spoke against it, and, as was said at the time, "after his speech the Bill was not thrown out, but pitched out."‡ In both cases the triumph was shortlived, and more shadowy than substantial. Under the Judicature Act the Master of the Rolls can no longer sit in the House of Commons, and the House of Lords has admitted temporal lords who are not hereditary peers—viz., "the Lords of Appeal in ordinary, official lords whose position is wonderfully anomalous, but who at most are Lords of Parliament for life, and who are not necessarily even that."§

Lord Malmesbury describes Lord Derby's last great parliamentary speech—that on the second reading of the Irish Church Bill: "Lord Derby's speech was a very good one, and the peroration very eloquent and touching; but his voice was feeble, he looked pale and ill, and his manner had lost its energy. It was altogether very painful for those who love him to see such evident symptoms of failing strength. The mind, however, is as clear and fresh as ever."|| This was on June 17. On September 14 the diarist records that "the accounts of Lord Derby are very bad, and I am very unhappy;" and on the 17th the news of Lord Derby is much the same—he is gradually "sinking;" and on September 23 we read this melancholy entry: "Lord Derby died this morning at seven o'clock. In him I lose my greatest friend, and the country a most brilliant and accomplished statesman."¶ It is interesting to compare with these words

* It is reprinted in vol. ii. p. 402 *et seq.*

† *Ibid.* p. 408.

‡ "Macaulay's Life," vol. ii. p. 335. The speech will be found in his own edition of his speeches.

§ "Nature and Origin of the House of Lords," p. 19.

|| Vol. ii. p. 401.

¶ *Ibid.* pp. 411, 412.

those of another statesman now also no more, who in early life was Lord Derby's colleague, but who in later years was always either opposed to, or opposed by, him. They said many a bitter word of each other, but remained friends throughout. "The news of the death of Lord Derby," writes Lord Russell, "has afflicted this country, which saw in him a man noble by character as well as by rank, always ready to sacrifice office for the sake of maintaining his opinions, and forming those opinions, if with the fallibility of human judgment, yet with an integrity which must in all future times command respect."*

Amongst the many entertaining anecdotes with which the Memoirs abound, there is one which shows the relations between the two Earls at the time when Lord Russell was at the Foreign Office and Lord Derby leading the Opposition, and had made some slashing speeches on the foreign policy of the Government.†

1861, June 28. Concert at Buckingham Palace. Whilst we were waiting for our carriage to go away Lord Derby joined us, and immediately after Lord John Russell came up. Lord Derby exclaimed, "How do you do, Lord John? you have got into very bad company." He looked at us all round with a grim smile and said, "I see I have;" when Lord Derby looking at him attentively, observed that he was incorrectly dressed, having his levée uniform instead of the full dress which he ought to have worn, Lord John said, "I know I am wrong and the porter wanted to turn me out." "Oh did he?" exclaimed Lord Derby, "Thou canst not say *I* did it." Of course all those round laughed at this apt quotation from Shakespeare, and no one more than Lord John himself.‡

With the mention of Lord Derby's death these Memoirs close, but there is a short appendix relating principally to the last years of Lord Malmesbury's old friend, the Emperor of the French. He saw him in the spring of 1870. "The result," he says, "of my visit and conversation was one of extreme pain, for I saw that he was no longer the same man of sanguine energy and self-reliance, and had grown prematurely old and broken."§ Lord Malmesbury, indeed, thinks the Emperor's "bodily suffering and exhaustion, from a deadly disease rather than any moral conviction," was the cause of his giving France a constitutional Government. || When these two old friends next met, it was at Chislehurst. Lord Malmesbury's account of the meeting is most interesting. We have space only for this extract:—

All the past rushed to my memory as the man stood before me whose race had been so successful and so romantic, now without a crown, without an army, without a country or an inch of ground

* "Recollections and Suggestions," p. 222.

† *Ibid.* p. 255.

§ *Ibid.* p. 415.

† Vol. ii. p. 247.

|| *Ibid.* p. 415.

which he could call his own except the house he hired in an English village. I must have shown, for I could not conceal, what I felt as he said “A la guerre, comme a la guerre; c’est bien bon de venir me voir.” In a quiet natural way he then praised the kindness of the Germans at Wilhelmshöhe; nor did a single complaint escape him during our conversation. He said he had been *trompé* as to the force and preparation of his army, but without mentioning names; nor did he abuse any one, until I mentioned General Trochu, who deserted the Empress, whom he had sworn to defend, and gave up Paris to the mob; when the Emperor remarked, “Ah voilà un drole.” During half an hour he conversed with me as calmly as in the best days of his life, with a dignity and resignation that might be that of a fatalist, but could hardly be obtained from any other creed; and when I left him that was not for the first time my impression.*

Lord Malmesbury again held the Privy Seal from 1874, when Lord Beaconsfield’s second Ministry was formed, until 1876, when he finally quitted office for a reason we regret—viz., “being rendered useless, from deafness, either in Cabinet or House of Lords.” †

We here reluctantly part with Lord Malmesbury. Our observations are confined to the political portion of his *Memoirs*, but these volumes contain much of interest and amusement for non-political readers. There are sporting chronicles, for the ex-Minister was quite as ardent a sportsman as his friend Lord Derby. There are records of foreign travel, by no means—especially in France—confined to the beaten track, and an abundance of anecdotes of notable persons and of social life. One of these relating to another veteran sportsman is so eminently characteristic of the man that we cannot forbear transcribing it. “Mr. Bentinck called and announced the death of Lord Fitzhardinge, whose last words were: ‘The angel of death is hovering over Berkeley Castle, and if you don’t feed those ducks in the lower pond, I’ll be d——d if you don’t lose them all.’ Old habit, strong in death.” ‡

As a politician, Lord Malmesbury’s views are not our views, nor his ways our ways, and it is therefore not worth our while to criticise them in detail; but we assent to the remark of the contemporary from whom we have so often quoted, that “his good sense, moderation, and placable temper are conspicuously exhibited in his journals;” § and we may truly say of him as did Lord Russell of Lord Derby—that his opinions are formed, “if with the fallibility of human judgment, yet with an integrity which commands respect.”

* Vol. ii. p. 418.

† Vol. i. p. 43.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 89. Earl Fitzhardinge, not the late Baron Fitzhardinge, is here referred to.

§ *The Saturday Review*, *ubi supra*.

ART. III.—DR. TEMPLE ON RELIGION AND SCIENCE.

The Relations between Religion and Science. Eight Lectures preached before the University of Oxford in the year 1884, on the Foundation of the late Rev. John Bampton, M.A. By the Right Rev. FREDERICK Lord Bishop of LONDON Elect. London : Macmillan & Co.

IF Religion and Science are not yet completely reconciled it is for no lack of peace-makers. Looked at from an economical point of view, the waste of mental energy consumed in this work is quite appalling. It is surely no exaggeration to say that the amount of intellectual labour expended unproductively upon this object would be sufficient, if properly directed, to have furnished a new nation with a fairly complete brand-new literature in all its branches—poetic, historic, scientific. From pulpit and from press has poured one continuous stream of words fervent with the spirit of animated disputation. Theology, deeming herself the aggrieved party, has not unnaturally displayed most zeal, but amongst scientific men also there has not been wanting earnest advocates of peace and mutual concession. On the one side, by laying stress upon the ultimate antinomies of reason, the finite nature of all human thought; on the other side, by relaxing somewhat the rigidity of dogmatic forms and by expanding the interpretation of theologic terms, endeavours have been made to induce Science and Religion to dwell together in a blissful state of wedded harmony, or in default of that, to establish such well-defined landmarks that there should be, in future, no cause to fear encroachment from either party. But no one who is willing to view the position calmly can fail to see that these endeavours have been unsuccessful. And the reason is not hard to find. Theologians in their despair often impute the failure to the all-grasping spirit of Science, which will admit no compromise and no concessions. And they are right. Science claims all knowledge for her own; her claims are not confined to material and external Nature in all its aspects, nor even to knowledge of the mind of man in its highest and most intimate workings. If it be asserted that there is a spiritual world distinct in nature from the physical world, and that this world can in some way manifest itself to man, Science demands a right to investigate this claim, and to regard it in that dry light of reason which is the sole human test of truth. Hence the complete and ultimate irreconcilability of Science and Religion. There should, amongst scientific men, be no shrinking from this truth, however disagreeable and difficult it may seem. It is better to face it at

once, and incur the full brunt of theologic hate, than to continue in weak half-conscious evasion of the real position. All theologians, too, must sooner or later be brought to see that they have no other standing ground with respect to the claims of Science than that of absolute dogmatism. The Church of Rome has, indeed, perceived and recognized this all along; hence her strength and fearlessness as compared with the Protestant Churches. Holding these convictions, as we do most firmly, we regard a volume like the one before us as a melancholy sight. This sorrow, indeed, is in some measure tempered by admiration of the boldness and vigour of the author. Far from contenting himself, as most Bampton Lecturers have done, with the scholarly elaboration of some special tenet of the Christian Church, or with the slaughter and *post-mortem* examination of some individual heresy, Dr. Temple sets himself no less a task than the exposition of the "Relations between Religion and Science." And in this work he does not confine himself, like so many others, to picking holes in the hypothesis of evolution, while inveighing against the presumption of Science for seeking to penetrate the prime mysteries of the Universe. He does more than this, or rather he does not do this at all. He starts, as he believes, from the beginning. Never have so many deep and various subjects been treated in so small a space. The questions concerning the uniformity in Nature, the origin and character of our idea of causation, the relativity of knowledge, free-will and determinism, are all stated and answered before the claims of evolution come into consideration. In fact, there is scarcely any important point of metaphysics or theology which has vexed the centuries that does not find a ready solution here. Upon a ground of human philosophy is reared an intellectual Tower of Babel, intended to reach heaven, but ending in the clouds of metaphysical and theological nomenclature. It would be impossible within a limited space to follow Dr. Temple into all the questions he opens, so we shall confine ourselves, in the main, to the consideration of the philosophic groundwork of the scheme, paying little attention to particular views upon such subjects as the truth and importance of miracles and other corroborative evidences of revealed Religion.

The first aim of Dr. Temple is to restrict the sphere of Science so that room may be left for the realm of spiritual knowledge which he intends to establish. Now, an examination of the foundations of Science shows its validity to depend upon a single principle—the belief in what is called uniformity in Nature. What, then, is the character of this belief? and what is its origin? On this subject—for the questions, though separate in form, are at bottom one and the same—there are two possible theories.

[Vol. CXXIII. No. CCXLVI.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LXVII. No. II. A A

Either this universal postulate is merely the highest generalization of Science, and our belief in it is derived from, and based solely upon, experience of the order of phenomena, or else it is a form of thought imposed by the human mind upon phenomena, and the belief in its absolute validity is a necessity of our nature. Now the former of these theories is the one adopted by Dr. Temple. First of all, dealing with the question of origin, he accepts the position maintained by Hume, and puts it with great distinctness: "This, then, is the answer to the question, Why do we believe in the uniformity of Nature? We believe in it because we find it so. Millions upon millions of observations concur in exhibiting this uniformity. And the longer our observation of Nature goes on, the greater do we find the extent of it" (p. 27).

This fundamental assumption of Science, then, is itself an induction, the widest and most valid of inductions, but still subject to the weakness of the inductive method, which can give no proof and establish no certainty. Experience can teach us that A does follow B; it cannot teach us that A must follow B. It is quite true that the constant association of A with B may make it necessary for us whenever we think of B to think of A following it, but we cannot rightly attribute this subjective necessity to the real relations of A with B. In short, there can be, from experience, no proof of the universality of the relation of cause and effect. Again, it is further alleged that this uncertainty as to the universal application of causation is recognized by our consciousness. "The certainty that Nature is uniform is not at all, and never can be, a certainty of the same kind as the certainty that four times five are twenty" (p. 29). Thus we have two statements, separate, indeed, yet to some extent dependent on each other—first, that our theory of causation is a generalization from experience, and therefore uncertain; secondly, that this uncertainty is recognized by consciousness. It is quite true that Dr. Temple recognizes the practical certainty of causation as a "working hypothesis," but the tendency of his whole argument is to show that the hypothesis does not assert a necessary truth and one that is of universal application, so that it is quite accurate to say that what is denied is the certainty of the operation of causation. Now it will be best to deal first with the appeal to consciousness. There is only one form of criticism that can affect an argument from appeal to consciousness, and that is denial. It is possible, indeed, to modify the abruptness of this method by some explanation, but a formal contradiction is unavoidable. We say, then, that it is not true that our certainty respecting causation differs from that respecting mathematical truths. When we are once satisfied that the relation

between two events is that of causation, it is as certain to us that the one event will be followed in future by the other as it is that two and two are four. Indeed, the assertion that "I am constrained to believe that two and two are four and not five; I am not constrained to believe that if one event is followed by another a great many times it will be so followed always" (p. 18), does not touch the case, for this is not a correct representation of what Science means by "causal relation." It is never asserted by Science that because "one event is followed by another a great many times" the relation between the two is proved to be that of cause and effect. It is, indeed, true that Science does regard mere observed sequence, when the observations have been fairly numerous and the circumstances sufficiently varied, as a indication of causal connection strong enough to justify an expectation that the sequence will hold in the future as in the past. But Science is far from regarding such hypotheses, however well based, as proved laws; were she so foolish, her folly would be continually exposed, for these hypotheses are constantly falsified or corrected by further experience. Only in cases where the evidence is such as to satisfy the logical canon of Difference does Science regard causation as proved. If we are to compare the certainty we feel respecting physical truths with that which we feel respecting mathematical truths, we must select one of the former which has passed the test of this logical method. For example, let us take the case of the two billiard balls which Hume makes use of. The movement of the first ball is here proved to be the cause of the movement of the second ball, from the fact that all other circumstances affecting the second ball when at rest remain unchanged, the only new phenomenon introduced being the motion of the first ball. Now, it is certain that if the second ball be again placed in exactly the same situation, all the other circumstances being the same as in the former experiment, a similar movement of the first ball will be followed by a similar movement of the second ball. And the certainty of this is as real as the certainty which we feel respecting mathematical truths; we know that the movement of one ball is the cause of the movement of the other as surely as we know that two and two are four and not five. It may, indeed, be granted that it is seldom possible to apply in its strictness the logical test above made use of, but that does not alter the fact that where it has been applied the result possesses complete certainty for our minds. It should be remarked, moreover, that one such experience is sufficient; there is no need of constant repetition, for nothing is thereby added to the proof or to the certainty of it.

Dr. Temple is surely misled in his opinion of the uncertainty

of causation, by regarding the numerous hypotheses, many of them well-grounded and of great practical value, which form so large a part of what is popularly understood by Science. There may be no possible doubt in our mind that, if A B C have been followed by a b c once, they will be so followed a second time, but we may feel grave doubt whether in an alleged second case exactly the causes A B C are present, neither more nor less, and exactly the effects a b c. What doubt there is is not as to the certainty of the working of Nature, but as to the certainty of our observation of Nature—a very different thing. And not only do we hold this certainty as to the working of Nature, but we are unable to conceive it otherwise. To repeat our former position, we can no more conceive a state of things where the same causes are not followed by the same results than we can conceive a world where twice two should not be four. If we apply this consideration to the question of the origin of our belief in the universal postulate, its importance is obvious. If our belief is based on experience, whence do we derive the feeling of certainty? Experience can give no guarantee that what has happened in the past will continue to happen in the future. No association of ideas in our mind can enable us to predicate certainty of the order of external events. A great deal too much stress has been laid by Hume and his followers upon the uniformity given in experience. Even in experience of external Nature there are frequent cases of what would appear to be breaches of this universal law; phenomena are constantly presented to our minds detached from their physical causes, and in many other cases the same result appears to follow from different causes at different times. That this latter fact is recognized by logic under the name of Plurality of Causes is sufficient to show that the uniform working of Nature is not so obvious and so universally recognized as some empiricists would have us believe. But if we turn to "internal" experience, to the examination of the operations of our minds, this uniformity in Nature is still less manifest. Ideas or thoughts are continually coming into our mind which we are unable to attribute to any cause; our feelings and emotions are often quite unaccountable, to say nothing of the working of moral motives stirring the will to action. Indeed, so far from our consciousness presenting any uniform sequence of causal relations, it is broken up into a thousand detached fragments bearing no perceptible relation whatever towards one another. It would, in fact, seem utterly impossible that we should have acquired the firm belief we have that all our thoughts are causally related, from introspective examination of these thoughts themselves, for at no time can we trace a chain of connected thoughts either forward or backward without coming to an apparent break. The appear-

ance of pure creation is constantly put before us in the workings of our mind. So neither in experience of the external world nor of ourselves does this uniformity seem invariable, so that the regularity observable in phenomena is very far from accounting for the certainty in our minds that the future will resemble the past in respect of causation. But if this were all the contention of Dr. Temple, it would be little more than a restatement of Hume's reasoning. He seems, however, to have been half-conscious that he had left the belief in uniformity upon a very feeble base. Experience will, he proceeds, only give us the notion of uniformity, but we have something more than this—a conception of causation. This conception of causation implies a permanence underlying all phenomena, and our idea of this permanence comes from the perception of something permanent within ourselves. This is his argument, and the following words will explain it more fully :—

We cannot believe that the future will be like the past except because we believe that there is something permanent which was in the past and will be in the future. And this assumption of something permanent in things around us comes from the consciousness of something permanent within ourselves. We know our own permanence. Whatever else we know or do not know about ourselves, we are sure of our own personal identity through successive periods of life (p. 25).

We shall have occasion later on to discuss the statement respecting our knowledge of our permanence. Here it will suffice to say that Dr. Temple has confused the origin of belief in causation with the origin of belief in the mode according to which causation works. There is no doubt that we are apt to regard causation in external Nature in an anthropomorphic manner, to impose upon it the mode of working which we trace in our own actions ; in a word, our notion of force or energy is derived from reflection on our own conscious motions. This, however, has no real bearing upon the question of the origin of our belief in the universality and necessity attaching to causation, but only concerns the particular mode according to which we imagine causation to work in external Nature.

After endeavouring to shake the universal validity of causation, Dr. Temple approaches the still deeper problem of the relativity of knowledge. Now, nothing has led to more grotesque failures than the attempt to view philosophic questions by the light of what is called common-sense. It would seem as if it were impossible for one human being to combine in himself the character of philosopher and that of practical man. Now, Dr. Temple is a practical man, endowed with that strong common-sense which, when combined with logical method, is of such value in

solving the questions that affect human conduct. But the very confidence bred of the conscious possession of this capacity is itself a snare when dealing with questions of metaphysic. It is this confidence that has led Dr. Temple astray in tackling the relativity of human knowledge. No one could put in a few words more clearly the teaching of philosophy on the subject: "We know or may know whatever comes under the observation of our senses as phenomena; we cannot know what underlies these phenomena." "We know ourselves, it is maintained, only through an internal sense which can only tell us how we appear to ourselves, but cannot tell us in any the least degree what we really are" (p. 39). Now, Dr. Temple is willing to allow that all our other knowledge is relative, but "there is one exception that we cannot get rid of, and that is the conviction of our personal identity through all changes through which we pass." So, further, "All other knowledge may conceivably be relative: a knowledge of things as they appear, not of things in themselves. But this is not: it is a knowledge of a thing as it is in itself; for amidst all changes in the phenomena of each man's nature this still remains absolutely unchanged" (p. 41). This is the sum total of his contention, and contains the whole of his argument in support of it. It is nothing more than a somewhat vulgar appeal to common-sense to decide off-hand a point that has been decided already by philosophy. For though it is true that Kant's followers are not in thorough agreement with the empiricists on this subject as on others, they do agree in so far that they all repudiate the notion that internal experience can be appealed to in order to attest the existence of "things in themselves." Nothing can be more clear than the language of Kant himself: "For though the 'I' exists in all thoughts, not the slightest intention is connected with that representation, by which it might be distinguished from other subjects of intuition. We may very well perceive, therefore, that this representation appears again and again in every act of thought, but not that it is a permanent intuition, in which thoughts, as being changeable, come and go" ("Kritik," p. 350). To appeal to consciousness to attest any existence other than that of phenomena is futile, for the sum total of phenomena is identical with the sum total of the contents of consciousness—they are only two names for the same thing: that I can only know things as they appear to be is an analytic judgment. So far as we can present to ourselves any thought of personal identity, it is a mere phenomenon. Assuming that the real Ego, the identity, is an object, it can never be present in consciousness as a subject—*i. e.*, we can never be conscious of it. To say that we can is to make a statement without meaning. Knowledge implies subject and object—that which

knows and that which is known ; that which knows can never be known because the subject would then be its own object. The "I" which has knowledge can never know itself—to say that it can is to erect another "I" beyond and above the "I" of which we speak. It is the vain endeavour of the eye to see itself. In short, to say "I know that it is I who know this and that" is no more than saying "I know this and that." The difficulty of Dr. Temple's contention is increased by the fact that he is unable to accept the transcendental æsthetic of Kant, whereby space and time are to be regarded as forms which the mind puts upon phenomena. From Kant's point of view, the consciousness of the permanence of the Ego given in phenomena is a fact, but one that does not increase our knowledge. For, assuming time to be merely a form in which the mind regards phenomena, and not a form of "things in themselves," the statement "I am conscious that it is the same 'I' that has different thoughts at different times" only means "I am conscious that I think"—a mere analytic judgment. But if, on the other hand, time be an external existence, it follows that my sense of personal identity is a mere phenomenon forming part of each of a series of phenomena in time—no absolute existence.

To discuss the point any further is useless, for it can only lead to a constant repetition of the same argument. So far as we can be said to have any cognition of the permanent Ego it is as a phenomenon. Now, with Dr. Temple it is not a phenomenon : it appears to be given to us not as phenomena are given, but by a faculty which he terms "direct intuition." This is only a name at present : later on it will be seen that what is meant is that this knowledge is a direct communication from the spiritual world. The fact is too apparent that all this flying in the face of logic is merely with the object of bringing in the complete paraphernalia of a religious system, beginning with a moral law, and ending with a revealed system of theology. There is something very naïve in the way in which this comes out as Dr. Temple proceeds. "And this conviction of personal identity will *presently*, be found to fall in with the revelation of the moral law, which is the subject of my lecture" (p. 42). There is a touch of the humorous in the words we have italicized, for we have no hesitation in saying that the only reason which could have led Dr. Temple to deny the complete relativity of knowledge was the necessity of providing a sphere of action for this moral law. But, before leaving this subject, it would be well to point out that strict logic has a further criticism affecting this consciousness of personal identity. It has already been shown that in no wise can such consciousness justify a claim to be called "knowledge of things in themselves;" it remains to point out

that, though we may be convinced that there is something which binds together all our phenomena, we are not justified in speaking of this conviction as "the consciousness of something permanent within us" (p. 25). Consciousness can only relate to something actually present to my mind; I cannot now be conscious of something that occurred yesterday, or an hour ago, or even a second ago; with events of the past I can only connect myself by memory. Hence it follows that "consciousness of something permanent," as implying a comparison between present and past states of the mind, could only be valid to a being out of time, where what we call past and present would be given together in consciousness. Since we cannot present to ourselves in consciousness, at any one time, present and past experiences, we cannot have any consciousness of what is common to them. By means of memory we can represent the past, but this fact can never justify us in saying that we are conscious of a permanence: such idea can only be regarded as derived from the confidence we repose in memory, and is entirely dependent on the validity of that faculty. I can compare my present feelings with what are given by memory as my past, but any conception of personal identity I hence derive may be, so far as I know, an illusion inherent in the nature of memory. There is no object to be gained in pushing to its extreme limits this scepticism regarding the faculties of the mind, but the possibility of such criticism ought to warn men against attempting to form a fabric of thought out of pieces taken from various systems. Accepting Kant's view of the Ego as a being which uses time as a form for phenomena, but is not itself in time, the idea of the unity or identity of self, (though perhaps not of the permanence which seems to require subjection to time) is a possible idea, but not for one who like Dr. Temple repudiates the transcendental æsthetic altogether.

It is a curious chapter in the history of human thought which deals with the illusion of free-will. There is so much vitality manifested in the theory that a casual outside observer would incline to argue its truth from its very pertinacity. Overthrown again and again, it advances once more into the arena, Protean in the various shapes it assumes—now the wild creature of hap-hazard speculation, now the fire of a theologic dogma, now the running water of a subtle metaphysic. When it is presented in the form of a "credo quia impossibile" doctrine, of course criticism is dumb, but modern theology is loath to shield itself behind this last barrier, preferring to show a bolder front, and meet its enemies on the field of reason. Hence it is that Dr. Temple elects to fight the matter over again. He first clears the course by narrowing the limits of the operation of free-will

to a minimum : though in all human action which is included under the name of Conduct free-will exists potentially, it is only called into active play in those cases known as Moral Struggles. What is the nature and mode of operation of free-will in these cases? Dr. Temple explicitly rejects Kant's view of freedom as a quality attaching to the character of man as a being out of time, but whose separate acts, regarded as events in time, are bound each to the preceding one by the law of invariable sequence. The ground on which he rejects Kant's theory is the same upon which he has dealt with the universal postulate and the Relativity of all knowledge. Once more his appeal is to consciousness. "It is plain at once that this [Kant's theory] does not satisfy our consciousness. We are not conscious of freedom as regards our life as a whole; we are conscious of freedom as regards our separate actions" (p. 75). Now, what is this freedom of which we are conscious? Is it a freedom to choose between motives, as Dr. Temple would have us to believe? Surely not. It is a freedom to choose between actions, to do this, or that, according as we prefer—*i.e.*, according to our strongest motive. In brief, we are conscious that we can do as we like; we are not conscious that we can like as we like. But perhaps it is unnecessary to repeat this oft-plied argument. Dr. Temple does not seem unaware of the logical strength of determinism. He has himself put the determinist position with a clearness and brevity which has never been surpassed. After conceding that the moral choice must be attributed to the character of the individual, he proceeds:—

Nothing will satisfy that law of uniformity but this: that given such and such parents, such and such circumstances of birth and life, there must be such a character, and no other. At what point is there room for any responsibility? I did not, on this supposition, make my character; it was made for me; any one else born in my stead, and living in my stead, would of necessity have acted exactly as I have done, would have felt the same, and aimed at the same, and won the same moral victories, and suffered the same moral defeats (p. 81).

This leaves nothing to be desired as an exposition of determinism, provided only it be clearly understood that the "any one else born in my stead" means "any one else born with the same nature as myself." Indeed, so strong is this position that it can safely defy any assault. Dr. Temple's method of attack is a flat denial that "my character at a given time" "has come out of the antecedents and surroundings according to any fixed law." This is, of course, a corollary from his previous contention that the sphere of causation is limited. But supposing there were exceptions to the law of causation, what is there

to prove that the actions of human life are such exceptions? This brings us again to the appeal to consciousness. Here Dr. Temple is rather more explicit, and does seek to give further information as to the nature of the freedom of which we are conscious. Speaking of the moral struggle, he says :—

In this case *we are distinctly conscious of a power to add force to that one of the contending opposites which is most identified with our own selves, and we know whether we have added that force or not. And not only may we add this force directly from within, but we may, and we often do, go outside of ourselves to seek for aids to add still more force indirectly, and we do for this purpose what we should not do otherwise. We dwell in thought on the higher aims which are the proper object of will; we read what sets forth those higher aims in their full beauty; we seek the words, the company, the sympathy of men who will, we are sure, encourage us in this the higher path* (p. 87).

Now, with the whole of this admirable piece of introspective criticism it is possible to agree most thoroughly, and yet in no whit to abandon the position of determinism. It may, indeed, be left an open question whether the words we have italicized express accurately the phenomenon, or whether it would not be better to regard a moral struggle as a combat, fought out between our motives, rational and irrational, without introducing the rational motive a second time in the shape of a choosing self. But, setting aside for the present this inquiry let us put the question, Is it not a fact that we sometimes do and sometimes do not exercise this power to add force to the higher motive? If so, what *determines* whether I shall on a particular occasion exercise this power? Dr. Temple gives no reply to this question; his analysis goes no farther. The position of determinism is not in the least affected. It presses the adversary thus: "You say you are conscious of a power to choose the better motive and to adopt various means of strengthening this power: but you will admit that you do not always exercise these powers: when you do so, why do you do so? What determines you to do so?" There can be no reply to this pressure except to retreat one step farther back and plant there the banner of free-will. Indeed, Dr. Temple contributes nothing further to the discussion excepting the following remark:—"The freedom of the will is the moral law breaking into the world of phenomena, and thus behind the free-will of man stands the power of God" (p. 90). Determinism has a prompt reply: "Is not this very act of interference from the real world itself determined? What cause decides whether the interference shall take place or not?" To these questions Kant is enabled to give a satisfactory reply;

his conception of free-will is a possible one, once admitting it to be possible to conceive time merely as a form of the mind, and, as such, applying only to the world of phenomena, and not to the world of reality. His reply would be thus:—"Causation only applies to a world where time is a universal form: in the world of reality time has no such existence, so that the law of causation which holds of phenomena does not hold there: hence there is no meaning for me in your question, 'What is the cause of an interference from the world of reality?'" Dr. Temple, however, can give no such answer; his world of reality is just as much in time as the world of phenomena, and is therefore just as much subject to the law of causation, for we can conceive no sequence save a necessary sequence. It is true, indeed, that our inability to conceive a world in time which is free from the law of causation is no proof that such a one does not exist. Our minds are finite. But such a world cannot exist for us, and no argument based upon it as an assumption can have any meaning for our minds. There may be a transcendental freedom, but we cannot predicate existence of it, for the term conveys no meaning to us. Since this is so, it would seem difficult to account for the persistency with which the free-will theory is held. The fact is that though determinism is logically irrefutable, it does not, when barely stated, furnish an adequate explanation of certain facts of consciousness. "In spite of all attempts to explain it away, the fact that we think ourselves free, and hold ourselves responsible, remains, and remains unaffected" (p. 82). That is to say, the theory of determinism, though it affirms the illusiveness of free-will, does not explain how the illusion comes to exist. Again, no explanation or justification is furnished of the feeling of "ought" in connection with certain actions. Nay, further, from the standpoint of determinism it is difficult to say why we should give a different kind of approval or disapproval to a man from what we give to a machine. When we praise a man for a good action, the sentiment in our minds does seem different in kind from that with which we regard an engine that is working well. Why is this, if they are both working as they must? And, lastly, there is no justification of the feelings of repentance or remorse if we are to consider man void of responsibility. This sense of "ought" and these feelings of moral approbation and repentance are some of the strongest emotions of our nature; are they to be regarded as mere illusions? It cannot be disguised that these terms must undergo a change of meaning from the point of view of determinism. But whether this change of meaning deprives them of all real value, and how they came to get their present meaning, are questions which belong by rights not to the

metaphysic but to the history of ethics; not to determinism but to the science of evolution of morals. Even if it were admitted that the recent attempts to explain the origin of these ethical notions from an evolution point of view had completely failed, that fact would not in the least impair the stability of determinism as a logical theory. However these difficulties be solved, determinism can abate nothing of its claims; no room can be made for any exception to the universal law of causation. It is almost pathetic to hear the voice of Dr. Temple claiming for his moral law just a tiny corner of the world, the merest fraction of human conduct, a single city of freedom in the kingdom of law—to hear his pleading cry, “Is it not a little one that my soul may live?” But no such claim can be admitted. If a religious system can only be based upon the illusive conception of free-will, we must learn to do without religious systems.

Having dealt at some length with the philosophical foundation of Dr. Temple's system, we may proceed to examine the treatment he accords to evolution. It has been the custom of theology at all times, when worsted in the combat with rationalism, to endeavour to insinuate itself into the good graces of its foe, and by a pretence of good fellowship to seek to win the victor to its side. The various objections raised by Science against dogmatism have ever been regarded as matters of vital import so long as the struggle was yet undecided, but when Science has proved its superiority, dogmatism, with unabashed effrontery, has sought to rob her enemy of the spoil by affecting to welcome the reforms forced upon her as sources of increased strength to her position. It may be urged that this only shows the generosity and the expansiveness of Religion. But one may be inclined to doubt the sincerity of reforms effected at the edge of the sword: many beliefs have doubtless been thus propagated amongst peoples in after-ages celebrated for their faith and devotion, but we can scarcely credit with sincerity the converted ancestors. However this may be, it is a noteworthy fact that modern theology, after failing to strangle in infancy the teaching of evolution, is beginning to ostentatiously lay aside its hostility now that the theory has grown into a tall and sturdy youth, well favoured by the cultured of all lands. Indeed, the liberal portion of the theologic world are more than tolerant. They are even cordial in their reception of evolution; it is their long-lost brother, whom they welcome with loving embraces; in fact, there is quite a dramatic recognition, an *ἀναγνώρισις*. This is the reception accorded by Dr. Temple. Evolution the enemy of Religion! Nonsense! The stability of Religion is increased tenfold by the teaching of modern Science; what was unin-

telligible before is now clear as day; what was admirable before is now ten times more admirable. Paley's argument from design is mightily strengthened by the discovery that matter was created of such a kind as to admit of all this marvellous complexity of harmonious development.

In the one case the Creator made the animals at once such as they are now; in the other case He impressed on certain particles of matter, which, either at the beginning or at some point in the history of this creation, He endowed with life, such inherent powers that in the ordinary course of time living creatures such as the present were developed (p. 141).

Now it may be well admitted that the force of the argument from design is not impaired by the new form it takes to accord with the teaching of evolution, but then that force is so very slight to begin with. We observe regularities in Nature, regularities imply design, design a Designer. By these few steps are we brought into the region of personality betokened by capital letters. But with the first step in this argument rationalism disagrees; regularity does not imply design. The position of rationalism is this: we observe regularities in Nature, nor can we conceive any world of change without regularities in the order of this change; for instance, the broadest regularity discernible in Nature is that of 'motion in the line of least resistance,' and we can neither conceive nor imagine any possible state of things where this law should not apply with the same rigidity with which it applies to our world. But these regularities neither prove nor indicate anything outside or beyond themselves; our conception of them as laws of Nature is as being in their essence immutable and eternal. The term "law" as applied to such regularities is apt to mislead in so far as a law is regarded as imposed by some one—to wit, a lawgiver—whereas the laws of Nature are nothing but regularities of inherent necessity. In close connection with this comes the further contention of Dr. Temple that the grandeur of the work of creation is much enhanced by the new point of view.

It has often been objected to Paley's argument, as I remarked before, that it represents the Almighty rather as an artificer than a creator, a workman dealing with somewhat intractable materials, and showing marvellous skill in overcoming difficulties, rather than as a beneficent Being making all things in accordance with the purposes of His love. But this objection disappears when we put the argument into the shape which the doctrine of evolution demands, and look on the Almighty as creating the original elements of matter, determining their number and their properties, creating the law of gravitation whereby, as seems probable, the worlds have been formed, creating the various laws of chemical and physical action, &c. (p. 115).

To all this the response is plain. Whatever by this new view of creation enhances the wonder and majesty of the work, enhances to the same extent its inconceivability and unmeaningness to the human mind. If it be difficult to form a conception of the work of a creator in adapting to his purpose given materials, it is much more difficult to conceive his calling into existence these materials. In fact, the objection applies to any use of the term creation—one of those theologic terms which through long use seems to have a meaning, but which has not. “*Nil posse creari de nihilo*” is an axiom of the human mind; the opposite of it is inconceivable. We cannot assert the impossibility of the existence of a Being who should be able to call something out of nothing—*i.e.*, to create; we can only say that such an act is impossible to be presented in our minds, it is an impossible conception for us—that is to say, the term creation is without meaning. There may be minds to which creation is a possible conception, just as there may be minds able to conceive that two and two are five, but our minds are not so made. Hence no belief in reference to creation is possible for us, for a belief implies that the object of belief can be clearly presented to the mind. When an inconceivable idea, or mystery (to use the theologic term), is proposed to our minds it can admit of no rational belief. Indeed, this obvious truth is so far realized that it is customary to relegate such mysteries to the region of faith. But even faith, if it is to have a substance, must profess some object upon which it is exercised, and this object should be some intelligible conception. The “*credo quia impossibile*” doctrine derives what influence it has from that boldness and effrontery which often gains a ready hearing and acceptance for paradoxes. Neither belief nor faith can really attach to the “impossible.” Let us take an extreme case as an illustration. Supposing that all the men for whose sound judgment and personal integrity we had any respect were to agree in upholding the statement that “two and two make five,” would their united testimony have any effect in influencing our belief? Surely not. We might indeed be led to say, “We believe that your statement ‘two and two make five’ means something,” but not to say, “We believe that two and two make five,” for were we to say so we should be saying what conveyed no meaning to ourselves; the belief expressed would be no more than a mere verbal statement. We can conceive neither the creation of matter nor of force, nor of any law regulating force, for to create such a regulating law is to create force itself. It is true that Science, while denying creation as an explanation of the universe, may itself be unable to offer any explanation, but a conviction that you cannot explain a thing yourself can never justify adherence to an explanation that is false.

A large portion of Dr. Temple's book is given to a general and popular explanation of evolution, and a criticism of some of the difficulties which underlie its teaching. Before, however, we examine his treatment of some of these difficulties it will be well to briefly consider his application of evolution to theology. He attempts to trace in the inspired Scriptures a gradual development of the knowledge of God, and of the moral law. In doing this Dr. Temple would seem to claim for evolution a wider scope than even its most ardent supporters have claimed, for he would extend it to the dealings of God himself. Evolution as applied to inspired Scriptures would seem to mean that God in the act of inspiration manifested himself in a gradually ascending scale of grandeur and goodness, that in the earlier periods he represented himself to man in a form of lower nature and morality, that by process of slow degrees through the whole of history he developed in man a truer and higher conception of himself until in the character and teaching of Jesus he disclosed himself in all the fulness and beauty of holiness. The conception is doubtless a grand one, looked at from a distance, but on closer view it is somewhat difficult to reconcile with any clear meaning of the term inspiration. In regarding the Old Testament from the evolution point of view, we cannot refrain from asking from time to time, "Did God do such and such immoral acts which are directly attributed to him? Is or was his character really such as it is recorded to have been?" If there is such a thing as morality, it must be the same at all times, in all places, and for all rational beings. Now, much of the morality distinctly attributed to Jehovah, and many traits of his character pictured in the earlier books, are deficient in moral goodness. Are we, then, to believe that God wilfully misrepresented himself? Surely not. Then the writers of these books misrepresented him. In what way, then, were they, specially inspired? It would be natural to expect that, if God specially inspired them, he would not permit them to hold and set forth false opinions about his nature and his conduct. We put this plainly and somewhat abruptly, through no desire to offend believers in inspiration, but because we feel that the vagueness attaching to the term inspiration is a practical difficulty that suggests itself to many thinking minds, and that Dr. Temple's application of evolution to inspired writings does not tend to diminish it. If we regard the Scriptures in the same way as other old records, we can indeed clearly trace in them an evolution or growth of moral conceptions bearing some distinguishable relation to the intellectual and political condition of the nation. And with this growth of moral conceptions we are able to trace a higher conception of the God whose unity and

personality had been a fixed belief throughout the eventful records of the national life. That this conception of the Jehovah should change with the national growth, not in detail, but in the fundamental principles of morality, is in nowise wonderful if we regard the Hebrew Scriptures in the same light as other early Eastern records, and merely affords an interesting chapter in the history of the formation of moral sentiments. But if the canons of ordinary historic criticism are to be suspended before the mystery of inspiration, it is difficult to say what can be gained by applying evolution to theology.

Perhaps the most interesting portion of Dr. Temple's treatise to the world at large is his general attitude to the teaching of evolution upon geology and biology. It will no doubt be a matter of surprise to some to find that he accepts with perfect complacency the teaching of modern Science as to the history of the development of the material world, and of the vegetable and animal life upon it. And yet such surprise can only arise from an ignorance of the course of thought within the Church during the last twenty years. It is a matter of common observation that such a book as "Essays and Reviews," which created such a panic among orthodox Christians twenty years ago, would cause little excitement, perhaps little interest, if it were published now. It is tolerably well known that there is a large number of clergymen of the Church of England whose unorthodoxy has spread far beyond the lines of "Essays and Reviews." Dr. Temple, in expressing his general assent to the teaching of Science, is only doing what he is obliged to do. He knows very well exactly how much he assents to, and is careful to reserve for himself a region outside the reach of scientific laws for the operation of his spiritual faculty in man. Most distinct and emphatic is the language in which he deals with the question of the origin of human life.

There can have been no life when the earth was nothing but a mass of intensely heated fluid. There came a time when the earth became ready for life to exist upon it. And the life came, and no laws of inorganic matter can account for its coming. As it stands this is a great miracle. And from this conclusion the only escape that has been suggested is that life came in on a meteoric stone from some already formed habitable world; a supposition which transfers the miracle to another scene, but leaves it as great a miracle as before (p. 170).

It is somewhat curious to find that one who has such a clear grasp of the teaching of evolution upon certain subjects should be unaware of the position commonly assumed by evolutionists upon this important point. It is quite true that all attempts at producing life out of so-called inorganic matter have hitherto

failed; man has not yet been able, perhaps never will be able, to discover the means of evoking the vital spark by a friction of dead material, but he is able to foster and increase the fire once kindled, and that, by the application of mere material fodder. Not only our physical life, but that higher form of life we call consciousness, though it cannot be called into existence by human effort, is ever kept up and fed by material sources; the food we eat is quantitatively represented in physical life and in consciousness. It is undeniably true that from a beefsteak we derive that force which we use in both physical and intellectual effort. The actual energy (or whatever name we call it by) which goes out of us in manual labour or in thought is got out of the food we eat by some process of conversion. This alone is sufficient evidence to render it more than probable that the vital flame within us is not different in its ultimate nature from the stored-up energy contained in the fuel upon which it is fed, and that it is only due to our ignorance of the full working of the transformation of forces that we cannot call life from what is called dead matter. For Science holds that there is no hard-and-fast line between the living and the dead, between organic and inorganic matter; that even within the lowest form of matter there exists some low mode of that highest function of organic life which we know as consciousness. To prove that this is actually the teaching, though by no means the discovery, of modern Science, we will quote the words in which Professor Clifford states it:—

The only thing that we can come to, if we accept the doctrine of evolution at all, is that even in the lowest organisms, even in the amœba which swims about in our own blood, there is something or other, inconceivably simple to us, which is of the same nature with our own consciousness—that is to say (for we cannot stop at organic matter, knowing as we do that it must have arisen by continuous physical processes out of inorganic matter), we are obliged to assume, in order to save continuity in our belief, that along with every motion of matter, whether organic or inorganic, there is some fact which corresponds to the mental fact in ourselves.*

That all the highest kinds of energy exist somehow potentially in all matter must be allowed, unless we are prepared to admit an inconceivable position—to wit, creation arbitrarily breaking in at some point in the development of the natural world. Holding that creation is neither a scientific fact nor a term conveying any meaning to our minds, the man of science is logically bound to adopt the position to which he is also led by consideration of the actual *modus operandi* of physical life. It follows, of course,

* Essays: "Body and Mind," p. 61.

both as a corollary to his view of the origin of physical life and from independent considerations, that Dr. Temple excludes from the operation of evolution that spiritual faculty within us which plays such a useful part in his scheme; in fact, he denies the possibility of a science of evolution of morals. He does not in dealing with the subject trouble himself to examine the doctrine of the earlier utilitarians, or the recent theory of Spencer, but contents himself with appealing to the eternal nature of right and wrong, and the universality of the moral law. It is quite impossible here adequately to discuss the question of the particular adjectives which may be properly applied to the "moral law" or the origin of our knowledge of it; nor are we invited to do so by Dr. Temple's treatment of the subject. The spiritual faculty which proclaims to us the moral law is quite independent of the rational faculty in us; it appeals to no evidence regarding its right to rule; it "requires our obedience by virtue of its own inherent superiority." It may, however, not be out of place here to conclude by briefly examining the psychology of Dr. Temple. There is a certain vagueness that clings to his moral law which will strike every reader of his book, after all the author has done to make it plain. The fact is, Dr. Temple tries to do too much with his moral law. It appears to have two separate functions. In the first place "it commands our duty," it is "the voice within which tells us what we ought to do." In this capacity it is perhaps intelligible as "conscience" within man. But what is its meaning when it claims to be regarded as the faculty by which man detects and appreciates spiritual truth?

The universe, as we see it, is not holy, nor just, nor good, nor right. The music of creation is full of discords as yet altogether unresolved. And if we look to phenomena alone, there is no solution of the great riddle. But in spite of all imperfections and contradictions, the voice within, without vouchsafing to give us any solution of the perplexity, or any sanction but its own authoritative command, imperatively requires us to believe that holiness is supreme over unholiness, and justice over injustice, and goodness over evil, and righteousness over unrighteousness. To obey this command and to believe this truth is faith (p. 54).

So, again (p. 213): "He has made our belief in Him rest mainly on the voice within ourselves in order that we might walk by faith and not by sight." As to the authority for the reliability of this voice, "We are to believe not because the truth of this voice is proved independently of itself, but simply because we are commanded" (p. 231). The fact is that Dr. Temple, with all his fine pretences of liberality and reasonability, introduces this "moral law" simply in order to remove spiritual truth from the

sphere of reason. He is not prepared to give a reason for the hope that is in him? He prefers to set up an irrational subjective standard within each man rather than permit the decision in spiritual matters to be referred to that human reason which in its principles is the same in all men, and forms an objective standard of truth. Pseudo-rationalistic theologians of the school of Dr. Temple are in the following dilemma:—If the basis of spiritual beliefs is not rational, why all this philosophic and scientific argument in which they indulge? If, as most men hold, there must be a rational basis for all beliefs, whatever the nature of the subject to which they refer, what need of this special faculty for recognizing spiritual truths? The dilemma has been often put but never rebutted. There is one faculty in man for discovering truth; that faculty is called reason. This reason is in all essential points the same in all men and at all times. The validity of this faculty is admitted. If any one claims to have some other faculty by which he recognizes truth, he must bring evidence of the validity of his claim. It is not sufficient to say that his peculiar faculty rules “by virtue of its inherent right to rule,” that “its title to our obedience is its supremacy, and it has no other title.” This is the very spirit of theologic domination and unreason against which Science has always had to fight so hard. Either reason must be supreme within the whole realm of knowledge, or its freedom is nothing. If any religion claims to possess truths, those truths must abide the test which reason imposes, they must stand or fall according to the impression made upon the unbiased mind by the evidence. The rationalism of our so-called Broad Churchmen is superficial in that it only builds the superstructure of its creed on reason, while the foundations are still laid in the sand of old assumptions. It will not do in these days for teachers to attempt to palm off upon thoughtful men systems affecting a rationalistic form, while the old leaven of superstition is surreptitiously put in under the guise of philosophic terms torn violently from their context and compelled to do theologic service.

This Dr. Temple has tried to do, and, in spite of considerable dialectical skill and considerable knowledge of the systems of various thinkers, he has completely failed. His failure so far as the philosophy of his system is concerned is merely another illustration of the truism that there is no mean between idealism and materialism but the mean of logical inconsistency.

ART. IV.—THE WORK OF WOMEN AS POOR LAW GUARDIANS.

1. *Annual Report of the Society for Promoting the Return of Women as Poor Law Guardians.* 1884.
2. *Women as Poor Law Guardians.* By C. A. BIGGS.
3. *Poor Law Reports, &c.*

NOTHING in the course of the remarkable awakening which has taken place within the memory of the present generation in all the phases of life involved in the intellectual and social development of women, is so wonderful as the ease with which they have entered upon public functions and public duties with which they were hitherto supposed to have nothing in common. It is true that John Stuart Mill long ago pointed out that if women had a special aptitude for any one function, it was for the function of governing, and that the proportion of capable rulers among queens and female regents was far in excess of that obtaining among male sovereigns. But this capacity was supposed to reside solely among the wives and daughters of royal houses, and it has been a new development of modern social life that the same ability was found to exist among the women of the middle classes. Where office is not hereditary but elective, we may even expect to find the standard of capability higher among women than men, inasmuch as more is demanded of a woman before she will be chosen to fill a post which generally falls to the share of a man. Sir Erskine May declared that not only were the liberties of England to be ascribed above all things to her free local institutions, but that in the school of these local duties citizens have acquired the capacity for wider fields of action. Whether the public offices now filled by women be looked upon as the schools in which they may fit themselves for more onerous duties, or as final in themselves, it is certain that women are each year taking an increased share of public work, and that it would be to the advantage of the nation at large, as well as to themselves individually, that this share should be further enlarged.

The public offices now undertaken occasionally by women, below the rank of queens, are churchwardens, overseers of the poor, registrars, members of the Metropolitan Asylums Board, of School Boards, and of Poor Law Boards. It is with the latter that we have to deal, for it is on these Boards, even more than on the School Boards, that the large reserve force which the nation possesses in women is increasingly required. The

British nation has hitherto unconsciously acted like the swift runner Lightfoot in the fairy story, who tied his feet together because he was afraid of running too fast: it disabled itself by shutting out one-half of its intellectual forces from taking any share in the national work, and it is only now partially recognizing its error. The result of the absence of women from poor law work was, first, that the office had fallen too frequently into incompetent and even dishonest hands. The majority of educated men were too busy to undertake effectively the large mass of unpaid and rather repulsive work involved in our poor law system. If from time to time they did undertake it, much of the wearisome detail had to be passed over to interested officials: the whole history of Bumbledom is evidence of this fact. The post of Poor Law Guardian has naturally not been sought out by cultivated or gentlemanly men, and it too frequently lapsed into the hands of the uneducated and self-interested men who were neither very careful of the well-being of the paupers under their charge, nor very scrupulous about wasteful administration of the public money. In some cases the guardians have authorized out-door relief to persons renting lodgings from them (in other words they collected their own rents from the parish rates); and the kinder-hearted among them were freely lavish towards the paupers, while forgetting to be just towards the ratepayers. The work to be done was on an enormous scale; there are 627 unions in England and Wales, comprising 14,916 poor-law parishes. If therefore we want a large fresh body of intelligent workers, persons of education and refinement, who will bring knowledge and good sense to the task, with sufficient leisure to give a large portion of time towards mastering and supervising details, and with the kindness of heart necessary not to be rebuffed by the weariness or distastefulness of the work, we can only find them by enlisting an increasing body of cultivated and intelligent women on these Boards.

Moreover, the work is specially fitted for women; for it is only domestic economy on a large scale. Accustomed to regulate her own house, a lady has had precisely the training necessary to fit her for a Poor Law Guardian; she has had the management of children, and looked after their health, their clothing, and education; she has ordered in the household supplies, and is accustomed to examine into their prices and quality; she has supervised her servants and allotted to them their employments; and, finally, she knows something of the requirements of a sick room. Enlarge a household and it becomes a workhouse; multiply the servants by tens and the children by hundreds, and you have a workhouse school; increase the sick room, and it becomes an infirmary; so that every woman who has managed her own

household with wisdom and economy possesses the qualities chiefly necessary in a guardian of the poor.

It is about ten years ago since women were first elected on the Poor Law Boards. In one or two instances previously ladies had been nominated; and the Baroness Burdett Coutts was once elected, but declined to serve. In 1875, one lady, Miss Merington, was elected in Kensington, and the following year another, Miss Collett, in St. Pancras. In 1877 there were three lady guardians in London, and one or two in the country. Still, public attention was not turned in this direction till about four years ago, when a small society was commenced in London with the object of promoting the return of qualified women as Poor Law Guardians. A similar society was established in Bristol about the same time, and this has been followed by others in Birmingham, Edinburgh, Brighton, and one or two other towns. The work of these various associations has been to spread information among women about the duties of Poor Law Guardians, and assist, when necessary, ladies to offer themselves as candidates.

The movement, though not rapid in its growth, has been steady and satisfactory. Last year forty-four ladies were officiating as Poor Law Guardians, fourteen of these being in London, five in Birmingham, four in Bristol and eight in Edinburgh. Generally speaking, there has been at first opposition, and dislike of their election, but they have overcome it, and it quickly subsides. In one parish the guardians issued a manifesto condemnatory of the conduct of another parish which had elected women, but before a year was over a couple of gentlemen on this very board had retired in order that their places might be filled by ladies. In another large town the chairman and two other guardians had declared they would throw down their office if a woman were elected; but it seems almost needless to say that they are working together very amicably now.

The special duties that fall to the share of lady guardians have been matters for much inquiry and comment. Although there is no part of the duties of a guardian in which the co-operation of women may not be useful, there are certain departments of work which naturally fall almost exclusively into their hands. These special subjects are the supervision of the women and the grown-up girls; inspection of the schools and arrangements for the placing out of the girls; the care of the infirmary, comforts for the sick and selection of nurses; the regulation of the internal economy of the workhouses, the food and clothing of the inmates, and the control of the officials and servants. On matters like these, any preconceived theory about special feminine instincts and feminine capacity would have

prophesied that a woman could render valuable assistance; and, as a matter of fact, experience has for once proved theory to be right.

A few months ago one of the members of the London Society addressed a circular to the ladies on the various boards of guardians, asking for information about the special work they were called upon to perform, and the degree of cordiality which existed between them and their fellow-guardians. On the latter point, as we have already said, the answers were unanimously favourable. On the former, a few extracts from the letters will serve to show the kind of work which the ladies are mainly doing. One lady writes that her work is

The selection of nurses and female servants in the Infirmary, ascertaining that they are properly cared for, overlooking the matron, and the working of the Institution generally; assisting in procuring work of various kinds for those applying for relief; putting parents in communication with the Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young Servants, which looks specially after the Poor Law girls, placing them in situations, providing them with clothing to be repaid out of their earnings; placing those who have not sufficiently recovered their health from the Infirmary in convalescent and other Homes, and the vicious in reformatories or training homes; communicating with district visitors in cases where the Poor Law cannot give further or adequate relief; helping to administer or rather advise on the outdoor relief, more especially in the cases of women and children, as one lady is assigned to each Relief Committee; sifting any complaints as to treatment, food, &c.; looking into the details of management, cooking, quality and price of food, and the various articles supplied.

There would seem to be employment for half a dozen ladies here, but this is not all that is done. Another lady writes:—

Just at the time when my co-lady guardian and myself came on the Board, the question was [pressing of having further accommodation for our workhouse children, who were too crowded in our workhouse schools. We have both of us, therefore, devoted ourselves to the study of the comparative merits of Cottage Homes, Boarding Out, Emigration, Certified Industrial Homes, &c. &c., and have also had to convert the other members of the Board to our own preference for Cottage Homes; this has, of course, all taken time.

If I had strength [says another lady] much might be done as a member of the House and Visiting Committee, both among the hospital patients and the children, especially those going to service.

If pauperism is ever to be eradicated or even permanently diminished, it can only be done through giving a healthier education to the children. No one who reads the report which Mrs. Nassau Senior, when Assistant Inspector of Work-

houses, prepared upon the deadening and machine-like influences exerted by the great workhouse schools, where seven or eight hundred children are massed together, can fail to see that the human plant, like the vegetable, requires space and air in order to grow up sturdily, and that although the drill and organization attendant on large numbers may be sometimes necessary for adults, they form the worst possible education for children, who, at a much earlier age than the children of the well-to-do classes, are forced into situations of responsibility and self-dependence. The children who have been drilled and lessoned, and fed and clothed, all as it were by machinery, without any thought or volition of their own, in these huge schools, became all at once little nursery-maids, who are responsible for the safety of little mites, smaller than themselves, or the hard-worked maid-of-all-work who has to think of a hundred things at once. How necessary, therefore, is the establishment of cottage homes, such as those belonging to the Kensington Union, and one or two other favoured parishes, and how all-important the advice and sympathy of some educated woman to inquire into the capacity of each child, the situations they are about to occupy, and to give them some good counsel afterwards. The Association for Befriending Young Servants and the Girls' Friendly Society have done a great work in this respect, and accordingly we find that the efforts of many of the lady guardians have been directed towards establishing a branch in connection with their parish.

"I have started the Girls' Friendly Society on a proper footing in our schools," writes one lady. Another says, "I attend to getting the girls and young women into places of service, and the boys also whenever opportunity offers." A third says, "When I find intelligent girls in the workhouse, my aim is to remove them as quickly as possible into respectable service before they can be tainted by any evil associations." A fourth adds, in describing her duties, "The schools interest me most, especially the endeavour to know something of the girls before going to service, and a general interest in their lessons and amusements." And a fifth tells how the other guardians beg of herself and her lady colleague to call at the homes of the children who are boarded-out, which lie quite away from their district, because the "little children want a lady to look after them." It is manifest that the assistance of women, so far from being rejected, will be warmly welcomed in this momentous task of looking after children, which forms so large a part of the work of every board of guardians.

But there is another section of the work that more especially is fitting for women only to undertake—*viz.*, helping the grown-

up girls and women who have drifted into the workhouse from no serious fault, back into respectable and independent modes of life. They are often, poor things, idle and unsatisfactory enough, yet much may be done by the kind and timely counsel of a cultivated thoughtful woman. A large number of applications for admission into the workhouse or infirmary are unsuited to be brought at all before the general Board, and the sufferings thus entailed upon the poor applicant, perhaps already driven to despair, of having her case discussed and criticized with none of her own sex to stand by her, have been and are most painful to think of.*

One lady who has been guardian for several years said that at first she was indifferent to her election, not seeing the necessity of it, but that in the course of her inquiries she heard so much of the mental suffering that respectable and honest women had endured in making their application for, it might be only temporary, relief before Boards composed only of men, that she became convinced the presence of one or more lady on public boards of this kind was a duty that women owed to humanity and decency. At present on any Board where there are two or more ladies as members, they form a committee apart, and these cases are brought before them only. Even when there is only one lady on the Board of Guardians she is often separately consulted. "There are," writes one lady, "many things which come before the Board that are not pleasant to hear; but I have always heard them treated so quietly and considerately as to make the unpleasantness as small as it could be." Another adds, "Of course much of the work is from the nature of it very painful, but I do not see that is necessarily a drawback to a woman undertaking it, though it adds to the difficulty of finding women willing to do so." Several lady guardians write that they have found employment for many women who have drifted into the workhouse from no serious fault; in one case she has formed a small committee to help the inmates to earn a separate living; and assist especially young girls who are anxious to begin a steady and honest life; and in another Metropolitan parish where there were three ladies, they worked so successfully in this way among

* One good story is told of a lady guardian who, passing in review a regiment of children, to all appearance nicely shod and stockinged, had the shrewdness to order them to take off their boots, when it turned out that the respectable-looking stockings were all without feet. On another occasion a Board, on which there was no lady, spent the whole morning disputing whether the needlewoman should make the cotton dresses of the women paupers with hooks and eyes, or buttons and button-holes. Eventually the party for economy carried it against the button-holes, which would have cost a half-penny more for each, and when the weighty question was thus decided, it was discovered, too late, that the workwoman had already taken her own way.

the women, finding them employment by which they could support themselves respectably, or inducing them to return to their friends, that there were fewer able-bodied women than able-bodied men in the adult wards, a condition of things before unknown.

Secondary in importance, but nevertheless very necessary, is the supervision of officials and servants, and as the majority of these are women, every gentleman on the Board is quick to feel the relief and satisfaction of giving over their management to his lady colleagues. Women, from their home training and habits, are always better able to check waste and lavishness in domestic expenditure than men are; and many savings in outlay, combined with greater comfort for the inmates, are traceable to the domestic experience and conscientious attention to details of women guardians. The matron, if honest and disposed to do her best, finds much satisfaction in having one of her own sex on the Board for consultation and suggestion; and if, as will occasionally happen, she be dishonest or idle, she can only be advantageously checked by a woman who is accustomed to housekeeping. The servants also of a public institution are inclined to wastefulness. Public money is apt to be considered everybody's money, and the same official who would be careful and scrupulous to economize a private employer's money, will be lavish in expenditure when only an indefinite body of ratepayers, or their representatives, an easily hoodwinked board of gentlemen, are in question. In one or two cases the matron has looked shyly or suspiciously on newly-elected women guardians, fearing that her prerogatives might be roughly interfered with; but a little tact, and an earnest wish to comprehend the working of the system, has always conciliated opposition. In fact the ladies have displayed considerable wisdom in waiting till they thoroughly understood the difficulties in the way of a reform before attempting to introduce it. "We were careful," says one, "at first not to speak or give an opinion, so that really they (the other guardians) were quite annoyed at our silence." Sometimes, however, the presence of women on the Board has been a protection instead of a check to the female officials. We remember one instance when a nurse was about to be dismissed from her post for an error in conduct, for which another official, a man, was equally to blame; but his share of the offence would have been passed over but for the courageous representation of the lady guardian that equal justice should be meted to both.

The efficient nursing of the sick, too, is a point which has attracted the attention of most lady guardians. In most of the replies from which we have already quoted there is mentioned the importance of substituting trained for pauper nurses, and

several ladies have, even during a short term of office, accomplished the change. Better classification in the wards has also been effected by one lady, and additional comforts provided for the extremely aged inmates have been attended to by some.

Experience shows that the gentlemen on the Board are prompt to recognize the aid given by quiet practical women, and there is no lack of readiness to provide the ladies with plenty of work. As an instance we will quote the Edinburgh Boards: On the City Parochial Board there are two ladies, and both have been placed on the House, the Medical Relief, the Relieving, and the Clothing Committees; on St. Cuthbert's Parochial Board there are six ladies, and all six have been placed on the Relieving Committee, two on Finance, four on House, three on House Accounts, three on Clothing, two on Shoe, and four on the Medical Committees. In another letter of the series already referred to, the writer says that the architect altered all his plans for the new school-building to suit her wishes, making the new schools and home for children at a distance from the House. Another collateral advantage which may be expected to arise when women are more frequently elected to these Boards is that it will check the tendency, now increasing, of carrying on these local elections (as unfortunately municipal elections are generally carried on) on party lines instead of individual fitness. There is some hope that women, who have been so long neglected by all parties alike, will introduce a more conscientious element into public life, and while comparatively indifferent if the public servants be Whig, Tory or Radical, will insist on their being honest and competent to fulfil their duties.

As the need is so great for a larger number of competent women as Poor Law Guardians, and as the duties of the office are so well calculated to arouse their sympathies and awake their interest, we have now to inquire "Why do not a greater number of ladies undertake the work?" Some of the obstacles which have hitherto tended largely to prevent women from coming forward are removable by time and experience; others require legislative alterations. The novelty of the employment, the publicity of the election, the real wearisomeness of the work, and the exaggerated unpleasantnesses have all caused women to shrink from offering themselves as candidates. The ladies already engaged in visiting among the poor or in relief committees are hard worked as it is, and do not yet realize how much more effective their work would be if they occupied the responsible position of guardians. They also hesitate, doubting if they have business training enough, whereas the fact is that their own home training is, as we have tried to show, the best preparation possible; others are afraid they could not give time enough; or

would undertake it provided a second woman could be found as their colleague. The frequency of the elections is another drawback, though a few unions may be found where the guardians are elected for three years. By degrees these objections will die away, as the really-pressing need for a larger measure of womanly influence becomes known, and women feel impelled to take up public charity as a duty. But the legislative restrictions are twofold. In some places they are absolute, as in Ireland, for instance, where, by the Poor Law of 1838, neither women or clergymen are eligible as Poor Law Guardians. There is some hope that this absurd restriction may cease to be law within "measurable distance." But there is another restriction which, while apparently acting impartially towards men and women, practically excludes the latter, or at least that portion of the latter most likely to have time at their disposal to discharge the office faithfully. This restriction is the qualification which compels all persons desirous of being guardians to be qualified householders, whose names are on the rate-book. The rating is in some unions as high as £10, in others it as low as £25. It is obvious that this restricts, almost to exclusion, the number of ladies who can be elected. Not only is the actual number of women householders only about one-sixth in proportion to the men householders, but the women who are householders are not as a rule those with most time to spare for the work. They have business of their own or families depending upon their care and exertions. The plea for retaining the qualification is that the duty of the guardians is primarily spending the public money, and therefore they should bear themselves a stake in the public interest as ratepayers. The same reasoning, however, might apply to members of School Boards, who equally lay out the money derived from a public rate, or members of parliament who vote on the distribution of the taxes; yet to neither of these offices is any property qualification attached. It is obvious that in the most crowded portions of our cities—in the East End of London for instance—few ladies of leisure are residing as ratepayers, though many would gladly go and do the needful work on the Boards if this qualification were removed.

Nevertheless the movement does progress, though slowly; this year there are more women guardians than last year; next election there will be still more. The care of the poor has always been women's work; in ragged schools, reformatories, hospitals, village homes, asylums of all kinds, women have not waited till Acts of Parliament made their path easy, but have pressed forward, making mistakes sometimes, but rectifying them again, with unshaken courage and unflinching zeal. They have known in its practical details the whole subject of pauperism; now they

have to grasp its theory and master its causes; they have to work, not singly, but in organization as suits the more complex conditions of modern life; but that they will so work, and that so far from slackening their efforts they will continue them till this branch of the public service gets to be looked on as more especially their province, we have faith to believe will be the case in future.

ART. V.—PETRARCH.

1. *Pétrarque, Étude d'après de Nouveaux Documents.* Par ALFRED MÉZIERES. 8vo. Paris. 1867.
2. *Francisci Petrarchae Epistolae de Rebus Familiaribus et Varias.* 8vo. Florentiae. 1859-63.
3. *Francisci Petrarchae Testamentum* A.D. 1370.
4. *Epistola ad Posterios Francisci Petrarchae.* Fol. Basiliae. 1581.

IT might be interesting in more than one point of view to inquire how much of the celebrity of Petrarch in the eyes of "Posterity" is due to the circumstance of his still unexplained relation to that "Madonna Laura" who absorbs so prominent a place in his Sonnets and Canzone. That this connection served, even in his own day, to enhance the interest and curiosity of the literary world regarding his personality, is not to be doubted. It set his early biographers to work immediately after his death to make discoveries, and time does not seem to abate the confidence of modern inquirers when they get on this favourite ground. Accordingly, with each new generation, the old stock of facts is once more thrown into the crucible in the hope that another effort may solve the mystery which envelops the lady, whose place during the last four hundred years in the conception of various critics has fluctuated between the mere "Iris in the air" of Voltaire, and as the sharer in Petrarch's "*giovenil errore*" of the more sanguine commentators, who, to use the phrase of the gentle Spenser, do not hesitate to affirm that she "loved with equal crime."

Now, the truth is, since the Abbé de Sade wrote his charming memoirs, some one hundred and twenty years ago, no additional facts have come to light, and the commentators on this debatable subject have been compelled to fall back upon the internal evidence which lies in his works for further elucidation. Ingenuity and erudition, however, have, in the interval, out of these

sources borne good fruits, and we may now be said to have arrived at that stage where probabilities may fairly be accepted as truths. Still, as the subject is one which leaves so much open to conclusions not easy to refute, we fancy that, independent of all consideration of the great interest attached to the history of the times, it will always be a favourite one with those who delight to concern themselves with the examination of insoluble problems. Take away, however, the sensational incident which gives so much zest to the curious, and the subject is one of the most attractive: for it is not merely as the lover of Laura and the mystery which surrounds her existence, that an interest attaches to the name of Petrarch. He has other and far more serious claims to the consideration of posterity—as one of the leading restorers of classical learning in Europe, as a great improver of his own language, as a poet without a rival in his peculiar vein, as an able diplomatist in the service of princes, and as an ardent patriot who may in a measure be said to have anticipated, five centuries before the event, the idea of the national unity of Italy under a single sovereign. Such a combination of incidents is rare in the life of a single man, and few are found capable of making their mark in spheres so different: yet Petrarch may be said to have been pre-eminent in all the walks we have indicated. Indeed it would be difficult to say whether the love passion which absorbed his best years was more irrepressible than his patriotism and devotion to literature. He likewise afforded, as regards his personality, some points of more than ordinary interest. He was not only a singularly handsome man, of fine presence and courtly manners, but of a nature peculiarly frank; gifted, moreover, with a capacity almost Horatian in its nicety of discrimination of men and things, to say nothing of a chivalrous devotion to friendship, which in these days we contemplate with a sort of wonder and delight.

Regarded in his purely mental aspect Petrarch deserves to be ranked as a remarkable man and as the most versatile writer of his time. He possesses much greater variety in this respect than Dante, for he shines in many walks, passing with ease from the sonnet to the philosophic treatise, or from the familiar letter to the epistle in Latin verse. As far as his writings reveal—and no one was ever more frank in his confessions—he appears to us as a man of sedate, but by no means happy temperament, capable of mingling in the agitations and distractions around him without any violent partisanship, and indulging in no enmities except against those he deemed the oppressors of his country. Compared with Dante his was a singularly calm and fortunate career. He was not destined to suffer for his political opinions, and to make his wrongs the justification of a noble outpouring of vengeance.

Petrarch seems to have possessed in the fine balance of his nature a sort of counterpoise against adversity. Moreover, he was peculiarly fortunate in his patrons; and it is mainly to the advantages he enjoyed in this respect that we owe most of those interesting letters which reveal so vividly not only his own thoughts and feelings, but unfold to us, as in a mirror, the history of his times. And those times were changeful and stirring ones for Italy, as they mark the culminating point in the political and civic distractions of the country, and the first abortive struggle for national unity and freedom. They mark also a critical period in the history of the Church, which was on the verge of losing that monopoly of power exercised from her central position at Rome, where she had so long dominated. They mark also the literary birth of the modern language, and the renaissance of art and letters which from this date commence to make rapid progress. Italy was still, as heretofore, the tempting soil whither the great rival potentates beyond the Alps came, if not to decide their quarrels, at least to make their most brilliant display. It is also the period when the Middle Age civilization outside of Italy shows visible signs of breaking up, though its sway is still unquestioned in opinion. Chivalry and Catholicity were then the two standards round which all men gathered, though feudal custom prevented the reign of courtesy extending beyond the charmed circle of the privileged orders, and the Church absorbed, in favour of her own hierarchy, almost all the benefits of the sacred institution. War, tempered by religion, was the recognized business of life: but as far as Italy was concerned, war was often a mere formal parade of arms which decided the issue without bloodshed, and the sudden presence of a great potentate from the other side of the Alps at the head of his host was frequently sufficient to strike terror into the rival factions and bring about a compromise.

There can be no greater error, however, than to assume, as so many of the Italian writers have done, down even to the time of Sismondi, that everything on the other side of the Alps was rude and barbaric. On the contrary, there was much material comfort observable in the middle and inferior orders, and a marked refinement in the manners of kings and nobles, many of whom gave great encouragement to the arts, and made poetry and music their study and delight. The Troubadour age had expired, but not without leaving traces of culture in the tastes and manners of the people, and a formal spirit of courtesy still held sway, even in countries which might be supposed to be beyond the pale of such influences: We have only to read Chaucer's "Flower and Leaf," to be assured of the polish and elegance which reigned in higher association, and his account of

the journey to Canterbury, to recognize both the freedom of manners and the good breeding which prevailed in general intercourse, when the Knight and the Prioress, the Justice and the Reeve could sit down at the same board and join in a common pilgrimage. It would be far nearer the truth to say that the social relations outside Italy were simple and honest, and that all within it (if we are to take the testimony of Dante), from the defrauding steward, the merciless usurer, the treacherous relative and the ready assassin, to the unscrupulous prince and the intriguing pope, was marked by faithlessness, rapacity and mutual distrust, where fortune had the most slippery foundation, where authority was powerless and rights were perpetually questioned. Contrasted with what we see in distracted Italy, the aspect of feudal life in other parts of Europe is not unpleasing; and as we view it in the records of the time, we should almost be content to let it speed on for a few more centuries without a protest. It is a calm and somewhat sleepy existence, it is true, as compared with that of civic life in Italy; but nowhere is it without mark and attraction, and we see little suffering abroad, except where there is the actual shock of arms. Such, however, was not the case in urban Italy, and more especially in Florence, which, although it claimed to be the centre of all that concerned the nobler aspects of human intelligence and culture, made a perpetual abuse of the forms of antique freedom it had inherited. When Petrarch first saw the light at Arezzo, though the struggles between the nobles and the plebeians had passed away, the spirit of individual faction raged fiercer than ever, and it is to the existence of these factions that Petrarch owes his destiny; for the exile of his father, Petracco, the notary, which caused him to be a wanderer, removed the son from this scene of civic strife, and preserved him for nobler purposes. Banishment was too often the reward in Florence of pure and disinterested patriotism, and its consequences extended sometimes to the second and third generation, the citizens excluding the victim of their hate from the spot which perhaps he loved the most of any upon earth. So, even when Petracco was no more, and the gifted son, in full possession of all his fame, knocked at the door for admission, his prayer was refused, and the decree of banishment remained unreversed.

He who desires to make a study of the works of Petrarch—we mean his Letters and Epistles in Latin verse, as well as his Sonnets and Canzone—in which love is the principal, but by no means the only theme—should first make himself acquainted with the general history of the times; for Petrarch makes so many references to things beyond the Peninsula, that without some such knowledge the point of his observations may often escape notice.

But with some enlightenment, drawn from exterior and parallel sources of reference, the information to be derived from the Petrarchian source will be found to possess a double value, and may even serve to explain subjects which have given rise to much literary controversy. For ourselves, we own to having made some rather unexpected discoveries, even in connection with English literature. That geographical abnormality, which has so long troubled the Shakesperian commentators, as to Bohemia being described in one of the plays as "a desert country near the sea," may possibly find some justification in the fact that the Kings of Bohemia, one of whom was Petrarch's correspondent, laid claim to many parts of Italy, and frequently took up their residence there; so that in the old legends and chronicles, the individual, as in other countries, became confounded with his territorial possessions. So likewise, if Shakespeare, in "The Two Gentlemen of Verona," makes his characters travel by water in the heart of Italy, and talk of being "shipped" and "posting after with the oars," and "loosing the flood and their voyage," for which Dr. Johnson took him to task, it is simply because they travelled by river and canal, just as Petrarch himself was in the habit of doing when he went from Avignon to various parts of Italy on special missions. All these journeys he describes with the greatest minuteness in his letters, which are full of amusing incidents and pleasant digressions, always captivating us by their confidential charm. His frankness here is perhaps the most remarkable trait in his character, whether he describes his fall from his horse, and the swelling in his leg, which he bore with such fortitude, or gives us a graphic account of the fearful earthquake and volcanic eruption which desolated the shores of Baiæ and the Phlegræan Fields. Sometimes he turns aside to indulge in an interesting digression on the subject of family history, suggested by his visit to a particular locality. All this he generally does in the most painstaking and punctilious way, and apparently with an eye to posterity. Except on one or two rare occasions, the calm and equable balance of his mind is always apparent; and, indeed, the same characteristics are observable in all his writings, whether in the "Epistle to Posterity," or in the inscription in the fly-leaf of the works of Virgil, where he records in touching and solemn words, the errors of his passion and the provocations of beauty, which had proved too powerful for mortal man to resist.

We have often asked ourselves—invoking the most sceptical disposition of mind as our protectress—why should so many things have been invented regarding this particular man, and which have stood on record now for the space of nearly five hundred years, if they have no substantial foundation? Why

did not Dante and other literary characters equally celebrated in their day, provoke a similar spirit of invention, if the conclusions be really false? Who is the clever manipulator who has been able to imitate the poet's style so adroitly that we cannot distinguish the false from the true? What could be the motive for such falsification? Nay, whose is the literary hand that—writing almost contemporaneously—delights to create embarrassment for the critics of after time? Since we cannot find a satisfactory solution of these questions, we are forced to conclude that there is, on the whole, substantial truth in these various accounts, and that we might just as well doubt the existence of his tomb, which still stands

“in Arqua where he died:
The mountain village where his latter days
Went down the vale of years.”

as to dispute the main and most interesting facts recorded by his early biographers. In truth, the more we study the leading incidents of Petrarch's life, and the more familiar we become with the history of the times, the more shall we be inclined to accept the original view, first propounded by Velutello,* and finally crowned by the Abbé de Sade. If there were much real unsoundness in the facts they could hardly have so long stood the test of time. But when our conclusions tend to become more fixed on better acquaintance, though we may at first have shaken our heads in doubt, we may fairly conclude that our faith is on the right track; though we admit that habit is a powerful persuader, and that prejudice often becomes confirmed by the simple contemplation of it. But take a modern case for illustration: Is it not possible that some sceptical inquirer in after time, on reading the monody of “Childe Harold,” and marking the frequent allusions made by the poet to his own wrongs and sufferings, may not call the whole in question as something exceptional, and even affirm (as Lord Macaulay has done in one of his reviews) that egotism and affectation dictated these outpourings, and that Lord Byron imposed on the credulity of the public? Now, we know, on the contrary, that this was not the case, and that the poet, instead of exaggerating, has perhaps rather suppressed the worst that might have been said against himself and others. So, taking up the Sonnets and Canzone of Petrarch, and reading in almost every page the ever-recurring, but still obscure, allusion to a devouring and unsatisfied passion, we might affirm, just as gratuitously as Voltaire has done, that Laura was a mere lay-figure, simply because we are unable to rise to the

* Velutello, however, differs from the Abbé as to the maiden name of Laura and the place of her birth.

height of the sentiment and feeling of the poet. At the same time, as we have observed, caution and discrimination are necessary on this ground ; and in the course of this article we hope to show that it is very possible the early biographers, who are our chief authorities, may have been too eager to accept every *on dit* regarding Petrarch, and to admit as evidence the testimony of certain prose writings imputed to him which possibly may not be quite authentic ; for Petrarch's name was a famous one in his own day, and naturally attracted much comment after his death.

Many of the biographers have been disposed to condemn the harshness of Petrarch's father as regards the education of his son and the choice of a profession. Petracco was himself a notary, and may probably have been ambitious of placing his son higher in the world. The profession of the law in Italy, next to that of the Church, at this period, gave perhaps the finest opening to talent. The law, indeed, seems to have been regarded by Italian parents in all ages as the natural sphere of action for sons of intellectual promise. It was also the fate of Tasso, as well as Petrarch, to try the patience of his father, and to express his disgust for the study of the law. Petracco, indeed, seems to have had in his disposition a good deal of that flinty character which Dante imputed to the Florentines generally, who, in his opinion, derived their indigenious grittiness from the rocks of Fiesole.* But to our mind it was this very discipline of Petracco which made him the practical man of business he afterwards became—fit to enter on important missions of diplomacy, and take so active a part in most of the leading questions in which Italy was concerned. Petrarch was accordingly sent to Bologna, in the first instance, to study law, and afterwards to Montpellier. At the latter school he remained seven years ; but in after time he does not fail to record his regrets at the restraints he endured, though he renders justice to the scholarship of the juriconsults of the locality. He complains of his lot in rather disparaging terms—"Septennium totum perdidii," are the words he uses when speaking of his literary experiences here, and he prefers rather to recall the pleasant walks he had on fête days in the environs, among the fields and vineyards, where he listened with delight to the chanting of the maidens who met him on his way back to town. In truth, it is to be feared that Petrarch from his boyhood was always somewhat of a dreamer, and rather inclined to wander in search of the beautiful wherever it was to be found. These excursions and the perusal of the Classics seem to have divided his time, not, however, to the satis-

* See "Inferno," xv. p. 62.

faction of Petracco, who, finding him one day with a copy of Cicero's works in his hand, snatched it from him and threw it in the fire. The foundation, however, of this early taste for the Classics, which never abandoned Petrarch to the close of his life, was probably laid by the notary himself; for Petracco was a man of literary taste and a great admirer of Cicero himself, being accustomed to read him aloud for the benefit of the family circle. Petrarch declares that even when he was so young as not to be able to comprehend the meaning of a single word, the fine periods of the Roman orator coming from the lips of his father sounded like music in his ear, and made him despise ever after all other Latin as rough and dissonant. At Avignon, however, he was well grounded in the classics by his old Tuscan schoolmaster, Conventole, who had probably found his way thither among the crowd of Italians who went to push their fortunes at the Court of the Popes. Petrarch, in years long after, pleasantly compares his tutor, after the Horatian manner, to a whetstone—"good to sharpen other things, but unfit to cut." Still, he never forgets his obligations, and his reminiscences on this ground are always pleasant ones.

The emigration of the family to Avignon was an important era in the life of Petrarch. Here the self-exiled Court of the Popes had been for some years established, and at this period it was the great focus of political and ecclesiastical intrigue, and brought together adventurers from all parts of Italy. Petrarch is particularly severe in his denunciation of everything he sees. It is difficult at this distance of time to say whether it is against the city, or the French nation, or the doings of the Papal Court itself, that he pours out his censure. He describes Avignon as the "Hell of the living, the common sewer of vice, the disgrace and rottenness of the universe; where nothing sincere or sacred is to be found, neither the fear of God nor respect for oaths or religion." In short, it is Babylon itself, and often does he declare that it is time he should depart out of Babylon. But still he remains, and has some strong reasons for doing so. One of these is the patronage of the powerful family of the Colonna, whose seat was at Palestrina, in the neighbourhood of Rome. Two members of this family were ecclesiastics, one Bishop of Lombez, and the other the Cardinal John, both fast friends of Petrarch, and to whom he owed his ecclesiastical appointments, which were in the nature of comfortable sinecures, which he was enabled to hold after receiving the tonsure, without actually entering into orders. To the fortunes of this family he adhered to the last, though during his own life they underwent many vicissitudes. How he became possessed of such powerful patronage does not appear.

It may probably have sprung from a certain identity of literary tastes, or possibly from an ardent desire on the part of both to make Rome the dominant mistress of Italy and of the world in the person of the Pope, speaking *orbi et urbi*, or through some powerful representative who would proclaim the ancient ascendancy of the nationality.* The members of this family were exceedingly numerous, and all of them energetic characters—most of any, the patriarch of the house, Stefano Colonna, of whom Petrarch, in one of his letters, gives a most interesting account, describing him as a veritable Roman of the ancient type, whose very look commanded awe, reminding us of Dante's line :

A guisa di leon quando si posa.

He is probably the "glorioso Colonna" of the Sonnets, and he lives to see the fatal ending of most of his children, and of that favourite grandson, a stripling of sixteen, who, in attempting to force the gates of Rome on horseback during the revolt of Rienzi, was suddenly shut in and massacred by the insurgents. Many such stirring incidents of the time, having reference to Italian history, and which passed under his actual observation, are to be found recorded in Petrarch's letters, with his comments and reflections appended ; in which, however, he always shows a strong leaning to the national, popular side ; for Petrarch was no stickler for sacerdotal sway, or even family exclusiveness, but rather what we might call, an aristocratic republican—that is to say, he wished the nobles and princes of Italy to sink their differences and put themselves at the head of a great national movement for the political regeneration and unity of the whole Peninsula.

But Petrarch did not employ all his time when at Avignon in merely courting the patronage of the powerful, or even in an ardent study of the Classics, however strong his passion may have been in that direction ; nor was it altogether the disgust he took to the doings of the Papal Court which drove him in search of solitude on the banks of the Sorgue. A much more powerful stimulus was at work ; for Petrarch had become very early enamoured of that lady whose personality has been in his page immortally enshrined and handed down to posterity. We conceive it to be utterly impossible that any man could, both in prose and in verse, in Italian and in Latin, go on for the space of twenty years, making the most marked allusions to a particular lady—describing her slightest movements, the motion of

* Petrarch, however, like Dante, had no sympathy with clerical ascendancy, and he inveighs almost as bitterly against the luxury, nepotism and worldliness of the Church.

her eyes and hands, her taste in dress, the serenity of her smile, her looks of reproof, and what is equally important, her frequent reconsideration of those reproofs, without there being a real and substantial foundation for all this. We see Petrarch, in point of fact, wholly absorbed for the best part of his life in one lady, regarding whose attractions both of mind and person he continues to descant unceasingly, and in the same elevated and impassioned strain : though we are forced to admit that his admiration, considered as a mere love-passion, grows sensibly feebler as Laura grows older, and perhaps it may be as Petrarch finds the same change coming over himself. Yet even then his admiration takes something of a purer and holier rapture, and the attractions of sensuous beauty, though never quite forgotten, give place to a sort of ideal worship of the excellence of the mind. We see Petrarch timid at first, and regarding Laura as it were at a distance, gradually become bolder and more confident in his advances ; and it would appear—if not from the Sonnets, at least from his confessions written in Latin—that she not only ultimately relents, but almost makes advances to him. Now, the question arises ; if it is only a mere shadow he is pursuing—that creation of the mind which Byron calls, “the bodiless thought,” “the unseen seraph,” “the wish that fevers into false creation”—why all this minuteness—why so much adherence to individuality ? The idea is inconsistent with the supposition of a mere lay figure. The effort would be too great for any mind, however ardent, and the exercise too monotonous to be long sustained : the sufferer assuredly would soon seek out some tangible object, and when he found it, would probably record either his satisfaction or his disappointment. But this Petrarch does not do : he is satisfied with the little he gets ; nay, he is even often enraptured with that little, and when he complains of his sufferings, it is not the lady he reproaches, but rather *himself* and the overpowering impulse that rises within him. The language and sentiment of the Sonnets and Canzone differ from most of the outpourings of baffled love in that they are not so much in the nature of complaints as agitating joys and even consolations. If we are to accept all that the commentators regard as evidence, Petrarch repented more than once at having allowed himself to fall under the empire of that beauty which held him so long in bonds ; and in this repentant spirit he submits himself to a severe and deliberate self-analysis—without, however, pronouncing himself actually guilty. And in examining these meditations—supposing them to be authentic—we sometimes fancy that Petrarch, being an ecclesiastic, was obliged to say something to save appearances, and possibly may have expressed a contrition which did not harrow him quite so much

as he would have the world believe. But in the Sonnets there is no self-condemnation, though there is a perpetual conflict going on between the intensity of joy and the reaction of sadness. Is not the case a peculiar one? Is there not something of an enigma in the relation of the parties? Petrarch, as we have observed, was a man of a temperament at all other times remarkably calm and well-balanced; but in the avowal of love he went beyond all bounds—and that, too, for a lady who, by his own confession at least, never reciprocated the passion in anything like the same sense as that which agitated him. His agony of mind, however, never reaches the high pitch of intensity visible in Eloisa's wail of love unsatisfied. It is much less sensuous, and far more in the nature of homage, mingled, however, with a certain self-regret. Still, he never expresses any want of hope or even a painful sense of deprivation; and if we are to accept the testimony of that treatise in Latin which he calls his "Secretum," it would even appear that by long years of perseverance he finally succeeds to all he desires, and at last makes Laura's acquaintance, and interchanges words of confidence with her, which he is certainly a great way from doing at the outset.

Petrarch, as we have said—actuated by a feeling of repulsion against the Court at Avignon—invariably, on his return from his various missions, retired to his solitude at Vaucluse, on the banks of the Sorgue, a tributary of the Rhone. He was always an ardent lover of romantic scenery, and this was one of the choicest spots in Nature. He delights to speak of its rocks, its prairies, its sparkling fountains, the magical effects of the windings of the river, and the rush of waters. Here in this *Vallis clausa* he sought seclusion with the view, as he confesses, of curing himself of his inveterate passion: but the image of Laura still haunts him, reappearing in the midst of this beautiful solitude more potent than ever. His rapturous exaltation sometimes rises so high that he almost deifies the natural objects which are for him her appropriate surroundings; and here amid fresh waters and under the shade of waving branches, where even the very air has a sacred serenity, his wearied spirit yields to a contemplation of her material excellence. Still the life he leads is an austere one. He tells us that he had no companions, not even a servant. In one of his epistles he says, "My only protector is a peasant, my sole companion a faithful dog; the solitude of this spot has frightened away all others." He describes the peasant and his wife, just as Horace does the denizens of the Sabine farm, but not with such light gaiety; for he has no Lalage to smile, no thoughtless girl bursting into a pleasant laugh in the corner to cheer him up. He is not so depressed, however, as not to be

able to give way to a little pleasantry at times; and never unmindful of his Classics, he confesses himself shocked at the sight of the sunburnt face of the peasant's wife, which is so disfigured by exposure, that he assures one of his friends if Helen had possessed such a face Troy would still have stood. He confesses that he subjected himself here to the severest regimen, eating the same coarse bread as the country people, content with a few figs and grapes, and occasionally a fish drawn from the waters of the Sorgue. But his mind and pen were never more busy, and here, doubtless, many of his Letters and Sonnets were composed. If he could not chase away the image of Laura, his spirit at least became more calm and composed; though at times the anguish of love wells up and torments him, and he fears to revisit the city lest the smouldering passion should be too violently roused by a chance meeting. So, in his imaginary conversations with St. Augustin, he says—or rather makes the Saint remind him—that when he visited Avignon, as he did occasionally, the old memories revive; that he sighs and stops, bursts into tears, and makes his escape back with the confession, “*Agnosco in his locis adhuc latere nescio quas antiqui hostis insidias,*” fearing that the beauty of Laura may ensnare him as before. Even when far away in the forest of the Ardennes his imagination is busily at work, and he fancies he observes her gliding motions, and the firs and beech trees to be “*donne e donzelle,*” who attend by her side. This image, we think, would of itself go far to prove that Laura was a lady of rank and not a person of ordinary station. Thus, wherever Petrarch moves or whatever he indites, the image of Laura perpetually haunts him; nay, even in sleep she appears before him, enters his chamber and “claims him as her slave.”

One circumstance seems to have escaped the commentators, as far as we have observed: it is that Petrarch rarely, or hardly ever, addresses Laura directly in his Sonnets by the word *tu* or *voi*, but generally uses the third person. In short, he speaks of her rather than to her, as if recalling her image or describing her person to a friend. This leads us to ask: For whom, then, were these Sonnets indited? Did they ever go to their address? Was it owing to timidity or caution, or want of confidence in himself, that he refrained from making a direct appeal? Was this form of phraseology used conventionally? Our idea is that it was adopted with a purpose, and that that purpose was to protect himself. Petrarch was an ecclesiastic, though not in orders; and though he might string together love-verses in praise of any object, it would have been highly improper for him, circumstanced as he then was, to have addressed any particular lady personally for the purpose of gaining her affections. It might

have cost him his place had he done so, particularly in the case of a married woman of such high rank as Laura de Sade, of a family so well known in the locality. If Petrarch, however, found it necessary to have some object on which to hang his verse, it seems to us that he chose the most appropriate lady for the purpose—the Chatelaine of Avignon. Now, as long as he observed a certain decorum, there was nothing improper in the selection. Was it not such ladies of rank that the troubadours selected when going their rounds, and were not such deemed the best of all entitled to such honours? It would have been almost ill-bred to have forgotten these traditions, and to have passed over the chief lady of the locality, particularly if she were reputed to be of surpassing beauty. Nor does it weaken this conclusion that Petrarch was sincere in his devotion, and oven touched to the quick by a violent passion, while with the troubadour, feeling was absent and the language was altogether conventional. We must remember also that Petrarch's position as an ecclesiastic debarred him from marriage, and he may have longed for some *confidante* in whose ear he might make a confession of his joys and sorrows. This he might do in a certain fashion by making Laura de Sade the subject of his outpourings, though he looked for no substantial response: but that he loved her—at least as much as one man may love another man's wife by contemplating her at a distance—seems unquestionable. The employment of conventional language does not necessarily exclude the idea of sincerity; though at times we are bound to admit that all seems either more or less forced and artificial. In the early Sonnets he does not even go so far as to apostrophize Laura herself, but merely alludes to the “*dolci sguardi*,” the “*parolette accorte*,” the “*chiomi biondi*,” all of which go to make up the “*dolce inganno ed amoroso froda*.” There is also, beyond doubt, much that is purely sensuous, and sometimes when he commences spiritually, as in the Sonnet beginning

In qual parte del ciel, in quale idea,

he soon subsides again into the sensuous. Petrarch also gives Laura at all times remarkable credit for her prudence and self-possession, and the power she possesses of keeping him within due bounds, sometimes by a look, sometimes by a gentle remonstrance. On one occasion he gets hold of a glove she happens to drop—not designedly, we presume—and he is not content until he has indicted a sonnet to this beautiful glove and the hand it covered:—

Candido legiadretto, e caro quanto
Che copia netto avorio e fresche rose.

One possible advantage we think may result from this minute

commendation of a lady's toilet, as regards its power to subject the spirit of man—that all judicious women in future, seeing the force of this potent agency, will take the hint which Petrarch has given. When we come to ask ourselves, however, if we feel touched by these descriptions—and that we think is the crucial test—we cannot speak affirmatively with confidence. We recognize everywhere finished courtesy, rhetorical enthusiasm, felicitous compliments and unmistakable homage; but we do not feel ourselves stirred as in some of Dante's relations. We are not thrilled by such descriptions as that in which Francesca of Rimini reveals the story of her guilty love, tells of the accursed book that did the mischief, the passing smile and the enraptured kiss. Indeed, the use of this conventional language seems to have excited doubts in the mind of some of Petrarch's friends. When Jacopo Colonna, Bishop of Lombes, taxed him on the subject, Petrarch, in order to justify himself, asks:—

How can you say that I have invented the imaginary name of Laura merely in order that I might have some woman of whom I might speak, and concerning whom people might be disposed to talk of me? Do you suppose that there is no other Laura in my mind than that poetical laurel which my long and indefatigable labour shows that I aspired to obtain? Would to God that what you impute to me by way of pleasantry was only mere invention and not real passion. Take my word for it, no one can long act such a part without great labour. To give one's-self the gratuitous trouble of appearing to be a fool is surely the height of folly; and I may also add, that although when quite well one may affect to be ill, we cannot simulate pallor, and you know both of my paleness and of my distress.*

This sincerity of spirit unquestionably frequently comes to the surface, and seems almost irrepressible. It is always *after* the event, however, and particularly when he is at a distance, that he is most ardent—sometimes giving way in an absent mood to a spirit of transport, sometimes indulging in vain regrets, sometimes confessing to himself as to a priest by way of relief or moral exercise.

But in whatever light we regard this attachment, we are unable to divest ourselves of the conviction that Laura was not a person in the same rank and condition of life as Petrarch himself, but a lady much beyond his social sphere—and what is more to the purpose, when we come to examine the question of identity—the wife of another man. Lord Broughton, in his notes to the fourth canto of "Childe Harold," repudiates the idea of a woman in this station of life, and in the face of the whole world of Avignon, "playing off for one-and-twenty years her little machinery of alternate favours and repulsés upon the first

* "Famil." ii. 9.

poet of the age." But what, we would ask, were the provocations of Tasso, to cure whose passion for a noble lady it was necessary to shut him up and accuse him of madness? Did Alfieri's daring in love meet with no encouragements from high rank? Petrarch had Italian blood in his veins, and his ardour was not to be repressed by long years of discouragement. For our part we do think Laura at times somewhat of a coquette; but a rare and adroit one. Would that we could find a few more of these self-possessed coquettes in La Belle France who could receive courtesies and accept homage to the same extent and play their part so well. Though Laura was proof against all the ill effects of lavish praise and persevering pursuit, we think she was not so uncourteous as to shut her ears and eyes to all that passed. We believe it was her high-born, ladylike qualities which kept her pure, and enabled her to hold Petrarch in her thrall until his passion had subsided and reflection brought him to his senses. Is not this the very course the sex are wont to pursue with those whose character and qualities they admire, but whom they cannot love? We do not know anything of Hugo de Sade to enable us to judge what sort of a husband he was. He does not appear to have been harsh or indifferent, for Laura bore him many children,* and perhaps he was a sensible man and allowed a wife, who had so much reason to be proud of her incomparable beauty, and in whose discretion he had full faith, to show that beauty to the world, and receive the conventional homage of the age. Further, how do we know that Petrarch was her sole admirer, or only one of many? Indeed, the latter seems more probable; for when the King of France visited Avignon in state on one occasion, when Laura was still a girl, the story goes, that being somewhat given to gallantry, he expressed a desire that one possessed of attractions so exceptional should be specially presented to him. The whole mystery of the relation seems solved if we once admit that the lady was of surpassing beauty and surpassing tact, and likewise take into account the age in which she lived and the land of complimentary song where the scene was enacted. What, then, was that age in France? It was only removed by one century from the age of the troubadours, and Petrarch was in his own person only a troubadour; but still with all the earnestness, the ardour and the religious feeling of his nation, and its characteristic tendency in matters of love to constancy to a *single* object, as contrasted with the spirit of pluralism—if we may use the expression—which marks the devotion of the more volatile Frank, who

* This conclusion, however, depends on the interpretation of two Latin words which have caused much embarrassment to the commentators.

passes from flower to flower, and whose pleasure is quite as much to show his own mealy wings as to sip the sweets. The Italian temperament is cast in a different mould, and Petrarch was an Italian of the Italians. He was then in the very heart of the land where nobles, only a very few years before, did not consider themselves demeaned by going about chanting lays of love in praise of beauty. Is it to be supposed that Petrarch was un-influenced by these surroundings and the memory of such traditions, or that he had to search long for an object? He only gave depth and earnestness to a species of amatory effusion, which had been generally current.* Further, we think that, being an ecclesiastic, he sometimes in his fervour used the language of religion, and substituted the worship of Laura for the worship of the Virgin, confounding together beauty, religion and love, just as the great masters of Imitative Art have since done. As to what was the real source of the deification of women which pervaded the period, or whether the sources were one or manifold, we will not undertake to say; but of this we feel assured, that at no period of history, either before or since, was the place of women so exalted in the estimation of men as in this chivalrous age. The incentives to such worship were not to be found in mere physical beauty, though that was by no means overlooked. It was something far higher and nobler, which only faith and imagination could grasp. So, the Provençal Renaissance, of feeble growth, bloomed like a flower and died, leaving almost no sign; and perhaps we should hardly believe that so romantic a condition had ever existed, or consider it only as a light vision floating in the fancy of the poets, if Petrarch, treading in the same walk, but infusing the Italian earnestness and pathos, and the whole force of his own personality, had not left us so graphic and indelible a record of his feelings.

But Petrarch entertaining, as we think, a sincere passion for the Chatelaine of Avignon, was necessitated to use a certain amount of discretion if he meant to remain unchallenged. This fact may partly account for the conventional modes of expression he makes use of, and his absolute concealment of the name of the object. The fiction of the laurel, therefore, may have done good service as a disguise; but in the end, we fancy, the secret came to be pretty well known. The Sonnets, most probably, were at first seen only by his intimate friends. By-and-by, the lady got a hint of what was going on, and by a certain degree of conscious acknowledgment, may have contributed to keep up the

* True, he took the form of the Sonnet from *Cinque di Pistoja*; but the intense personality which he throws into his manner of treatment, and his power of transfiguration as regards the individuality of the object, had no previous example in either language.

flame. She may possibly have admired Petrarch's genius, and even pitied a celibacy to which she could offer no substantial consolation. In truth, we cannot conceive, if he had not, to a certain extent, been flattered and encouraged, that he would have persevered in his course for twenty years. Authors, in those days, moreover, were not indifferent to the smiles and patronage of rank; and just as the Colonna and the Visconti were his male patrons, Laura de Sade may well be considered his lady-patroness—the ideal Madonna of his verse. The question then arises: Was this an irregular or objectionable relation as manners then went? We think not, considering the customs of the time, and the fact that Petrarch was known and recognized as a poet of repute attached to the Papal Court at Avignon. In fact, it is not improbable that he was tolerated and welcomed rather than reproved. No doubt all the Italians about the Court were glad to get a sight of some fresh effusion from his pen where Laura was the subject; for it cannot for a moment be supposed that Petrarch kept his Sonnets merely for his own eye. The idea will not admit of serious consideration. These love sonnets, therefore, as they appeared, were probably circulated about the locality, and if Laura's retainers did not read Italian, they at least heard whispers of what was going on, and communicated it, as a matter of course, to their mistress, who would have been prudish and unwomanly indeed, if she had expressed herself shocked by the admiration of the handsome stranger from the other side of the Alps, who knew how to revive the spirit of the Troubadour days in a manner far more fervent and complimentary than had ever been seen before.

One fact is important to take note of—namely, that the Sonnets, as we now have them in the mass, suffer greatly from the mere circumstance of their all lying together. They are like a vast heap of conserves which were never meant to be swallowed at a single feast. The result is that we are sometimes cloyed, and it may be, even fatigued by the frequent iteration of the same sentiments. But the soft flow of the language and the beauty of the imagery—though this at times, we confess, is somewhat common-place—preserves the charm. Probably, if we only knew it, each of these Sonnets has a special history of its own, and, if we were aware of all the circumstances out of which they arose, we should, no doubt, appreciate them more. That they were written on various occasions, and perhaps quite as much for the ear as for the eye, is apparent from the opening line of the first Sonnet:—

Voi ch' ascoltate in rime sparse il suono.

No doubt they were freely circulated and passed from hand to

hand by those who, finding that Laura had once been started as the theme, were naturally curious to know how it would all end. But as we have said, they are not all love sonnets, and there are also many for whom no owner can now be found. Indeed, the 179th Sonnet, which is one of the finest examples of stately harmony in the language, might fit either man or woman, and, in fact, seems more appropriate to the former, though Laura's name is appended :—

In nobil sangue vita umile e queta,
Ed in alto intelletto un puro core,
Frutto senile in sul giovenil fiore,
E' in aspetto pensoso amina lieta.

But, as years flow on, Petrarch's strain becomes more serious and majestic, and his outpourings after Laura's death, when her clear star appears to him purer than ever, and love's arms are shattered, and can no longer wound him, he rises to his most sincere point of exaltation. Then he laments that the beautiful lady who has died in her chaste bed, will no more appear in the flesh—nay, that even virtue and courtesy are dead; her spirit's image alone remains, "not pale, but as white snow." These "Triumphs of death," we think, constitute a further proof—if further proof were wanting—of the individuality of the lady, as well as of the intensity of the poet's affection. They prove that Laura was no shadow, but a beautiful reality, and with such testimony to her virtues and charms of person as Petrarch gives, we may almost call her "a perfect woman nobly planned."

What, then, is the fair and reasonable conclusion from the circumstances? It is that Petrarch was sincerely and deeply enamoured of the lady he makes the subject of his verse; that he persevered for long years in the indulgence of this passion; that Laura, in the course of time, began to feel a sympathy with his condition, and consented to interchange words with him; and finally, that Petrarch, cured of the passion of his early years, converted it into a sort of beatification of the lady. Why, if these conclusions be probabilities, should we doubt the authenticity of that memorable entry by his own hand in the fly-leaf of his *Virgil*? Was it unnatural that Petrarch, who for twenty years had sung the praises of Laura, should desire to clear up the mystery before his death, and inform the world who the lady really was? If the following confession be a forgery (and we must remember that it is now several hundred years old, and is still preserved in the Ambrosian Library at Milan), it is, indeed, a most successful counterfeit of his style; for if ever Petrarch speaks from the depths of his heart it is here. Let the reader judge for himself :—

Laura, illustrious by her virtues, and for a long time celebrated in my verses, first appeared to my eyes in the early period of manhood, in the year of our Lord 1327, early in the morning on the sixth day of the month of April, in the Church of Sainte Claire at Avignon; and in the same city, and in the same month of April, on the same sixth day at the same hour in the morning (but in the year 1348) her light was withdrawn from this world when I by chance was at Verona—alas! unconscious of my fate. The sad intelligence, however, reached me through the letters of my friend Ludovico in the same year at Parma, on the nineteenth day of the month of May, at nine in the morning. Her chaste and beautiful body was deposited in the Church of the Minor Friars on the day of her death at Vespers,* and her spirit, as Seneca says of Scipio Africanus, as it came from heaven, so I am persuaded it has returned thither. In order to have ever before my eyes the painful memory of this event, it has seemed to me fitting that I should record it in this place as a source both of grief and pleasure; since, in truth, there is now nothing in this life which can please me longer, and the strong link that bound me to earth is broken, I feel that it is time I should renounce Babylon, trusting that by frequent introspection during my remaining hours, I may attain to the full conviction of the vanity of all things; which by the grace of God will not be difficult to me when I reflect earnestly and solemnly on the anxieties of the past, my vanished hopes and the unexpected issue of all my calculations.

As to the affair of the discovery of the medal and parchment sonnet in the leaden casket at Avignon, we think the Abbé de Sade must have been imposed upon, and in his eagerness to accumulate more proofs than were actually required, he adopted the story and gave it too ready credence. But we do not think that the doubts expressed by Lord Woodhouselee as to Laura being a married woman, though supported by so great a name as that of Professor Marsand of Padua, can be upheld on the ground that it was improper on the part of a canon and an archdeacon, as Petrarch was, to pay such devotion to a lady who had a husband living. That Laura was a married woman seems beyond question, for Petrarch always addresses her as "Madonna" in his Sonnets; and in his dialogues in Latin, which we shall shortly notice, he invariably speaks of her as *Mulier* and *fœmina*, and never as *Virgo*. Further, it is to be remembered that there was no culpability on either side, for Petrarch did not gain the lady, as some would have us suppose, but has even left a confession to the contrary; for he states that "no prayer could move her, no flattery persuade, and notwithstanding her age and mine, she preserved her honour and remained firm and unconquerable, in

* She had died of the plague which was then raging all over Southern Europe.

spite of the many circumstances which might have melted a heart of adamant."* In short, Petrarch's homage, which commenced under conditions calculated to inspire the utmost purity of affection was forced to remain pure to the close.

It would be idle to discuss at this day, with any hope of arriving at an absolute and final result, the question of Laura's identity as vouched for by the Abbé de Sade; but we cannot help observing that we should have considered his case much stronger if he could have given us a later date for her contract of marriage with Hugo de Sade. It does appear singular that Petrarch, who went to Avignon as early as 1313, when he was only nine years old, should not have seen Laura until two years after her marriage. Laura, let us remember, was even in very early years celebrated for her beauty, and Petrarch was a great admirer of female beauty. Although occasionally absent at Bologna and Montpellier engaged in his law studies, he was doubtless often back and forward to see his father. Still, having regard to the secluded mode of conventual education then prevalent, it is possible that Laura may not have been much in public until Petrarch first saw her, as he confesses, in the church of the nuns of Sainte Claire. It has also sometimes occurred to us to ask: Why was the Abbé so eager to verify the family documents by submitting them, as he states, to legal scrutiny? The step seems quite unnecessary, unless he fancied that his good faith was likely to be called in question, or that what had been so well preserved for 400 years was in danger of being lost. The step was fortunate; for the papers he quotes as original authentic documents extracted from the archives of the Sade family, were destroyed during the Revolution, and the impulse of the Abbé to associate his family name with a great literary reputation came just in time to save them from oblivion. As we can no longer refer to these originals, we must take his word for it. But why should we dispute the word of the Abbé? Why should we refuse to believe that she, who was the lode-star of Petrarch's life and the inspirer of his Sonnets, was the married lady, Laura de Sade, and not some other still undiscovered Laura, merely because the Abbé is so zealous and intent on proving his case?

On the subject of Petrarch's moral purpose in his relations with Laura, M. Mézières—whose work, by the way, has been crowned by the Académie Française—observes, by way of comment, as follows: "Although chaste love, disengaged from all sensual desires, may not be a sentiment contrary to nature, as the greater part of the world generally think, it is assuredly an exceptional state of the soul; and if almost all the epochs of history

* "De Contemptu Mundi," 3.

offer examples of it, it does not the less remain an accident, and as it were a psychological rarity. So the world is unwilling to believe in it, and only speaks of it habitually by way of derision. The more Petrarch saw of Laura the more he became attached to her. Struck at first with her exterior attractions, he discovered—thanks to his intimate relations—her moral qualities, and loved her the more for it. But the secret remained buried in the depths of his heart—in short, he loved her too much to dare to speak of it.” We think, however, that nothing in the poet’s confessions, whether in prose or verse, will bear out such damaging conclusions as M. Mézierès seems to have arrived at in the following passage :—“ Ce n’était point en effet au amant tiède et réservé qui adressait à sa maîtresse un hommage tranquille. C’était un homme d’un tempérament de feu, d’une complexion amoureuse, très, porté dans sa jeunesse aux plaisirs des sens, comme il nous avoue lui-même, qui se jetait aux pieds d’une femme jeune, désirable, et qui témoignait tout de suite par la vivacité de ses attaques l’impétuosité de ses désirs.”

But Petrarch was likewise at all times actuated by a strong love of literary fame, and aspired to obtain the laurel crown, the acquisition of which implied the claim to hold the leading place as a poet in Italy. Dante seems also to have looked forward to one day obtaining the same honour,* but was not so fortunate in his patronage. Petrarch, regarding this acquisition, records in his punctilious, business-like way, that on the 23rd of August, at nine o’clock in the morning, he received from Rome a letter from the Senate inviting him to be crowned at the Capitol ; and, strange to say, on the very same day a letter reached him from his friend the Chancellor of Nôtre Dame offering him a similar honour in the name of the University of Paris. Petrarch’s patriotism, however, did not allow him to hesitate for a moment, and he accordingly made choice of the Eternal City. We are even disposed to think that he took considerable pains to effect this end, and his talent for negotiation no doubt was here brought to bear. He would hardly have aspired to the laurel crown, however, had he not been fully conscious of his deserts. He was in every sense at that period *vir laudatus a laudatis viris*. His reputation as a poet had not only been established, but he held a distinctive place as one of the restorers of ancient literature, being an enthusiastic collector of ancient manuscripts, of which he appears to have possessed a considerable number. In speaking on the subject of these antiquarian tastes he tells us on one occasion how much he suffered from having lent Cicero’s

* See “Par.” xxv. “Ritornero poeta, ed in sul fronte
Del mio battesimo prendero ‘l capello.”

work "De Gloria" to a needy friend, who sold it in his distress for an insignificant sum; in which regret posterity has ever since shared, not without a faint hope, however, that so interesting a treasure, whose value like a lost joy has possibly been enhanced from the fact of having been once in possession, may yet turn up. It is beyond doubt that one of Petrarch's weaknesses—if it can be considered a weakness—was his ambition of holding a leading place in the opinion of his own countrymen during his own life, and his anxiety on the subject of future fame. No one illustrates in his own character more finely than he does the tendency to nourish, and it may be, to over-estimate, the value of "that last infirmity of noble minds." We cannot, however, go with those who affirm that his sense of superiority and his mastery over the language led him to sneer at Dante's rugged style, or that the latter was jealous of Petrarch's renown and good fortune. Petrarch, while affecting modesty and never vainglorious, is always fully absorbed with his own personality; but his excess of egotism is not unpleasing, and this result is a good test of merit. This consciousness of power attends him in all his literary efforts, and is perhaps most visible in his Latin verse. If he does not here boast like Horace that he can "strike the stars with his lofty head," he seems always to say, *Io anche sono poeta*.

When we come to examine the verse and language of Petrarch and Dante, and compare the Canzone and Sonnets with the "Divina Commedia," we observe a vast difference both in structure and character. One would almost suppose that they were separated by a century or two. Dante is rough, enigmatic and archaic, with an obvious inclination for quaint and obscure forms of expression. He seems to have regarded the *lingua volgare*, then in current use, as capable of being projected into literary composition. Its use certainly lends at times a powerful realism to his descriptions and originality to his sentiments. In Petrarch, on the other hand, the language of common life is entirely absent. Everything is either more or less ornate and polished. The language in his hands is so melodious and flowing that one would almost fancy it could not go much further. If Petrarch by his manipulation carried the Italian language to the highest pitch of luxurious softness, in Dante we see what real force it possesses. But as an innovator in this walk, Petrarch triumphed while Dante failed; and it is just possible that the example of the former may have tended to weaken the language in after time; for modern Italians are far more enamoured with Petrarch's triumphs in ringing the changes of melody than they are with Dante's pith and muscular grasp of the idiom. Even in the hands of old Villani, the historian of Florence and the contemporary of Petrarch, the language possesses a rough masculine

vigour almost wanting in our day. Had the stream, instead of pursuing the gentler and more effeminate direction, taken the Dantesque course, it would probably at this day have been more incisive and vigorous; and, in our opinion, it was Dante's intention that it should take that form of which he had given us so memorable an example. Petrarch and his school, however, triumphed, and in this respect, whether for good or evil, he is to be regarded as exercising a potent and preponderating influence over the language of his country. In Petrarch's descriptions of Nature, there is at times such an excess of the florid as to make us doubt the truth and reality of the description. His pictures, in short, go beyond what we find in Nature. A proof of this may be seen by comparing the celebrated Canzone beginning "Chiare, fresche e dolci acque," with the refreshing picture Ariosto gives us in the "Orlando," where the weary cavalier dismounts from his horse to rest beneath the shade in the heat of the day:—

La fonte discorrea per mezzo un prato
D'arbori antiqui e de bel ombre adorno.

Here all is so vivid and real that we can almost luxuriate in the scene as we read, whereas Petrarch presents to us a dream of enjoyment which we can hardly grasp, so deep is the infusion of his own personality into the description. Yet his verses abound in many lines, which possess all the force and depth of Dante, with a certain elegance wanting in the latter. Thus the opening line of the "Inferno," which strikes so solemn a keynote at the commencement, may be compared with Petrarch's enunciation of the same sentiment, and we think without any disadvantage to the latter:—

Era giunto al loco
Ove scende la vita, ch' al fin cade.*

Petrarch may also be fairly classed among the psychological poets, and as an example of his process of self-analysis we may here quote Chaucer's very close translation of the 102nd sonnet as given in his "Troilus and Cressida":—

If no love is, O God what feel I so?
And if love is, what thing and which is he?
If love be good, from whence cometh my woe?
If it be wicked, a wonder thinketh me,
When every torment and adversity
That cometh of him may to me savery thinke:
For aye thirst I the more that I it drinke.

* Sonnet 47.

One word as to the imputed influence of the writings of Plato on Petrarch's sentiment and moral intent. Nothing can be more absurd and out of character than to attribute to him what is popularly understood by a Platonic influence in matters of love. If there is any trace of the philosophy of the Academy in Petrarch he must have got it at second-hand. It is certainly not visible in his Sonnets, and wherever it appears in his prose works it is probable that he derived it from his perusal of Cicero, or from St. Augustin, who, as we know, borrowed largely from Plato in his "De Civitate Dei."* It was rather from monastic life that Petrarch owed his moralizing and reflective tendency, and the disposition to sound and examine the secrets of his own heart. Though clerical life at this period was remarkable for laxity and a love of epicurean enjoyment, still monasticism had left its traces deeply engraven on the thought and philosophy of the time, and philosophy was perhaps never at a lower ebb than at this period. Realism, into which scale the Church then threw her weight, was in the ascendant, and all that partook of the ideal in speculation was put under a ban. The result was the evolution of a narrow and selfish creed; for the mediæval philosophy, shut up in solitude and celibacy, fed only on itself and the inner emotions. Hence the subjective practice of self-examination which, degenerated into a sort of beatified egotism, instead of assisting speculation, narrowed the bounds of knowledge and the range of human sympathy. To our idea the metaphysics of the cloister was the suicide of pure reason. That many of the Sonnets of Petrarch are strongly tinged with the influence of the self-questioning tendency of which we speak is not to be disputed. Further, nothing can be more out of place than to attribute to him a leaning to Platonic love in the original Greek sense—nay, even the conception of it. The two sentiments are as wide as the poles asunder. The Platonic *ἔρως* was a liberal and cheerful love—the love of the beautiful and the good wherever it was to be found. Beauty, in the acceptation of Plato, has nothing in it sensuous; it was rather the ideal of physical perfection to be seen everywhere in Nature, and to be loved for its excellence: not a passion to be quenched by the contemplation of a single individual, much less of a single woman. Petrarch's conception of love, contrasted with the philosophic, is in truth of the most selfish order. It is simply the admiration of one object—eternal constancy to one lady. Petrarch we grant is far more chivalrous than Plato, but he is also far more sensuous.

* Petrarch, it is true, professes to be a great admirer of Plato, and gives him the supreme place in his "Trionfo della Fama," but his works were virtually sealed books, even for the learned, until a century after.

The one is all ideality, with sympathies as wide as the universe; the other is content with his own self-absorption and its restricted associations. In truth, we may say that Petrarch was as ignorant of the true spirit of Platonism, as Plato was ignorant of the solitary musings of the cloister. Hence, inasmuch as we find a superabundance of psychological analysis in the Sonnets, in that respect they differ *in toto* from the love effusions of antiquity. With both the poets and philosophers of Greece there was always the tendency to worship Nature and to spiritualize material things, but never to make a spiritual worship of carnal things. So, out of the asceticism of the Middle Ages, and perhaps even from the peculiar discipline of the Catholic religion itself, sprang that materialistic tendency of sentiment which abounds in Dante and finds a sort of deification in Petrarch. The solitary position of the monastic recluse, so different from the free and active life of the Greek philosopher, who discoursed among the statues of gods and heroes, and within sight of the wrestlers in the arena and the dealers in the market-place, forced all his thoughts inwardly upon himself until they became either more or less tinged with mysticism and sadness. Can we wonder, then, that Petrarch so often gives way to complaint, and that by way of relief in his more enthusiastic moments he almost deifies the person of Laura—bows as it were before her image, as doubtless he had often bowed before that beautiful Madonna, by Giotto, which he so carefully bequeaths in his will.

When we come to examine the work which goes by the title of "De Contemptu Mundi," which Petrarch called his "Secretum," and which has been the mine from whence so many of the biographers have largely drawn in seeking to clear up the mystery of his relations with Laura, we must frankly own to entertaining some doubts. There is in the style of these dialogues not only a marked difference as compared with his other works, but the tone is languid and "pathological" to excess. The analysis and cross-examination to which he subjects himself perpetually remind us of the questionings of a practised confessor accustomed to put others on their ordeal. On almost all other occasions Petrarch writes with a certain self-conscious sense of elevation, and an erudite importance of manner which are here entirely absent. When a man cannot even pen his last will without betraying his mannerism, we may be sure it would not have been totally absent in a work of such length as the "De Contemptu Mundi." Looking also at the manly tone of the "Epistle to Posterity," which is a serious composition, we have often been inclined to suspect that the "De Contemptu Mundi"—the date of which is conjectured to be 1342—to be the fictive work of some prurient monk and curious admirer of Petrarch, who wa

anxious to relieve posterity of all doubt and embarrassment on the subject of Laura, and to make out a perfect case, not altogether to the credit of the poet. We have often asked ourselves: Why did Petrarch here write so much about himself? Why does he show himself so intensely egotistical? In this passing suspicion we fancy we should have some support from the circumstance that these confessions are not always very pleasant reading, and are sometimes presented *ad nauseam*. At the same time we admit that such a conclusion, except on the legitimate grounds we have stated, would be in a measure altogether against received tradition and the opinion of the biographers. But if the "De Contemptu Mundi" can be shown to be spurious, it may be asked, does not the whole fabric raised by the biographers fall to the ground? We think that such a conclusion by no means follows, but rather that these confessions, by whosever hand they may have been written, bear out the tradition current after his death, and may possibly have been founded upon it. Still, even here, we would prefer to believe rather than to doubt, and would not desire to question too rigorously all those scraps of evidence which that consummate advocate, the Abbé de Sade, pieced so well together, and made out an almost perfect case. We would rather at this date rest on the conviction which led Velutello, more than three hundred years ago, to make a pilgrimage to Avignon to inquire into the local traditions, and visit the tomb where the remains of Laura reposed, and where the memory of her was still green. But in whatever direction we scrutinize, whether into Petrarch's Latin compositions, or take a review of the social characteristics of the age in order to discover new light, all our inquiries tend to confirm the stainless honour and virtue of the lady; and perhaps—what is quite as important—tend to rehabilitate the moral character of the great restorer of letters, to justify him at least as far as Laura de Sade is concerned; for it is not to be forgotten that Petrarch, though an ecclesiastic, was not exempt from the weaknesses of manhood, and, as an evidence of the fact, had, by some unknown lady, two natural children, a son and a daughter, to whom he was much attached. The son encouraged fond hopes at first, and his father took great pains with his education, intending to make him a scholar like himself; but the young man detested books, turned out badly, and gave him a great deal of trouble, dying prematurely of the plague at Milan. His daughter, Francesca, married a young gentleman of Milan, Franciscolo di Brossanno, who seems to have so secured the confidence and regard of Petrarch, as to become the principal heir under his will.

As we have already observed, if we would really understand

the character of Petra^{rch}, and divine the nature of his relations with her who is the subject of his Sonnets, we must study the general history of the times and the manners of the period ; and nowhere is this better unfolded than in his letters and epistles in Latin verse, which are addressed to every variety of persons, from his attached literary friends, whom he playfully styles Socrates and Lælius, to the Emperor of Germany and King Robert of Naples, whose enthusiasm for literature was so great that he told Petra^{rch}, if he had to make a choice, he would prefer to part with his crown rather than with his books. Further, within the last few years, a most interesting discovery has been made of one hundred and sixty-seven additional letters addressed by Petra^{rch} to his friends ("De Rebus Familiaribus"), and edited by Signor Fracassetti, of Florence, with an Italian translation by the same hand ; and no doubt from this source additional light might even now be thrown on some of the debatable incidents of the poet's life. Taken as a whole, the letters of Petra^{rch} may be regarded as by far the most interesting relic of a distinguished man, who mingled largely in the public transactions of the times, and who, moreover, was remarkably frank in his confessions as well as minute and graphic in his descriptions. This descriptive talent is in truth one of Petra^{rch}'s exceptional gifts ; for few succeed better than he does in depicting the scenes through which he passes on his travels, or by enlivening his page by some historical digression or reference to family legend. Unlike Dante, who, when he mentions individuals, contents himself with giving us an obscure hint, Petra^{rch} enters largely into details, and lays open the inner life and actions of the men with whom he comes in contact. These letters were all written obviously with an eye to posterity, and abound in apt classical quotations from Seneca, Ovid, Terence and Horace ; the last of whom he calls by way of distinction, the Satirist. On one occasion, when he was obliged to make the journey to Italy by sea, owing to the passage by land being blocked by the disbanded Condottieri, and when he was nearly wrecked, he comments on his narrow escape from drowning by complacently quoting from Publius Syrus the pithy saying : that, "He who has been twice shipwrecked should never cry out against Neptune."* The letters for the most part are fair examples of the dry concise style of Latinity, which may appear remarkable in one who was so great an admirer of Cicero ; but we suspect that Petra^{rch}'s legal education, under the guidance of Petracco, had much to do with shaping the character of his Latin prose, and may possibly have repressed a little of its exuberance as well as imparted to it that

* "Improbe Neptunum accuset qui iterum naufragium facit."

circumstantial, and almost lawyer-like punctiliousness, which is one of his characteristics. One may be tempted to inquire, why have we these long letters, these minute and careful descriptions and choice quotations? The answer is, that these letters, no more than the Sonnets, were not intended to be hidden under a bushel, but to be freely circulated and read aloud. We cannot quite say whether in the audience-chambers of the magnates of the Middle Ages there was an official letter-reader, just as there was in Heroic times a bard

Who sat, a customary guest, and shared
The banquet, with beethen honours bound;

but assuredly there was good occasion for the existence of such an official; for letters were the great medium for conveying and circulating the news of the day. We can well fancy, therefore, that the arrival of a letter of Petrarch's would create a sensation and soon gather a crowd of curious listeners to hear its contents; and of this circumstance no doubt he was well aware, and shaped his style accordingly, knowing that what he wrote would be subjected to comment and perhaps even severe criticism. Reading aloud also seems at all times to have been a rather favourite occupation in Italy. One of the most beautiful pictures by Guido—the Sewers—represents this subject, and in Boccaccio's day it was the custom for some lady to read aloud, while the others were engaged at their embroidery. Sociability in these days was in a measure *de rigueur*, and for a friend to have repressed a letter, content to devour it in secret, would have been a churlish act. In the case of Petrarch's letters of business and negotiation, they were probably read *vivâ voce* by the secretary, who afterwards indited the response; and nearly the same process was doubtless observed in the case of his letters to intimate friends, which were passed from hand to hand and copies made. It is likewise to be noted that all authors of repute in those days aspired to shine in both the ancient and modern tongues—witness Dante, Petrarch and Chaucer. The crucial period had arrived for the introduction and use of the *lingua volgare* in literature; and we think it was only the patronage of the great names we have mentioned that enabled it to get a start; for after their death it receded and did not again find favour until two centuries later. Yet, although Latin was everywhere the official language and the language of correspondence, it was by no means the language of intercourse and general conversation. Petrarch's high finish shows the progress of the Vernacular, and Dante even distinguishes the various idioms spoken in Italy, and on more than one occasion he makes the sufferers in the "Inferno" recognize him by his Tuscan speech. It would be

mere pedantry and affectation, however, to affirm that the age of Dante and Petrarch was one of transcendent merit or intellectual force. It is rather interesting to us from its archaic quaintness and simplicity than for its power. It bears either more or less an infantile character, though we grant that there is a freshness which possesses something of the charm of a new creation. In truth, modern literature was then only in leading-strings; and if the question started by Sir William Temple as to the respective claims of the ancients and moderns had then been put, it must unquestionably have been decided in favour of the former.

But wherever we move on this ground we feel that we are passing, as it were, through a mediæval atmosphere. Even Catholicity itself—claimed to be unchangeable and eternal—bears a stamp peculiar to the age. The depth, the earnestness, the calmness which then pervaded faith, and which is everywhere visible in Petrarch's reflections, has no counterpart in our times. The rule of the Church was then unquestioned; the worst abuses of clericalism had not manifested themselves, and the exasperations of the Reforming spirit had as yet no place. The Catholicity of Dante and Petrarch may be seen and studied in their works, and great is the contrast. Petrarch was devout in an equivocal sense; that is, he regarded religion not as a dogmatist, but with the eye of a philosopher and a man of feeling. Compared with Dante his Catholicity is of the voluptuous order rather than ascetic. It is tender, pathetic, sentimental, indulgent rather than severe. Dante, like a father of the Church, is formal, authoritative, and sometimes even inexorable; but we can see that Petrarch claims a wide latitude for himself as well as for others, though there is no reforming spirit at work in his convictions. Out of his searching and philosophical mode of judging serious subjects, we might easily infer that a great change is not far off. So, also, in political matters, the tendency of Petrarch's mind was essentially towards Liberalism. This explains the fervour with which he threw himself into the cause of Rienzi, whom he assisted both by secret advice and by public advocacy at the Court of Avignon. This episode in the life of Petrarch is, on the whole, creditable to him; for he adhered to his friend throughout his fortunes, and was led to take the course he did from national and generous motives. He writes on this subject in the spirit of a man who would willingly sacrifice his life to free his country from the oppression of the stranger, and for the moment he fancied that Rienzi's was the hand and heart ordained by Heaven to accomplish the desired end. When the Tribune found his way to Avignon in 1343, among the crowd of ardent Italians who longed for the union of the nationality under a single head, Petrarch was deeply impressed—if not, indeed, imposed upon—

by Rienzi's fervour and stirring eloquence; for in one of his letters he mentions that the latter drew him aside in conversation and inflamed him to such a pitch that he fancied it was "an ancient oracle that had spoken." We may be sure that Rienzi was no ordinary man to have thus succeeded in gaining Petrarch's countenance and support; and it is not improbable that these conversations may have inspired that most stirring of all his Canzone beginning:

Italia mia, benchè 'l parlar sia indarno.

How many Italian hearts have since been touched by this fervid appeal, and fancied the hour of deliverance was at hand? This ode is at once a confession of tenderness, patriotism, trust in Providence, dignity and indignation. In point of elevation of sentiment as a national strain it has probably never been surpassed. The "Marseillaise" and the "Chœur des Girondins" are mere vindictive common-places in comparison. The closing lines can never stale by repetition:

Virtu contra furore
Prendere l'arme: e fia 'l combatter corto:
Che l' antico valore
Nell' Italici cor non e ancor morto!

The fact then remains on record that Petrarch was among those who, in a certain sense, may be said to have anticipated that great uprising of the nationality which has only taken place in our generation. But Rienzi failed, and Petrarch was forced to submit: only, however, to change his chief. Accordingly, in his latter years, he aims at the establishment of a reign of universal peace under the auspices of a central Roman power which should sway the world. It was in this spirit that he penned those urgent letters to the Emperor, Charles IV., beseeching him to come to the succour of the Peninsula, telling him that he is no longer for him King of Bohemia, but king of the world and the true Cæsar. "When you have once planted your foot in Italy," says he, "you are no longer a German but an Italian." In giving this invitation, however, Petrarch was only following up the fatal precedent of bringing in a foreign despot to control men who never could agree to control themselves. Charles and he met at Mantua, and passed eight days together, from morning till night discussing the interesting question of pacifying Italy, which each, however, regarded from totally different points of view—the Emperor desiring only glory for his arms, Petrarch to constitute Rome the mistress of Italy as she had been in bygone days. In recording these interviews Petrarch declares that he did not hesitate to use the freest and

boldest language with the Emperor, adding, "Such liberty of speech was always congenial to me when dealing with princes, and the habit has much augmented with the approach of age."* This, indeed, was nearly his last public effort in the cause of the nationality, and it is not improbable that the disappointment resulting from the failure of his dreams, as well as the premature death of Laura, may have driven him into the retirement of Arquà—still, as of old, clinging with romantic fondness to the choice spots favoured by Nature. Here he was within easy reach of the Visconti, the most generous of all his patrons, and the one who first made him independent in a worldly point of view, when he became possessed of that "golden mediocrity" which he confesses was always one of the modest desires of his life.

In his latter years Petrarch's popularity with his countrymen and his fame abroad seems even to have augmented. He tells us that he could hardly stir out of doors without attracting notice; that when he passed through the streets of Milan all heads were instantly uncovered out of respect; and he mentions that on one occasion when the two armies were ranged on each bank of the Po he was permitted to pass through the ranks of both, and even hailed with acclamations by the soldiers. In truth Petrarch held a much more distinguished place during his life than the world, judging of him solely by his Sonnets and Canzone, has generally accorded. It has been well observed by one of his biographers that, "it is he, of all modern writers—not even excepting Voltaire and Goethe—who reaped during his own life the greatest glory, and obtained from his contemporaries in every part of Europe the most marked admiration."† Chaucer, who was his contemporary, though considerably younger, would hardly have given him such honourable mention in the prologue to the "Clerke's Tale," if his name had not been even then a household word in literature:—

Francis Petrarch, the laureat poet
whose rhetorike sweet
Enlumined all Italy of poetry.

We may here just observe that we do not think Chaucer and Petrarch ever met, as the Abbé de Sade, following the conjecture of Speght, seems to have imagined. It is, indeed, possible that Chaucer, possessing a good knowledge of the Italian language, as is evident from his many translations, may have been one of the company of English who went to assist at the marriage

* "Libertate illa auxit vero vicina jam senectus," Famil. xix. 3.

† M. Mézières.

of Lionel, Duke of Clarence, in 1368, with the daughter of the Duke of Milan; and it is certain, as Tyrwhitt has shown, that he was nominated to an embassy to Genoa in the year 1372. There seems also to have been a standing tradition in England regarding a meeting on this occasion between the two poets; but our reason for coming to a contrary conclusion is, that so frank a man as Chaucer would hardly have forgotten to have left on record some hint of the fact, and perhaps even have told us something personal of Petrarch himself, instead of contemplating him, as it were, at a distance. Petrarch, it must also be remembered, was, on the occasion of this marriage, well advanced in years, and had gone into the quiet retirement of Arqua, having given up all his employments.

How, then, did Petrarch gain this wide popularity and literary repute? The answer is, by reason mainly of his versatility and disinterestedness. He was in all respects a many-sided man, as well as a sincere and ardent patriot. But we think his flowing and harmonious verse, and even the laurel crown, did much to disseminate his fame. Moreover, by dint of tact and temper he possessed great influence in public matters, and became the especial favourite of the higher orders. He was therefore a man who could obtain favours for others, and hence he was courted himself. But if he was successful beyond all his compeers—and, indeed, is hardly paralleled in this respect in any period, in securing the favour of the great, he was never servile. Whenever he addresses his superiors in rank there is a natural dignity in all he says, and he never forgets what is due to himself. He rarely makes use of art or finessè to effect his end. His appeals are always lofty, as if to stir up noble sentiments in others; and his encomiums are not flatteries, but rather well-expressed praises which exalt the men he commends.* In no sphere, indeed, does the worth and dignity of Petrarch's character stand out more creditably than in these public relations, and the purity of his action is attested by the earnest efforts he made to reconcile the two implacable republics of Venice and Genoa, boldly accusing the former of the crime of parricide in calling in the arms of the Arragonese and Greeks against their common country.

Yet, Petrarch, on the whole, can hardly be said to have been a happy man. His exceeding restlessness in passing from place to place, his voyages and long journeys, which he says extended as far as the shores of the ocean, prove that he was not so.

* He tells Boccaccio in one of his letters that it was always his endeavour to bring princes round to his way of thinking, not to be subservient to their wishes or ideas; and that he has often held himself apart and refused to join in the feast lest it should prejudice his influence in diplomacy.

Wherever he went he seems to have carried with him his perpetual sadness of spirit, and the conviction that the things of this world do not suffice for a complete consolation, and that we must look further. His great relief, however, lay in his books, and to these he returns invariably with cheerfulness and even rapture, prosecuting his studies with the greatest ardour, carefully apportioning the hours to rest, reading, and recreation, and sometimes even rising in the middle of the night to write down some passing thought lest it should escape record and be forgotten. Writing also seems to have been with him to the last a passion. One of his pithy observations is:—"The lightest and most agreeable burden you can carry through life is a pen; all other pleasures soon cloy and pass away, but the pen always remains a delight." It was under this constant desire of disburdening himself of his thoughts that he doubtless composed the "Epistle to Posterity;" where, with pardonable egotism and in his precise deliberate fashion, he proceeds to give a short biographical account of himself, not forgetting to own a little pride as to ancestry. He alludes to the interest his name had created in the minds of men who, he presumes, have heard many things regarding him which he desires to clear up. He accordingly describes in a few words his personal appearance, his temperament, character, and inclinations; recalls some of the early incidents of his life, and his various friendships, and just gives an obscure hint that there was "one honest love in the world, and one only" which ever absorbed his thoughts: but he is silent as to the name. His last literary labour was devoted to his poem of "Africa," which he prized beyond all his works, and which he left unfinished. The tradition runs that he was engaged on it when death overtook him, seated in his armchair, dying, as M. Mézières touchingly observes, "like a soldier at his post."

We shall just conclude with a brief reference to Petrarch's will, which is one of the most characteristic documents we possess respecting him, and which, like everything else he does, is composed with unusual care, and written in the most earnest manner. He does not begin in the ordinary formal way, but adopts an original method of his own, making short comments as he proceeds. He begins by alluding to the uncertainty of life, and the necessity on the part of all for the exercise of prudence in matters of such moment; he reminds the reader (who of course is Posterity) that in speaking of what are generally termed a man's goods, they prove but too often impediments to the soul, and rather disparages the value of what he has to bestow. In the bequest of his picture of the Madonna to him whom he calls his "magnificent Lord of Padua," he takes care to state that it was the work of "that renowned painter

Giotto," which was sent him by his friend Michael Navio, of Florence, "the beauty of which the ignorant are unable to appreciate, but which the masters of the art admire and are even astonished at." He leaves numerous bequests to the poor, generously remits money borrowed from him by needy friends, and provides for all his servants severally. He gives his horses to two friends, whom he allows to make a choice by casting lots; bequeaths his breviary and his gold cup to Lombardo a Serico, that "out of it he may drink water, as he drinks it more willingly than wine;" and among other gifts he leaves to Giovanni Boccaccio of Certaldo—who it seems needed the boon—fifty golden crowns, "to buy him a winter gown* for his midnight studies," observing by way of comment and encomium: "A small gift for so great a man." He does not even omit to apologize at the close for his means being so limited, saying that he should have made a very different will had he been "as rich as the vulgar believe." He enjoins his heir, Franciscolo di Brossanno, who had married his natural daughter, to do certain specific acts, and by a strict clause prevents him from alienating his lands. But the love of fame, even as regards the disposal of his body after death, does not desert him at this supreme moment; for he takes particular pains to mention at least half a dozen places where he might be interred according to circumstances; but apparently leaving to his friends the choice of the spot they deemed most fitting, mentioning, however, Rome last. He excuses himself indeed, for being so minute and particular regarding this latter point, observing that "the things concerning burial are, I must confess, more than becomes a man of letters, though they may be mentioned by an unlearned one." Possibly Petrarch was of the same opinion as Pericles, who, in his famous oration over the dead, declares that for a great reputation a man's tomb should be as co-extensive as his country's itself. Many localities in Italy, indeed, would have been proud to have claimed the honour of being the custodians of such relics.

As regards the person of Laura, whose material semblance† has excited perhaps as much curiosity as that of any woman who ever lived, the world has been permitted virtually to know nothing. The traditional portraits which have been handed down to us fall so far short of the glowing description of her

* When Milton in "Comus" speaks of the "budge doctors of the Stoic fur," many doubtless suppose that this fur was worn only by way of ornament or distinction in the Middle Ages. To our idea the fur was for warmth, as studies were then carried on by night under the lamp; and fires, at least in Southern climates, were not in fashion.

† Zeffrino Re, in his work "Ritratti di Madonna Laura," has devoted much time to this interesting subject, but we fear without any satisfactory result.

celebrator that the disappointment created thereby has possibly led some to be sceptical as to her existence. But this is by no means the case as regards Petrarch himself. His likeness, engraved by Raphael Morghen, after reputed portraits executed during his life, may well be accepted as reliable and truthful; for it represents a handsome and portly Tuscan—one of that softer Tyrrhenian race which the more energetic Romans were in the habit of sneering at as the “*pingues et obesi Etrusci*.”*—an outward characteristic which they bear even to this day. We see in this well-known engraving, not only the modern type of the race, but the oval outline of face given in the busts of Mæcænas, “the descendant of kings;” as well as a considerable resemblance, at least in the lower part of the face, to the reputed bust of Virgil, who, in gentleness of character and elegance of versification, has so many points in common with the author of the Canzone. But Petrarch, taken for all in all, has few parallels or compeers in any age. We cannot examine the history of his times without admitting how perfect and characteristic a type he is of the spirit of Mediæviality. The story of his life, so amply furnished with facts and details on some points, is singularly enigmatical and deficient as respects the one debatable subject. In short, the real Laura has never yet been identified. We have even no assurance that her very name is not a fiction. Though we have adopted the more prosaic conclusion that she was the wife of Hugo de Sade, we still admit that it is possible to argue plausibly that she was an unmarried lady, that she sympathized ardently with Petrarch’s passion, that insurmountable obstacles lay in the way of their union, and that the seal of secrecy remained unbroken by mutual consent. This is the transcendent solution, and we frankly own that is not in our power to disprove it. If, in quitting this interesting ground, we feel a sort of regret that our own lot is cast in a feverish and somewhat iron age, it is at least some consolation to know that by dint of a little study and some enthusiasm we may almost forget our surroundings, and transport ourselves back into a sphere of civilization which, with all its restraints and shortcomings, must still have possessed many delights for a generation so different from our own, who indulged in no ardent political longings, and whose calm Utopia lay not in the hopes of the future, but the beauty of the past.

* “*Obesus Etruscus*,” Cato, xxxix. “*Pinguis Tyrrhenus*,” Virgil, G. ii. 98.

ART. VI.—THE JUDICIAL SEPARATION OF MOTHER
AND CHILD.

1. *The Position of the Mother in the Family in its Legal and Scientific Aspects.* By FRANCES ELIZABETH HOGGAN, M.D. Manchester: Ireland & Co.
2. *In re Agar-Ellis, Agar-Ellis v. Lascelles.* *Law Reports*, 10 Chancery Division 49, 24 Chancery Division 317.
3. *In re Besant.* *Law Reports*, 11 Chancery Division 508.
4. *A Bill, intituled an Act to amend the Law relating to the Guardianship and Custody of Infants.* H.L. 1884 (7), Session 2. Presented by the Lord Fitzgerald.

THE subject we are about to discuss is one upon which, it seems to us, there is considerable haziness of thought. It is one of those cases in which the law has fallen far behind the current morality, and acts like a clog upon it; and in which, therefore, the most obvious improvement that can be made is to alter the law. It is very common to hear people get into a barren discussion upon what can or cannot be done by legislation in the direction of social improvement, without seeing that the possibility of doing good by legislation really depends upon the relation of the state of the law to the state of current morality at any particular period. If the proposed legislation is too far in advance of current morality, it will have no effect, or perhaps even a bad effect. If, on the other hand, the current morality is considerably in advance of the actual state of the law, the law has a directly bad influence in holding up authoritatively a standard of morality lower than that which the majority holds. Then follow the inevitable results; judges upholding practical injustice by ingenious arguments; the coarser grained part of humanity insisting on their legal rights, whatever may be the justice of the case; the usual appeal to common sense against principle; and the usual condemnation of the more thoughtful and fair-minded view as visionary and Utopian.

This is the unfortunate position of things on the subject of the mother's rights and duties to her child at the present moment. No one denies her some duties in the matter; but she is denied that freedom which would alone enable her to fulfil them. We are constantly told by the party of stagnation, that a woman's duties are home duties, that she ought to devote herself to her children, that public questions are out of her sphere, and that domestic life will give her every opportunity for development and usefulness. And yet when any question arises between

father and mother as to the education of their children, we are also told that the father is the person to judge, and the law is appealed to in favour of his exclusive authority. That both parents owe an overwhelming duty to their children no one denies; but the question has long ago arisen, whether the mutual rights and obligations as between themselves, as settled by the present law, accord either with reason and justice, or even with the current morality.

Ought, then, those rights and obligations to be the same for both parents? How are they to be regulated, and in case they become conflicting, how are they to be reconciled or adjusted? In considering these questions, the main point to be looked to throughout is the benefit of the child. Neither parent can have any right in the child which is contrary to the child's benefit. Its benefit is originally the first consideration, even between the disputing parents themselves, though the original subject of the dispute is apt to be forgotten in the passions to which the controversy gives rise. There is nothing like a right of property in a child. The guardianship of a child, and the authority necessary for that position, is a sacred trust to be exercised, not for the benefit of the parent, but for the benefit of the child entrusted to him. Therefore, a father or a mother claiming the exclusive possession of a child, must be able to show that such exclusive possession is for the child's benefit. It is only when the child's benefit is equally consulted by entrusting it to the care of either parent that any right arises in the parents as between themselves, apart from the benefit of the child. Here, then, we have two principles which are often confused, but which are perfectly distinct in thought. The child may be entrusted to one parent rather than the other, upon one of two distinct grounds: either (1) because it is more for the child's benefit to be with one parent than with the other; or (2) because, where the child might be equally well placed with either, there is some reason existing between the parents for giving it to one rather than the other. Let us see what is the position of the father and mother of a child in the light of these two principles.

Now the physical benefit and growth of the child is entirely dependent upon the mother during its early years. Before its birth it is entirely dependent upon her in every case. Before that time the father does not, and could not if he would, make any personal sacrifice whatever on behalf of his child, unless it can be said that in maintaining the mother he makes some sacrifice for it. But this cannot be taken into consideration, for this is one of the duties he has undertaken on his marriage, whether there be any children of it or no; and except in case of the wife's

misconduct the law of Church and State has from time immemorial enforced this duty upon him. Even after it is born, for many months, and in most cases for several years, the father has little trouble with the child beyond maintaining it. He can do hardly anything for its moral or mental welfare until several years are past. No doubt if he is living in the same house with it his affection for the child insensibly grows with its growth. Its pretty ways entwine themselves into his memory and round his heart. But to be plain he is not much troubled with the care of it. When it is naughty it goes to its nurse or its mother, and he is rid of it till it is a pretty plaything again. In a small house indeed, where space is very limited, the father has to bear the squalling and nuisance of his children close at hand. But even in this case he makes no special sacrifice. The mother has to bear it too, on the top of all her other cares and anxieties for the children; and in right of her motherhood the father generally holds her responsible if one of the children becomes a nuisance either to him or to others.

Contrast this with the position of the mother. Her trouble and anxiety begin months before the child is born, and we can hardly wonder, when we consider the matter fairly, that women lay the stress they do upon that trouble and anxiety; upon the anguish and danger that accompany the child's birth, and the constant watchfulness and care which a mother devotes to her child all through its early years. The child indeed, as a woman has written,

is her own in a sense
 Which can never be known,
 Save for this thing alone:
 The child that is reared at her body's expense.
 Her part is a growing burthen to bear,
 Present labour and after care;
 The prodigal need to give of her best,
 To squander herself through the life-long hours;
 A sacrifice of perennial birth,
 A bondage binding her soul to earth,
 Keeping it down with a chain of flowers;
 A swift life-current that sets to her breast,
 And leaves her happy and dispossessed,
 With fading beauty and 'minished powers;
 A tender torment, a priceless pain,
 A very passion of fond unrest:
 Such is the loss and such the gain,
 Of the woman whom love has crowned and blest.*

But besides the mother's care and anxiety in its early years,

* Mrs. Pfeiffer, *Contemporary Review*, June, 1884, pp. 830-831.

has she not much more to do with the child than the father has as long as it is a child at all? The best of fathers has, as a rule, little time to give either to the physical or mental training of his child. Saturday afternoon and Sunday are free, but the child has often gone to bed when he comes home of an evening, whatever his line of life may be. We leave out exceptional cases. We are now trying to arrive at the principle upon which legislation should proceed. In the absence of the father the mother is responsible for the child's behaviour, and often for its education while at home. In the case of girls the father may be, generally is, fonder of them than of the boys; but he is almost as helpless to bring them up properly when they are growing into women as he is when they were little infants.

These facts are beyond dispute, and the rule of law to be deduced from them seems clear. First, on the ground of the benefit of the child, as long as it is a child at all, the mother has the preferential claim. Her faculties have been trained through countless generations for this very purpose. The allotment of duties between a married pair, by which the wife makes the home while the husband provides her with the means of doing so, proceeds from reasons in the physical constitution of men and women which cannot conceivably be altered as long as there is a home at all. The mistress of the home must inevitably have the possession of the children, because the children must be brought up in the home and not outside of it.

Secondly, if the benefit of the child were equally consulted by giving it to either father or mother, and this in the case of older children might be so, has not the mother by her devotion to the child won a right for herself to its possession? Where the mother's conduct is not unexceptionable she would forfeit this right, on the ground that to give it to her would not be for the benefit of the child. Where the child was old, say fourteen, and the father had by his care and attention got a hold upon its mind, and was more capable of training it than the mother, that would be a reason on the same grounds for taking the custody from the mother, not because she had forfeited her claim but because of the greater benefit to the child. On the other hand, where the benefit of the child did not seem to demand a decision for one party more than the other, where the child's education could be equally well attended to in either case, the mother, by reason of her early sacrifices for the child, has a decidedly better claim than that of the father. In either case parting with the child must be painful, in either case proper provision should be made that the other parent should frequently see the child; but the mother's feelings should have a preferential claim to be considered, other things being equal. *A fortiori* where the scale dips in favour of the

mother; where the father's conduct has been equivocal or worse; where the child concerned is a girl, to whom a mother's care and attention is more essential than the father's; in all these cases the mother has the best claim, not only on the ground of her sacrifices, but on the ground of the benefit of the child.

We have stated a rule which is rational, fair, and intelligible, and which is grounded upon facts which no one can deny. These facts, being an irreversible part of our human nature, are potent in forming the habits of mankind, and those laws of society which are the basis of any good legislation, and which are strong enough to make bad legislation either wholly impotent or the instrument of the worst of all tyrannies. Let us proceed to consider what is the rule of law which now prevails. We shall find it the opposite of all this. We shall find it based upon the usages of a civilization which has passed away, based upon a theory of the inferiority of woman to man, which is not now true, and the logical deductions from which are as false as the assumption from which they start. The ancient Roman law, from which the rule as to the custody of children now prevailing is taken, was more consistent. It held that the wife was in the custody of her husband, just as much as the child was in the custody of its father. When this rule was evolved facts no doubt corresponded to it. They correspond no longer. The modern marriage, whatever the archaic terms of the law ecclesiastical or civil may say to the contrary, is an affair of mutual consent by two parties meeting on equal terms. It is no more a giving the wife into the custody of the husband than it is the capture of the wife by the husband *vi et armis*. That marriage among the Romans was the first a great many centuries ago, and that marriage among the Tartars was, and, perhaps is, still the second, are not facts upon which we can found any rule of law for the present generation of Englishmen and Englishwomen; and any rule of law, which however bolstered up by acute reasoning, is in fact founded upon modes of living entirely alien to our own, must be galling in its practical results, and ought, as soon as possible, to be swept away to give place to something better.

The rule of law at present prevailing, that the father is entitled to the exclusive possession of the child, has resulted from the advantageous position of the man as compared to the position of the woman. There was probably a time in the history of every race, when the father claimed no right to his child, and felt no responsibility on account of it. Before marriage became an institution the difficulty of tracing any parentage on the father's side, and the consequent exceedingly feeble parental instinct in the father as compared to that already developed in the mother, brought about this result. There are

well-known instances, both in history and among the lower races now in existence, where this was or is the state of facts. The growth of parental instinct in the father, bad as may have been some of its results, is essentially connected with our domestic life. The ideas of marriage and home are inseparable from it. But it had the effect of handing over the wife and children into the power of the father. As the slave took the place of the wife as the worker this tendency was accelerated. Then came the stage with which we are, most of us, familiar, and which left an indelible impress through the Roman law upon modern European society. Society was built up upon the family, not upon the individual, and the members of the family were those who were under the paternal power. This was so much the case that a woman left her own family on marriage, and passed from the custody of her father into the custody of her husband, as she does in India to this day.

It is from this idea that the rule of law now existing in England is derived. That rule is that the father is alone responsible for the bringing up of his children, and is the sole judge of what is right and proper for them to do and to be. The mother may be his agent in bringing them up. She may have a certain discretion delegated to her by the husband, no one can interfere with her as long as the father acquiesces, but if he chooses to interfere there is hardly a limit which can be put upon his caprice or unwisdom.

A man may be in narrow circumstances; he may be negligent, injudicious, and faulty as the father of minors; he may be a person from whom the discreet, the intelligent, and the well-disposed, exercising a private judgment, would wish his children to be, for their sakes and his own, removed; he may be all this without rendering himself liable to judicial interference.*

Even the father's vicious habits is not a ground for interfering, unless he brings his vice into contact with his children. He may be living in adultery, but if he does not bring the adulteress into the presence of his children, that cannot deprive him of any of his rights over them.

I do not place my decision on the ground of the imputed immorality of the husband, using the word immorality in the sense attached to it by convention, which limits it to the relations between the sexes. It is manifest that, according to the principles by which this jurisdiction has always been exercised, there may be immorality of that sort which would not be held sufficient ground for depriving a father of the custody of his children. Nor do I put it upon the ground of gross and

* Sir J. Knight-Bruce in *Ex parte Fynn*, 2 De Gex and Smale at p. 474, A.D. 1848.

habitual intemperance alone. If that were indulged in privately, and were not associated with other conduct calculated to prejudice in an important degree the welfare of the child, I should not, as at present advised, be disposed to take him away from his father's custody.*

But there is no case which more strongly lays down this rule than the latest on the subject, the too well known "Agar-Ellis" case.† The reader will only need to be reminded of the facts of it.

Mr. Agar-Ellis, a Protestant, being anxious to marry the daughter of Lord Camoys, a Roman Catholic, after much discussion, solemnly promised that, in case there should be any children of the intended marriage, they should be brought up Roman Catholics. After the marriage had taken place on the faith of that promise, he changed his mind, and was anxious that his children should be brought up Protestants. The mother, relying on his promise, used all her influence to bring them up Roman Catholics, and, partly behind her husband's back, partly with his knowledge, instilled the distinctive doctrines of the Roman Church into the minds of her children. The marriage took place in 1864. There were three girls born, and from the year 1866 to the year 1878, there was a constant struggle between the father and the mother as to the religious education of these unfortunate children. The children sided with their mother, and declared that they were Roman Catholics. The mother took them to confession, the father took them to church against their will. The children resisted, and at last, unable to control them, the father appealed to the Court.‡ The Court held that it could not, if it would, enforce the father's promise, nor in any way interfere with his authority. The only order made was, that in effect the mother was to do nothing with the children without first obtaining the consent of the father; but it was left entirely to his discretion whether he would try to force the declared convictions of his daughters in favour of the Roman church or not. At that time the girls were, one 13, another 12, and the third 11 years of age. What has happened in the case of the two other children we do not know; but what happened in the case of the second daughter we know from the report of the subsequent application to the Court on her behalf.§ It was what any one would have expected to happen.

"Consequent on this decision," says the report, that is, the first decision above referred to, "Mr. Agar-Ellis removed his children from the care of their mother, and placed them with clergymen

* Lord Coleridge in *Re Goldsworthy*. Law Reports, 2 Queen's Bench Division, at p. 83, A.D. 1876. This is a statement of a well settled rule.

† Reported Law Reports, 10 Chancery Division 49; and on the second application 24 Chancery Division 317, A.D. 1877 and 1883.

‡ 10 Chancery Division 49, A.D. 1878. § 24 Chancery Division 317.

and other persons, allowing their mother to visit them *only once a month*, and requiring that all correspondence between the mother and the children *should pass through his hands or be subject to his supervision.*" In January, 1883, the girl being sixteen, through the intercession of the judge, and apparently not without difficulty, she was allowed by her father, "subject to his control, to practise the Roman Catholic religion, to attend service at the Roman Catholic Church on Sundays and festivals, and to prepare herself for her first communion." She had been confirmed before she was taken away from her mother. In June, 1883, the poor girl writes to the solicitor who had conducted her mother's case:—

I write again to ask you to apply to the judge for leave that I may spend my vacation with my mother, as you know that for this last two years I have been moved about from place to place, and have only had part of one vacation with my mother which the judge ordered. The people I am with now are very kind to me, but they want to go abroad in July, and are unable to take me with them. Father has no place to take me to, and with one exception has never spent a vacation with us *for over four years*. I am always among strangers. I am longing to see some of my relations. I know you will do what you can for me.*

We continue the sad story in the words of the present Master of the Rolls:—

Thereupon the mother and the daughter, after requesting that this young lady, who is nearly seventeen, might for those few weeks live with her mother—not always, but for those few weeks of this year, and stay with her mother until the return of this Madame Guerini to England, and after having been refused, have petitioned this Court, asking this Court to make an order that this young lady shall be allowed, notwithstanding her father's objection, to stay with her mother for some weeks to be named by the Court, during the absence of this other lady; and they have stated as facts, that the father, although he has not forbidden correspondence between the mother and daughter, has insisted that every letter written by the daughter should be shown to a person nominated by him; and that every letter received from the mother by her daughter should be read by the person nominated by him—such person being no relation either to the mother or the daughter; and they have asked for an order that free access may be had between the mother and the daughter; and that the correspondence may be free—the meaning of those two applications being that, whereas the father has allowed the mother to see the daughter once a month while the girl was younger, the girl and her mother now wish to see each other whenever they please, not at the mother's house, but at the place where the father has appointed the child to live. That has been refused by the father, and they request the Court to make an order that they may have that

* 24 Chancery Division, at p. 319.

freedom of access, and they have petitioned the Court that their correspondence may be free and not subject to that strange control put upon it by the father.

It was proposed by the Court yesterday that the Court should not interfere with the visit of the mother, but that the father should allow, not access whenever the daughter and mother wished it, but once a fortnight instead of once a month, and that the correspondence between the mother and the daughter should not be subject to this supervision. But both these modifications are *refused by the father*. He refuses, therefore, to allow his daughter to pay a visit to her mother; he refuses to allow his daughter to see her mother more than once a month; he refuses to allow his daughter and her mother to correspond, except upon the condition that the letters are shown to himself or third parties. And we are told that this is done for fear that the affection of his daughter towards him should be altered.*

After that statement of the case one should have expected to hear that, as the father had abused his authority, not from any mistaken notion as to the child's benefit, but apparently out of ill-feeling or sectarian hatred to the mother, from whom he was then living separate for good reasons, and with an almost insane idea of lessening her influence with the child, the Court thought it time to interfere and to try if the mother could not succeed better than the father in the proper education of the children. No such course, however, was taken. The "patience of the Court" was not even then "exhausted," and it refused to interfere. "It is not in our power," said Lord Justice Cotton, "to go into the question as to what we think is for the benefit of this ward. The father has not, in my opinion, forfeited his right to exercise his duties as a father, and we ought not to interfere."†

That decision makes it hard to imagine a case, not involving the direct moral corruption of the child, where the Court could be induced to interfere with the father's rights. And the odd thing is that the Court seems entirely to overlook the most natural and obvious way out of the difficulty, namely, to entrust the mother with the duties which Nature gives her, and men in private life concede are especially hers. In all the cases on the subject there cannot be found a single expression as to the rights or feelings of the mother. The father's right to the custody of his children is "one of the most sacred of rights."‡ "The rights of the father are sacred rights because his duties are sacred duties."§ "The law of England has recognized the natural rights of a father, not as the guardian of

* *Re Agar-Ellis*, 24 Chancery Division, at p. 324. † *Ibid.* p. 334.

‡ Lord Justice James, 10 Chancery Division, at p. 72, A.D. 1878.

§ 24 Chancery Division, at p. 329, A.D. 1888.

his children, but as the father, because he is the father."* "The natural duties of a father are to treat his child with the utmost affection and with infinite tenderness. . . . The law does not interfere because of the great trust and faith it has in the natural affection of the father to perform his duties, and therefore it gives him corresponding rights."† Again:—

The authority of a father to guide and govern the education of his child is a very sacred thing bestowed by the Almighty and to be sustained to the uttermost by human law. It is not to be abrogated or abridged, without the most coercive reason. For the parent and child alike its maintenance is essential, that their reciprocal relations may be fruitful of happiness and virtue; and no disturbing intervention should be allowed between them, whilst those relations are pure and wholesome, and conducive to their mutual benefit.‡

All this is very true, very praiseworthy, and very edifying, but if the reader did not know that the learned judges, whose expressions we have quoted, were men of the world, he would almost imagine that they had been educated by the old school-master in "Adam Bede;" and had been taught by him "that there isn't a thing under the sun, that needs to be done at all, but what a man can do better than a woman, unless it's bearing children, and they do that in a poor make-shift way; it had better ha' been left to the men—it had better ha' been left to the men."

How much longer is it to be taken for granted that a mother's right in her child is *not* "one of the most sacred of rights," or that her duties are *not* "sacred duties?" Is "the law of England" (an expression which is always used, we observe, when something barbarous is to be laid down) never going to "recognize" "the natural rights" of the mother "because" she *is* the mother? Will the law never have sufficient "trust and faith" in the "natural affection" of the mother to give *her* "corresponding rights?" And is it to be taken as a part of the theology (we would not disparage the word religion by putting it into such a connection) imported into "the law of England" that "the authority of a father . . . is a very sacred thing bestowed by the Almighty," but that the Almighty has bestowed no such sacred authority in the case of a mother. The orthodox view of the economy of the universe apparently being, that whereas the physical suffering of bringing the child into the world belongs exclusively to the mother, the moral authority over it when born has been "bestowed" upon the father alone.

The mistake made in the legal decisions on this subject is that it is assumed that if the Court interferes with the authority of the

* 24 Chancery Division, at p. 327, A.D. 1883.

† *Ibid.* 327, 328.

‡ Lord O'Hagan in *In Re Meades*, Irish Reports, 5 Equity, at p. 103.

living father, it will have to take upon itself the duty of seeing to the education of the child. "Fancy the position of a child," said Lord Justice Bowen, in the year 1883, "with its father living, which the Court endeavours to bring up by judicial machinery, instead of leaving it to be brought up by *parental* care. Judicial machinery is quite inadequate to the task of educating children in this country."* We do not know whether the learned judge has any children of his own, but if he has, we do not suppose that when he used to be engaged at the Temple or Westminster every day from ten to seven, he left his children to be brought up "by judicial machinery." The mother in the case in which the Lord Justice delivered himself of those words was willing, only too willing, to provide for and educate her child, if only she could have induced the Court to allow her to do so. By giving such a decision the Court was not maintaining the peace of families of which it posed as the protector. It was giving direct encouragement to every capricious and cruel husband to become a capricious and cruel father also. One line in an order of the Court would have given notice to any father, whom it might happen to concern, that he would not be allowed to exercise an unlimited indiscretion to the injury of his child in order to prevent its "affections being alienated from him," much less in order to provide himself with a weapon against its mother in any contest which might happen to be going on between them. It may be difficult, perhaps, for the Court to interfere as long as the husband and wife are living together, but, at any rate, in cases where they have separated (as they had in the case we are discussing) there is no reason whatever why the Court should not be empowered to trust the mother with the education of the child quite as much as it does the father. Supposing they are both innocent of any wrong doing, why should there be any presumption in favour of the father? In either case the other parent might be allowed to see the children "at all reasonable times," as is generally the practice now. In the ordinary course of things, where there is no quarrel, the mother sees far more of the child than the father. The father is usually engaged in his labour or business most of the day, the mother is the parent at home; and when the child is not at school or at work, she is the person who is responsible for it. Therefore, we say, there is a good reason for the presumption being in favour of the mother, where the conduct of both parties is unexceptionable.

But in cases where there is a doubt, and in cases like those mentioned where there is no doubt; where the father has been

capricious, or where he is, as described by Lord Justice Knight-Bruce, "a person from whom the discreet, the intelligent, and the well-disposed, exercising a private judgment, would wish his children to be, for their own sakes and his own, removed," why not remove him? Why not give the mother a trial? The choice is not between the father and "judicial machinery," but between the father and the woman, who is at least equally responsible for bringing the child into the world, who has been generally supposed to have had some faculties bestowed upon her for bringing it up, and who in the world's ordinary course has much more to do with its bringing up than its father has.

We think that any reader who has followed us thus far will agree that the present law on this subject should be amended, and it may be in his recollection, if he has taken any interest in the subject, that a Bill was brought in last year by Mr. Bryce for this purpose. Every one, without exception, who spoke upon the second reading of the Bill in the House of Commons, admitted the badness of the law as it stands. Yet such is the inertness of the mass of mankind who are willing to live under any law rather than take the trouble to alter it, that the legislation proposed, not being particularly heroic, and only affecting "a few women and children," has not yet been carried out. The general inertness of mankind was on this occasion ably represented by the House of Lords. In spite of having many more exciting and less important topics to occupy its attention, the House of Commons managed to send up the Bill as amended to the Upper House by August 1. Parliament was not prorogued till the 14th. A couple of night's real work would have sufficed to pass the Bill, and their lordships have often passed the gravest measures with less consideration. An Irish Coercion Bill would not take more than a couple of hours; nevertheless they threw out the Bill on the ground that it had come under their notice too late in the Session to be dealt with.* Many of their lordships, however, expressed themselves disposed to take the matter in hand, and, among others, the Lord Chancellor made an eloquent appeal to the House in favour of the Bill. Encouraged by this, Lord Fitzgerald, who is in charge of the Bill, presented it again in the form it left the House of Commons in the autumn Session, and as altered by a Select Committee, now awaiting the further consideration of the House.

* The reader may be interested to know how much time their lordships had to spare after August 4, the date of the second reading of the Bill. *The House adjourned at the following times after that date:—August 4, 6.15 P.M.; August 5, 7 P.M.; August 6, no sitting; August 7, 5.45 P.M.; August 8, no sitting; August 9, no sitting; August 10, Sunday; August 11, 5.30 P.M.; August 12, 7 P.M.; August 13, 3.30 P.M.; August 14, prorogation.

But in order to understand the amendments of the law proposed by Mr. Bryce's Bill, it is necessary to understand how hardly the present law presses upon the mother in another case, and by doing so overlooks the real benefit of the child. By the statute * which abolished the wardship of the Crown, the father was empowered to appoint a guardian for his children after his death until they attained the age of twenty-one. The mother has no such power given her. Her claims are not considered if she survives her husband. As against the widow, the guardian appointed by the father has nearly, if not quite, the same powers as the father. She must take all her authority from him. But this is not the worst. In addition to this the Court has evolved the doctrine that it is the duty of the widowed mother to bring up her child in the dead father's religion, *however much she may disapprove of it*. *Cujus regio ejus religio* was the catchword which seemed to afford some reason in the sixteenth century why Protestant princes should coerce the consciences of their subjects. *Religio sequitur patrem* is the catchword which affords an excuse to an English Court in the nineteenth century for forcing the conscience of a widowed mother. It is not on the father's command alone that this is done. If he has left no directions the Court will "presume that he intended his children to be brought up in his own religion."† Why should there be any such presumption? The father may have been a conscientiously religious man without wishing to force his belief on his wife, or to torture her through their children. The fact that he has left no direction should be ground enough on which to found the presumption that he did not wish to interfere with the discretion of his wife after he was incapable of judging of the circumstances in which she might be placed. This is reason, but it is not the present law. The judge is generally a reasonable man; he is almost always a merciful man; but the present law does not allow him to use his reason or to extend his mercy to the mother of the child. The position in which the judge is placed is well illustrated in the following words of Vice-Chancellor Wickens:—

Were I at liberty to follow my own opinion I should have no hesitation in acceding to Mr. Jackson's argument. For to direct that this ward shall be brought up in the Roman Catholic faith will be to create a barrier between a widowed mother and her only child; to annul the mother's influence over the daughter on the most important of all subjects, with the almost inevitable effect of weakening it on all others; to introduce a disturbing element into a union which ought to be as close, as warm, and as absolute as any known to man; and lastly, to

* 13 Car. II. c. 24.

† Seton on "Decrees," p. 752.

inflict severe pain on both mother and child. But it is clear that no argument which would recognize any right in the widowed mother to bring up her child in a religion different from the father's can be allowed to weigh with me at all. According to the law of this Court the mother has no such right. *The duty of the widowed mother is in general to bring up the child according to the faith which the father professed, even though she utterly disapproves of it.**

This is the rule even where the father has left no directions, but even if the father had left the most positive commands, it is not the duty of the Court to enforce those commands upon the widowed mother. In considering the benefit of the child, the Court cannot weigh the respective merits of religions. It has no criterion for doing so. No one but a bigot would maintain that the loss of the child by this mental separation from its mother, could be compensated for by the advantage of belonging to one sect more than another. No rational being, even if he were a sectarian himself, would think so. No child could, even if it were allowed to do so, make any distinction between the worth of the mother's opinion on religious, and her opinion on moral questions. A child taught that its mother's opinions are wrong, and as in some of these cases, damnable; cannot help losing its respect for, and confidence in, the mother's moral judgments, or her instructions on any subject whatever. Is the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, then, an equivalent for a mother's love? Is it so important that a child should not believe in the infallibility of the Pope, that in order to prevent it you can afford to undermine its faith in the infallibility of a mother's justice? Can a life-long belief in the omnipotence of Calvin, or the Fathers make up for the loss of a belief in a mother's wisdom? But it is not a question of what sectaries think or private individuals believe. The question is: Ought the State, standing above sects, and looking to the benefit of the living and not of the dead, to enforce the wishes, even when definite and decided, of a dead father, to the detriment of a living woman and her child?

This rule is the more intolerable because, as has been said, the rule is not founded upon any direction of the father as to the religion of the child. The presumption is always against the mother. In the absence of any directions to the contrary, the mother must, on pain of separation from the child, bring it up in the religion of the father. The most ingenious inferences have been made in some cases to ascertain what that religion was. In one case, the place where the parties were married was held to be

* *Hawksworth v. Hawksworth*, 6 Chancery Appeals 540, A.D. 1871.

evidence of it.* Even where the father has given indications that he wished to trust the mother with the education of his children after his own death, she must still, unless there is an express direction to the contrary, bring them up in the father's religion. For it appears by a case reported so recently as the January of this year,† where the father had allowed his wife to bring up the children Roman Catholics, and appointed her by his will, their guardian, jointly with others, yet that they were members of the Church of England as he was himself, was held sufficient reason for ordering the widow to bring the children up in the father's faith. The common sense presumption would be that in such a case the father intended the mother to have the education of the children in her own hands. But the legal presumption is just the other way. In one case ‡ indeed, where the mother had become a Protestant after the death of her husband, and had carefully educated her son, a little fellow of eight and a half, in the controversy between Catholics and Protestants, the Court, after an interview with him, came to the conclusion that it was too late to interfere without "unsettling the mind of the child." The decision has been disapproved. "I for one," said Lord Justice James, "should be loth to do anything which could operate as the slightest encouragement to persons, whether mothers or not, who obtain access to young children, to begin the task of proselytizing when they are of too tender an age to be disturbed by those religious controversies by which the adult world is so much distracted."§ We entirely sympathize with the learned Judge in his abhorrence of bringing up children in a controversial atmosphere, but the harm was done, and to order the child to be re-converted could only do further damage. In the *Agar-Ellis* case the same distinguished judge did not seem to imagine that it was cruel to give up much older children to an injudicious father for the well understood though hopeless purpose of changing their settled convictions in favour of the Roman Church. The conclusion to be drawn is obvious. Where the father is determined to force his child into conformity with his views, the Court can only say, "The law has made him, and not us, the judge, and we cannot interfere with him."|| But if the mother, left with a child of tender years, who has as yet received no religious impressions, ventures to bring up her own child in

* *Skinner v. Orde*, L. R. 4 Privy Council 60, and see *In re Skinner*, *ibid.* 3 Privy Council 451, where it seems clear that the father belonged to neither of the religions in dispute.

† *In re Montague*, 28 Chancery Division 82.

‡ *Stourton v. Stourton*, 8 De Gex Macnaughton and Gordon, 760.

§ 6 Chancery Appeals, at p. 443.

|| Lord Justice James, 10 Chancery Division, at p. 75.

her own religion, that is "proselytizing," in spite of the fact that her dead husband, if he would have been so unwise and so hard-hearted as to interfere between mother and child in his lifetime, may be presumed to know better, if he knows anything at all, when he has left this world of doubt and controversy far behind. And not only so, but though it may appear, as is often the case, that the husband never interfered in his lifetime with the mother's teaching, the same Court which forbids her to enter into "those religious controversies by which the adult world is so much disturbed," will give minute directions as to the doctrines in which the child is to be brought up.

We should be the last to propose that a child's mind should be "unsettled" by controversy, but that is just why we think that the Lord Justices in *Stourton v. Stourton* were right to see the child. It may be that the age of eight and a half is too early for an ordinary child to have become attached to any form of faith, but surely the girl of twelve, in the *Agar-Ellis* case, was old enough to have become immovably attached to a distinctive creed, as the event proved she had; and would any person of common sense suppose that by ordering a girl of that age to be brought up in a religion against which she had already imbibed a prejudice, any good could be gained? If the father exhibited any intention of so forcing the girl's conscience, that of itself showed an indiscretion so great, that if the Court were allowed to treat the mother's claim as co-ordinate with that of the father's, it would, in the exercise of its discretion, give the child into the custody of a mother who was capable of acknowledging existing facts, and had a better notion of what was for the benefit of the child.

And this brings us to Mr. Bryce's Bill. As originally drawn, it contained a clause which would have given the Court this power. It provided that, "the parents of any infant shall, during the continuance of their marriage, be its joint guardians."* The purpose of this clause has been much misrepresented and mistaken. It was not intended by it to disturb the peace of families, and no such result would be likely to follow from it. In every well-regulated family, that is, in far the greater number of cases, the father and mother are now in practice the joint guardians of their children. They, together, make up their minds how the children should be brought up. Each gives way a little, if there is any difference between them. But the object of the clause was to prevent the Court, when there is unfortunately any appeal to it, from being bound by the absurd old rule of the

* Guardianship of Infants Bill, ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, Feb. 6, 1884. Section 2, H. C., Bill 14.

exclusive authority and unlimited discretion of the father, and to enable the judge to decide between the parents solely on the ground of the benefit of the child itself. That clause was, however, lost in Committee, and we are sorry for it. It declared a principle which is the only true one, and, therefore, the only workable one, and unless there is some declaration of that principle in the new Act, the Court will still be left only a choice between two evils. Either the child must be brought up by a bad father or by "judicial machinery:" that is the doctrine; while the unfortunate child, whose benefit is supposed to be consulted, is deprived of the care of the person most fit and proper to bring it up, and the poor mother pleads for her child in vain.

The Bill as now drawn provides that, on the death of either of the parents of an infant the survivor shall be its guardian in the case of the father alone; in case of the mother, either alone, or if the father appoints a guardian, jointly with the guardian appointed by the father.* Here, again, creeps in the same principle, the curse of the former law. Why should the father be left to exercise an uncontrolled discretion over the child on the death of the mother, while the mother is to be kept in check by the father's representative? We should not so much object to the appointment of a guardian by the father, if the mother was empowered to appoint one also, though we think it would be far the simpler and better plan to leave the surviving parent to exercise, for the welfare of his or her own child, a discretion limited, of course, if it should become necessary, by the jurisdiction of the Court, exercised for the benefit of the infant only. But we object, on principle, to the idea that the father has a dearer interest in or a more sacred responsibility towards his child than the mother has. This has nothing to do with any theory as to the superiority of one sex to the other. By depriving the mother of the responsibility, which is, like the father's, to use the words already quoted, "a very sacred thing bestowed by the Almighty," just as great and just as sacred a responsibility as that bestowed upon the father, you are degrading the idea of motherhood, and thereby injuring, not only the particular child, but many children, while by interfering between mother and child, you are doing the particular child you are anxious to benefit an injury for which nothing will compensate.

If it be wrong, as we think it is wrong, to countenance by law the idea that the responsibility of fatherhood is greater than

* Guardianship of Infants Bill, H. L. 1885 (46), Secs. 2 and 3 (2).

the responsibility of motherhood while both parents are alive, it is doubly wrong to suppose that a third party, a stranger, whom no one can suppose to have any "authority bestowed upon him by the Almighty," can exercise as good a judgment as to what is for the benefit of the child as its living parent can. But the mother has a remedy under the Bill. She is not indeed considered fit to appoint a guardian as the father is, but she may appoint one "*provisionally*," and the Court, if satisfied that such appointment is necessary or desirable for the welfare of such infant," may appoint a guardian to act *jointly with the father*.* Jointly with the father! This is worse than the old law. If the father's character and habits are such as to make him an unfit person to have the custody of a child, the old law would deprive him of it; but the new law is going to empower him to "act jointly" with another person in bringing up the child. On the other hand, except in a really grave case, it is monstrous to introduce a stranger to interfere between parent and child.

The Bill further provides that a guardian may be appointed by either parent to act after the death of the survivor, and in case both parents appoint the guardians are to act jointly.† In this case the guardians, if unable to agree, may apply to the Court for its directions in the interest of the infant.‡ But where the surviving father and the guardians appointed by the Court are unable to agree (which as the Bill stands would be pretty certain to be the case), it seems at least doubtful whether there is any provision under which the guardian could apply to this Court against the father.

In the case of the mother the Bill provides

That the Court may, upon the application of the mother of any infant (who may apply without a next friend), make such order as it may think fit regarding the custody of such infant, having regard to the welfare of the infant, and to the conduct of the parents, *and to the wishes as well of the mother as of the father*, and may alter, vary, or discharge such order, on the application of either parent, or after the death of either parent, of any guardian under this Act.§

Upon this clause depends the efficiency of the measure, and there are two objections to it as it stands. The first is that the effect of striking out the clause above referred to, which constituted the father and mother joint guardians of the child during their joint lives, is that the old rule of the exclusive power of the father remains unabrogated. How far the Court

* Guardianship of Infants Bill, Sec. 3 (3).

† *Ibid.* Sec. 3 (1).

‡ *Ibid.* Sec. 3 (3).

§ *Ibid.* Sec. 5.

would be able to depart from the old authorities even under the above clause seems exceedingly doubtful. "The discretion of the judge," said the late Sir George Jessel, in one of these cases* "is to be exercised on judicial grounds;" that is, in accordance with precedent; and if there is nothing in the new Act to abrogate the old doctrine, it is quite conceivable that the Court would feel bound by authority not to interfere with the father's authority in spite of "the wishes of the mother," which have, according to the old rule, nothing whatever to do with the welfare of the child. Any ambiguity upon this point would be sure to lead to litigation and might even render the Act a complete failure.

The other effect of this want of clearness in the Bill as at present drawn is that it is questionable whether it touches the hardships on which we have before laid great stress; that is, whether it abolishes the rule by which the widowed mother is obliged to bring up the child in the father's religion. The recent case before referred to† shows that the appointment of the mother as joint guardian of the child after the father's death will not prevent this rule taking effect. More than this, the rule took effect where, under the old law, the mother was "guardian by nature;" that is, in the absence of an appointment of a guardian by the father. Any one who knew the law before, or has read with any attention the above statement of it, will, we think, agree that this obligation to see her child brought up in a religion not her own, because the dead hand of the father still maintains its grasp on the child, sometimes even against the wishes of the father himself, is the greatest hardship which at present the mother has to suffer. If the Bill passes as it stands we believe that it will leave this great wrong unrighted; at any rate, it is extremely doubtful whether it will do so or not.

There is another point in which we think the Bill as it stands fails to meet the hardship of the case, though we would gladly see the Bill passed without touching it rather than not have it passed at all. Nevertheless it is a point upon which we wish to insist particularly, and a point which affects the father as well as the mother, though it is especially with regard to the mother that we speak of it here. Differences about religion have been a fruitful source of strife between parents, and have often been the cause of litigation as to custody. Up to a certain point the Court has been absolutely impartial as to religion. It insists, indeed, that the mother shall bring up the children in the father's religion, not because it prefers one religion to another,

* *In re Taylor*, an infant, 4 Chancery Division, at p. 160.

† *In re Montague*, 28 Chancery Division 89.

but because it prefers the father to the mother. "With the religious tenets of either party," said Lord Eldon in one of these cases, "I have nothing to do, except so far as the law of the country calls on me to look upon some religious opinions as dangerous to society."* But although the Court is impartial as between sects it is far from allowing complete liberty in this matter. The "opinions dangerous to society" apparently include opinions hostile to Christianity, at any rate if they are actively promulgated, and if there is any danger of their being taught to the child. It is indeed verbally correct to say that there is no recorded case of a father being deprived of the custody of his child purely on the ground of his religious views,† and in each of the two most striking cases on this point there were certainly other questions involved, but the judgments delivered in both these cases clearly show that the Court will not allow the father, much less the mother, to bring up a child in what speculative opinions he pleases. In Shelley's case, in the year 1817,‡ it was stated in evidence that Shelley had derided the Christian religion and denied the existence of a God as the Creator of the universe. But Lord Eldon did not lay any stress upon these opinions in his judgment. It was apparently upon the ground that Shelley had deserted his wife and children in order to live in adultery with the woman he had subsequently married, combined with his speculative opinions on the subject of marriage, that his application for the custody of his children was refused.§ "I shall studiously forbear in this case," said Lord Eldon, "because it is unnecessary to state in judgment what this Court might or might not be authorized to do in the due exercise of its jurisdiction, upon the ground of the probable effect of a father's principles of any nature whatever upon the education of his children, *where such principles have not been called into activity* or manifested in such conduct in life, as this Court, upon such an occasion as the present, would be bound to attend to. . . . I consider this, therefore, as a case in which the father has demonstrated that he must and does deem it to be

* Lyons v. Blenkin, Jacobs' Reports at p. 256.

† Simpson "On Infants."

‡ Shelley v. Westbrooke, Jacobs' Reports, p. 266. The case is very meagrely reported, but the judgment, a written one, is given *verbatim*.

§ Shelley had abandoned his first wife, Harriet Westbrooke, and two children suddenly in the middle of June, 1814, without, at first, leaving her anything to live upon. He was already in love with Mary Godwin, and left London with her within six weeks of his separation from his wife. The first wife died Nov. 10, 1816, and Shelley married Mary on Dec. 30, 1816. Symonds, pp. 80-83 and 92-94. We believe, though we have not seen it mentioned elsewhere, that the true reason of Shelley's second marriage was in order to give him a better chance of getting possession of his children.

matter of duty which his principles impose upon him to recommend to those whose opinions and habits he may take upon himself to form that conduct in some of the most important relations of life as moral and virtuous which the law calls upon me to consider as immoral and vicious."* Shelley's views and practice as to marriage were evidently in Lord Eldon's mind a reason for depriving him of his children quite as much as if not more than, his abstract views on religious questions.

In the same way Mrs. Besant's case was complicated by the moral questions which she has raised by her writings, and the fact that several of her publications, beside the one on which she was convicted by a jury, appeared to the judges to come within the criminal law as "calculated to deprave public morals," although all the judges as well as the jury admitted that they were published with perfectly good intentions. Mrs. Besant, on her separation from her husband, had obtained from him a covenant that her little girl should remain with her, while the boy should remain with his father, but after the publication of the writings in question, Mr. Besant applied to the Court to give him the custody of his child, notwithstanding the covenant in the separation deed. The statute under which Mr. Besant applied enacts that the Court shall not enforce a covenant in a separation deed as to the custody of children unless it shall appear to be for the benefit of the infant to do so. The late Sir George Jessel and the Court of Appeal decided that it was not for the benefit of a child to be brought up by a mother holding such views upon religion and morality as Mrs. Besant had avowed. There are three conclusions of law which appear to be established by this case. First, the rule we have referred to before, that a child even when in the custody of the mother must be brought up in the religion of the father; secondly, that the Court cannot allow any parent to bring up a child without any positive religious teaching; and thirdly, that it was not for the benefit of a child to associate with a parent holding and publishing views upon social and sexual morality which brought her within the criminal law.

We will first consider the question of morality. The case, it will be seen, differs from Shelley's in this, that there was not the slightest imputation against the mother's personal conduct, apart from the publication of the works before referred to. And it was not only on the ground that the mother's opinions would damage the child in themselves, but also on the ground of the social abhorrence in which, in consequence of her opinions, the mother was held, that the Court took away her child.

* Lord Eldon, *Shelley v. Westbrook*, 1817, *Jacobs' Reports*, 266.

It is impossible for us [said Lord Justice James] not to feel that the conduct of the appellant in writing and publishing such works is so repugnant, so abhorrent to the feelings of the great majority of decent Englishmen and Englishwomen, and would be regarded by them with disgust, not as matters of opinion, but as violations of morality, decency, and womanly propriety, that the future of a girl brought up in association with such a propaganda would be incalculably prejudiced. The appellant contends that these are unfounded and unwarranted antipathies and prejudices, like those with which rival sects are wont to regard one another. But the Court cannot allow its ward to run the risk of being brought up, or growing up, in opposition to the views of mankind generally as to what is moral, what is decent, what is womanly or proper, merely because her mother differs from those views, and hopes that by the efforts of herself and her fellow-propagandists the world will be some day converted. If the ward were allowed to remain with her mother, it is possible, and, perhaps, not improbable, that she would grow up to be the writer of such works as those before us. From such a possible future the Master of the Rolls thought it his duty to protect her, and we have no hesitation in saying that we entirely concur with him.*

It was hardly to be expected that the Court would come to any other conclusion. A judge, however liberal-minded, could hardly overlook the fact that Mrs. Besant had brought herself within the criminal law. The benefit of the child, in the sense of its worldly advantage, demanded that it should be brought up by a parent whom the world treated with consideration and respect, rather than by a parent who, however wrongfully, the world treated with contumely and scorn. In all these cases the benefit of the child must first be considered. The parents have no rights directly contrary to its benefit. It is only when the benefit of the child is equally consulted by giving it to either parent that the question between the parents arises. If the benefit of the child is to be considered, its social advantage and happiness must be large elements in such a consideration. A parent may see good reason to sacrifice his social advantages for the good of mankind. He may be a noble-minded reformer bent upon carrying out what he is convinced will in the future be recognized as an advance upon present morality. But if he makes up his mind to this he must count the cost. He has no right to drag others into his unpopularity. If his wife, like the rest, objects to his views, and objects also to their children being brought up in them, it cannot be said to be for the benefit of the children that they should be brought up in views "abhorrent to the vast majority of mankind."† If the aid of the Court is appealed to in such a case, it would be impossible to maintain that, in consulting the benefit of the child, the Court could do

* *In re Besant*, 11 Chancery Division, at p. 521.

† *Ibid.* at p. 515.

otherwise than hand it over to the parent whose social position was assured, rather than let it remain with the parent who had sacrificed social position and consideration even for the noblest ends.

At the same time we entirely dissent from and condemn the conclusion of the judges, that a person holding the speculative opinions of Mrs. Besant, whether on religious or moral subjects, is necessarily unfit to bring up a child. There was no evidence whatever, nor was it likely, that Mrs. Besant intended to acquaint her child with the controversies in which she herself was engaged with regard to marriage and population until the child had come to years of discretion. And it is a curious inconsistency to hold that a father may be guilty of gross immorality in his private life, and yet if he does not bring it under the eyes of his children, he cannot be interfered with; but that the mother may not hold speculative opinions upon questions of morality, which the child is incapable of understanding, without being liable to be separated from it. The opinion so strongly expressed by the late Master of the Rolls, that to bring up a child without religious instruction was "not only reprehensible but detestable, and likely to work the utter ruin of the child,"* if it was an expression of individual opinion was entirely out of place. If, on the other hand, it was a statement of the law, the sooner the law is altered the better. Such an opinion is contradicted by experience, not only in the case of John Stuart Mill, quoted by Mrs. Besant, but in numerous cases of less distinguished persons. Such a rule of law, if it is a rule of law, is inconsistent with our vast scheme of public elementary education, which is based upon the principle that secular education must be compulsorily enforced, while religious education is not only not enforced, but forbidden to be given by the teachers appointed by the State to any child whose parents object to it.

Nor can it be fairly said that the rejection of Christianity in any form any longer implies any social stigma. The argument, therefore, that to bring up a child without the knowledge of Christianity is not for its benefit will not hold. It may be inevitable that part of the martyrdom through which every social reformer has to go to win his crown, must include, in some cases, separation from his children, as well as the severance of other ties, yet it is evident from these cases that the law goes further than this. Mrs. Besant's child was taken from her not wholly on the ground of her personal unpopularity. It is pretty evident that the law would touch not only persons who have made up their minds to social martyrdom

and counted their cost, but also that very numerous class of persons who do not pretend to any such high mission, but still do not at all accept even that vague and attenuated Christianity which is still supposed to be a part of the "common law of England." It is quite clear, although no such case has ever happened, that an Agnostic, Positivist, or Atheist father would not be allowed by the Court, if application were made to it, to bring up his child in the religious or anti-religious views he professed, however strictly orthodox his views of morality, and however blameless his life. Nor would a mother, after the death of such a father, be allowed to bring up her children as the father might have wished and directed, however anxious she might be to do so. From Lord Eldon's judgment, already quoted, it appears that apart from moral questions, if Shelley, holding opinions contrary to Christianity, had expressed the intention of having his children brought up as Christians, he might have obtained possession of them. In the same way the late Sir George Jessel, having stated that Mrs. Besant had prohibited the child's teachers from giving her any religious education, adds :—

It is, therefore, not only entertaining and publishing these opinions, but she considers it her duty so to educate the child as to prevent her having any religious opinions whatever until she attains a proper age. I have no doubt Mrs. Besant is conscientious in her opinions upon all these matters, but I also have a conscientious opinion, and I am bound to give effect to it. I think such a course of education not only reprehensible but detestable, and likely to work the utter ruin of the child, and I certainly should, *upon this ground alone*, decide that this child ought not to remain another day under the care of the lady.*

These decisions remind one of Dr. Johnson's theory that freedom of thought was not interfered with by a censorship of the press, because under it a man could always think what he liked, and he had no need to express his opinion. In the same way, according to modern theory, a parent may think and even publish what he likes, but he may not bring up his child in opinions "contrary to religion." What this religion is, however, is nowhere stated. At one time it may have been the doctrines of the Established Church ; but this had, as we have seen, passed away before Lord Eldon's time. It was only "opinions dangerous to society" with which Lord Eldon would interfere. Neither is it necessarily Christianity in any shape.

It would be impossible for the Court to allow its ward, a Christian child, the child of a Christian father, baptized in the Christian Church, to remain under the guardianship and control of a person who professes

* *In re Besant*, 10 Chancery Division, at p. 514.

and teaches and promulgates the religious, or anti-religious, opinions which the appellant avows that she professes and intends to persevere in teaching and promulgating. . . . The Court is real guardian of the infant, and must perform its duty to the ward accordingly. . . . It is a plain imperative duty which the law casts on the Court; it is the plain right of the infant ward. *The same duty and the same right would exist if the child were the child of a Jew, a Parsee, a Mahomedan or Buddhist.**

But what could be more arbitrary and ambiguous than a rule which includes a Buddhist, the first article of whose creed is to deny a Creator, as a religionist, and excludes a Positivist as a secularist; which includes a nominal Unitarian, and excludes the most idealizing Agnostic. It is the same rule which has so long and so unjustly excluded Mr. Bradlaugh from Parliament, a rule which splits theology into slices, and insists that the last minute infinitesimal slice is the indispensable safeguard of society and religion. In a celebrated French catechism the answer to the question "What is God?" begins "God is an expression." The opponents of freedom of thought and speech, if they do not think that this is an adequate definition of the nature of the Deity, at least give us some ground for supposing that they think it is the only part of His nature in which it is essential that mankind should believe.

The principle which we should wish to see laid down on this point is quite clear. It is that in estimating the benefit of the child the Court should take no direct notice of religion whatever. This would abolish for ever the iniquitous doctrine that there is something, we know not what, specially sacred in the religion of the father. The father's and mother's religion should be absolutely indifferent to the Court as religion. The benefit of the child is the only thing for the Court to consider. No one, considering only the benefit of the child, would be capable of interfering with the living mother in bringing up her child in her own religion. The Court should allow the child to be brought up in the mother's religion, not because it is better than the father's, but because the mother cannot beneficially bring up the child in any other religion than her own. Any direction of the father to the contrary should be disregarded, on the ground that it is not for the benefit of the child; and apart from that, neither parent has any right to make any direction as to its education.

But though the Court should take no direct notice of religion, it should not allow its impartiality to be used as an instrument of torture or as an excuse for bad faith. It is clear that if the rule which prefers the father's religion to the mother's is

* *In re Besant*, 11 Chancery Division, at p. 520.

abolished, some provision must be made for the cases of mixed marriages. These cases are frequent, and some definite rule should be provided for them. This the present Bill does not do. In the first place we think that a promise made before marriage as to the education of a child in a particular religion ought to be regarded as valid, with the limitation that such promise is not to be enforced unless it is for the benefit of the child. At present such an agreement is "not binding as a legal contract. No damages can be recovered for a breach of it in a court of law, and it cannot be enforced by a suit for specific performance in Equity."* Now a promise in writing made before marriage with respect to property, upon the faith of which promise the marriage takes place, is one of the most binding agreements the law knows. It is upheld against creditors, for instance, in favour of an innocent wife, even when the husband promising knew at the time he made it that he was a bankrupt and could not in justice to his prior creditors perform it.† That it is to be enforced with the utmost strictness against the husband himself has been a settled rule ever since the Court of Chancery existed. But a promise that is more implicitly relied on than any promise as to property; a promise given under the most solemn and tender circumstances; a promise, on the faith of which the marriage takes place in a far more literal sense than on the faith of any stipulation as to property, is void and cannot be enforced, while the marriage which took place upon the faith of it is irrevocable. That this is, so it seems to us, a most pernicious instance of the tendency of Englishmen to insist upon rights of property, while rights which ought to be far more sacred than any rights of property remain unenforced. Not to enforce such a promise is a direct encouragement to oath-breaking and the worst of bad faith. Every such decision must tend to shake morality. Many a self-sufficient father is willing enough to believe that rights are "bestowed upon him by the Almighty" so "sacred," that no promise, however solemn, can barter them away. We have already said that such an agreement should not be supported where it is not for the benefit of the child. If, for instance, one of the parents died before the child had received any religious impressions, it would be quite fair that the surviving parent, whether father or mother, should bring up the child as he or she pleased. But if the child had begun to receive religious impressions from its deceased parent, it is obvious that it is not for its advantage to make any change.

* Lord Justice Mellish in *Andrews v. Salt*, Law Reports, 8, Chancery Appeals, at p. 636, A.D. 1873.

† *Kevan v. Crawford*, 6 Chancery Division, 29.

It is not from any idea as to the benefit of the child that such agreements are not at present enforced. The sole reason why they are nugatory is that they interfere with the "sacred rights" of the father. We have tried to show by every argument and illustration which we thought capable of bringing it home to the mind, that the theory which regards the father's rights in his children as sacred and the mother's rights as *nil*, is a theory not warranted by Nature and directly contrary to present facts. To tell a man that he may break his most solemn engagement to his wife, not for the benefit of the child, but because his authority over his children "is a very sacred thing bestowed by the Almighty," who has bestowed no such authority upon the mother, is to pervert the first principles of religion and to make outworn usages of society and archaic rules of law of more importance than the most sacred vows in the eyes of a God of Justice.

A great deal of twaddle, we can call it no less, has been talked about the impossibility of enforcing an order as to the religion of the child in the case of a dispute between the living father and mother. But when it was acting in support of the "sacred" right of the father, the Court found no difficulty in enforcing the order. It could then make an order :

That the mother be restrained from letting the said infants, or any of them, or causing, procuring, or permitting them, or any of them, to be taken, *without the consent of the father*, to confession, or to any church or place or places of worship where worship is performed, otherwise than according to the rights or ceremonies of the Church of England as by law established.*

Substitute "mother" for "father," and add something like the following :

But that the mother be permitted, in accordance with the said agreement, and so long as she shall think it desirable, to bring up the said infants in the communion, doctrines, and worship of the said Church,

and you have all that is necessary. Such an order could be just as easily enforced against the father as against the mother. There has never been any difficulty in enforcing it against the mother, and surely at this time of day the Court is not going to be afraid of not having its order obeyed. Sir Cusack Smith, in an Irish case, pathetically asks, "Is the Court to apply the property of the husband during his life-time, and against his will, to the education of his child in that form of religious faith from which he conscientiously differs, and the adoption of

* *Re Agar-Ellis*, 10 Chancery Division, p. 75.

which by the child he believes will be destructive to his eternal welfare."* We answer, Certainly, if he has promised that it should be so ; if he induced his wife to marry him on that understanding. To let him bring the child up "in a religious faith from which" its *mother* "conscientiously differs, and the adoption of which by the child," she "believes will be destructive to his eternal welfare," is no better. If one party must suffer there is a reason why it should be the father ; namely, his promise.

We must confess that to see the rights of property and eternal damnation placed in such close connection is a little amusing. If the parties really have such an awful gulf dividing them it is the same for both. Either will suffer if the child is brought up in the religion of the other. The overwhelming reason why it should be the father, is this, that foreseeing the circumstances, knowing that he should have to pay for the education of his child, if that is the thing that seems so hard, he deliberately promised that it should be so. The Court has never found any difficulty in applying the husband's funds to the performance of his covenants in a marriage settlement, and there would be really no difficulty in compelling the husband to allow the wife to bring up the child in her religion, any more than there has been found any difficulty in compelling the widow, bound by no promise, but, on the contrary, often deprived of the benefit of one, to bring up the child in the father's.

It is no use to keep the law as it is in this respect in the hope of discouraging mixed marriages. They may be very unwise, they may from a sectarian point of view even merit a stronger epithet ; but they are sure to take place, and are not less likely to take place in the present chaotic state of religious opinion than formerly. But to declare such promises void in law will not prevent mixed marriages ; and the reason is this, that at the time of the marriage, when each party believes the other's word perhaps more implicitly than any other thing, it appears so unlikely to either husband or wife, that such a promise should ever be questioned by the other ; that to know that it is void at law has no influence on the action of the party to whom the promise is important. The only effect that the present law can have is to make it easier for a man of weak character to make the promise, not with the deliberate intention of breaking it ; but with the thought that, if necessary, the law will allow him to break it, acting as a salve to his religious scruples. This directly increases the number of mixed marriages, if it has any effect, because it enables the husband in some cases to make a

* *In re Browne*, 2 Irish Chancery Reports, at p. 160.

promise he would not otherwise make. It just dips the balance in favour of the marriage, which, but for it, would never take place. And the man to be influenced by such a reason is precisely the man who, when children are born to him, would find his religious scruples stronger than his promise.

In cases where there is no promise before marriage, and the parents cannot agree as to the religion in which the children are to be brought up, there should be an arbitrary rule, such as we believe exists in Germany, that the girls are to be brought up in the mother's religion, and the boys in the father's. This rule is not more artificial than the rule that all the children are to be brought up in the father's religion, and it is much more just.

To sum up, we have tried to show that as soon as the father began to care about his children at all, his advantageous position, compared to that of the mother, gave him the opportunity for moulding custom or legislation in his own interest. Before the period of legislation, the father was stronger than the mother; and, in those times at any rate, the strongest got what he wanted. Since legislation began, man has been the legislator until quite lately, without even a word of criticism from women; and, at the present time, though man's legislation cannot be said to be entirely without some criticism from women, the criticism is all too little, and women have no direct voice in the making of the laws of their country. But a time has come when legislation must be treated from a more intelligible point of view. Legislators are beginning to feel that they should legislate not for men only, as heretofore, but for the whole community. From a material point of view, it should be asked what is for the benefit of the whole community, man, woman, and child? From a social point of view, it should be asked, not only what are the feelings of men, but also what are the feelings of women, who make up more than half the community; and the law should not offend against those feelings without the most urgent cause.

In considering what form any legislation on this particular subject should take, we have tried to show first, that, by the law of Nature, the mother is the parent who makes all the sacrifice for the child before its birth, and almost all in its early years; that by the universal consent of civilized parents, the father is commonly the bread-winner, while the mother looks after the children at home; that in the case of girls, this care of the mother lasts longer and is even more important than in the case of boys. From this we deduced a rule that where there are disputes between father and mother, and the law is appealed to, the parent who needs most consideration from the law is the

mother. First, for the children's sake, because in the natural course of events they are best brought up by her ; secondly, on her own account, because her sacrifices for them have been greater. And that, therefore, other things being equal, the custody of the children should be confided to her, with provision for proper access to them by the father. We have shown that the present rule of law in England is the very contrary of all this ; that the Court, adhering to an archaic conception of a father's rights, will not interfere with those rights unless it should appear "not merely to be better for the children, but essential for their safety and welfare in some very serious and important respect" * that it should do so. We have shown that the Court at present takes no notice of the mother's rights at all ; that some of the judges have even considered that where the law is appealed to the choice lies between the child being brought up entirely by the father or by "judicial machinery;" that the widowed mother must bring up the child in its dead father's religion, even if he left no commands for her to do so. We have shown that, quite apart from any moral question, the man or the woman who does not believe in revealed religion, would not at present be allowed to bring up his or her child in accordance with his or her own beliefs. We have shown that a promise, on the faith of which a mother was induced to marry, is not binding upon the father after marriage ; that his rights are considered more sacred than his oath ; that his authority over his children is supposed to have been "bestowed upon him by the Almighty," who has bestowed no such authority upon the mother. That is the present state of the law ; and, contrary to reason, contrary to justice, forgetful of mercy as it is, an existing law has an immense weight of influence in its favour. We hardly expect that every one of these blots will be removed. The existing law has deadened to its effects the consciences of those who have had to administer it. It has prevented the morality of every unthinking person who has been born and bred under it, from rising above it. It has all the prestige of having "always existed," and, therefore, has the reputation of being an "inevitable law," or "ordained of God," according to the predilection of the speaker. But, in spite of this, we have every hope that the intelligence, the sense of justice and the kindness of heart which have always been the characteristics of Englishmen, will enable Mr. Bryce, and enable him in the present Session, to add to his many and well-earned laurels in other fields, the distinction of adding a very beneficial amendment of the existing law to the Statute Book.

* *Re Goldsworthy*, Law Reports, 2 Queens Bench Division, at p. 83.

ART. VII.—KAROLINE BAUER, LEOPOLD I., AND
BARON STOCKMAR.

1. *Memoirs of Karoline Bauer.* From the German. In Two Volumes. Second Edition. London: Remington & Co. 1885.
2. Copies of the *Times* Correspondence in reference to "The Memoirs of Caroline Bauer." Remington & Co. 1885.

THESE Memoirs resemble in one respect the letters of Caroline von Linsingen.* The "Memoirs" and the "Letters" alike contain the story of a *liaison* of a German lady with a royal person. In each case the lady believed—or at least represents herself to have believed—her *liaison* to have been a valid marriage, a delusion which no one else could entertain. In each case the alliance, whatever its nature, was dissolved for reasons of State; but there is this difference between the "Memoirs" and the "Letters": the "Letters" exalt a very coarse and commonplace man † into a *preux chevalier*, a moral hero; the "Memoirs" degrade their hero. They represent a prince, undoubtedly of great political experience, of generally acknowledged sagacity, and of large influence in European politics, not only as an unamiable man, but also as something very like a fool. There is, in the case of the "Memoirs," none of the doubt and obscurity which overcloud the authenticity of the "Letters." On the death of Karoline Bauer, Baron Ernest von Stockmar, the son of Baron Stockmar, Prince Albert's "irresponsible Minister," scented from afar danger to the reputation, not only of his father, but of his father's patron, Leopold I., and wrote in hot haste to the publisher of the German edition of the "Memoirs":—

According to the newspapers, Karoline Bauer is dead, and you are entrusted with the publication of her papers, among which I understand there are also "Secret Memoirs" concerning that period of her life which she spent in England in the vicinity of Prince Leopold of Koburg. You, for many years the deceased's friend and editor of her books, ‡ will know that her mother was a step-sister of my grandfather; she herself therefore cousin to my late father; and you will

* *Vide* WESTMINSTER REVIEW, N.S., No. CXVI., Oct. 1880. Article, "Caroline von Linsingen and King William IV." In spelling Caroline in that article with a C and in the present article with a K, we have followed the spelling in the respective books; and so in the case of Koburg, &c.

† King William IV.

‡ This refers to two works published in the lifetime of Karoline Bauer—viz., "Out of my Stage Life," and "Wanderings of Comedians." See "Memoirs," vol. i. Introduction.

not be surprised that the advertised "Secret Memoirs" somewhat engage my attention, I being at the present time the senior member of the family of Stockmar. If the newspaper report with regard to the "Secret Memoirs" be well founded—and it appears indeed probable enough—it will not be a secret to you that my late father, to his great regret, was in various ways mixed up with the subject-matter of the "Secret Memoirs." A sequel to the dissolution of that connection in England was the life-long estrangement of my father and his cousin, who, quite without ground, had reproached him in an insulting manner with prejudicing her interests. She seems to have recognized herself as in the wrong, for she has repeatedly attempted to approach my father again, who, however, declined any *rapprochement* to the very last.* I should be very sorry if these "Secret Memoirs" revived these old dissensions. The object of these lines, therefore, is to obtain from you a reassurance, and to beg of you that the editing† of the "Secret Memoirs" you would, with a gentle hand, cancel anything that might cause a public scandal. This would not merely include direct and indirect attacks on my father, but also similar ones on Prince Leopold, in whose actions the memory of my father is compromised, inasmuch as he was the prince's man of business. The tendency of all previous publications of Karoline Bauer has been to turn everything to good. Sincerely I hope that the same rule may prevail in the editing of the "Secret Memoirs." In so doing the memory of your late friend will be best served.‡

The memory of the deceased would have been best served by a cremation of the MS., by which the world would have suffered little, if any, loss. The publisher seems to have been unwilling to forego the profit likely to result from giving to the world these *mémoires scandaleuses*; and we find Baron Ernest shortly afterwards again addressing him in reference to the allegations of the lady as to her treatment by Leopold I.

Do you think it possible [he writes], from your knowledge of human nature, that any one, to say nothing of a lady, will enlighten the world with the truth about so delicate and private a personal relationship? Not I. I well believe that Karoline Bauer had much on her heart about that episode; but I cannot believe that it could do good to any one, least of all to her or her memory, if a posthumous recapitulation of it were to take place. For that episode was an error, soon enough recognized, in which there was hardly anything that can be regarded as beyond every-day experience.§

Baron Ernest, therefore, unqualifiedly admits that his father and Karoline Bauer were cousins, and that a connection which was "an error," but not beyond every-day "experience," existed

* Conf. "Memoirs," vol. ii. p. 314.

† Sic in original.

‡ "Copies Correspondence," &c., pp. 5, 6. The date of this letter is October 21, 1877.

§ *Ibid.* p. 6. The date of this letter is November 7, 1877.

between her and Leopold I. The first English edition of these Memoirs was published towards the close of 1884. They were much read, for the reason we will state in the words of a contemporary—"mainly because Stockmar, Leopold, and the entire gang of Anglo Court Germans, had been lauded so impudently and so extravagantly that people were glad to find that something was to be said on the other side." *

About the time of the publication of the second English edition, a letter from no less distinguished a person than Professor Max Müller appeared in the *Times*, with the title, "A Literary Hoax." The Professor, it will be remembered, edited the English translation of "Baron Stockmar's Memoirs." As their editor, he asks permission of the editor of the *Times* to declare that the contents of the "posthumous memoirs of the lady" who calls herself "Baron Stockmar's niece" are "apocryphal, and worse than apocryphal." When the Professor wrote this he evidently was ignorant of the well-grounded fears of Baron Ernest, and the damaging admissions he had made.

They [the Bauer Memoirs] appeared, the letter continues, in Germany in 1880, and have lately been translated into English. At first the editor, a personal friend of Miss Bauer, seems to have believed in her *bonâ fides*. He advanced her considerable sums of money during the closing years of her life, and she tried to repay him by making him her literary executor, and leaving to him her manuscripts, full of confessions and revelations, to be published for his benefit after her death. Soon, however, his eyes were opened, and he did the only thing which a man of honour could do—he himself declared his old friend, Miss Bauer, to have been guilty of lying and falsehood, a swindler who for years had piled lie upon lie, fraud on fraud (*Lug auf Lug, Trug auf Trug*). After this these Memoirs were disposed of so far as Germany was concerned, and it is but fair therefore that, now the book has been published in England, English readers should know what they have to expect in these nauseous papers. Such posthumous bités and growls have become a great nuisance of late. No one is safe from these literary ghouls. The assassin cannot be called to account; the victims generally can no longer defend themselves. Fortunately, in the case of Baron Stockmar, there is no necessity, at least in England, to defend his character and that of his friend and patron the late King of the Belgians, against the silly charges of Miss Bauer. But the accused is not so often so safe, nor the accuser so untrustworthy and discredited. The memoirs of Karoline Bauer may at least serve one good purpose, if they act as a caution against all memoirs *d'outre tombe*. †

* *Truth*, January 29, 1885, pp. 157, 158.

† "Copies Correspondence," &c., pp. 3, 4, but in a later letter (p. 10) the Professor admits that he knows nothing of the German editor.

The highly respectable firm who published the English edition of the "Memoirs" replied to the Professor, incorporating in their reply Baron Ernest von Stockmar's letter to the German publisher. With more zeal than discretion, the learned Professor, instead of letting the question rest, entered into a controversy with the publishers. He replied to them:—

No doubt, in saying that Miss Karoline Bauer calls herself a niece of Baron Stockmar's, I meant to imply that on this as on other points she was simply romancing. Have the publishers of her Memoirs refuted my statement? They say that the present Baron Stockmar writes of her as the daughter of the step-sister of his grandfather. Does that make her the niece of the late Baron Stockmar? Karoline's baptismal certificate, dated March 29, 1807—not, as she states, May 28, 1808—will show what her real relationship to the Stockmar family was.

This letter shows great carelessness on the part of the writer, for throughout these volumes Miss Bauer never calls herself the niece of Baron Stockmar, but always his cousin. The publishers rejoined:—"We consider we have refuted Professor Max Müller's statement, inasmuch as in our letter we showed that the present Baron Stockmar admitted her relationship as cousin of his father, which is precisely the position she claims for herself throughout these Memoirs."* After setting forth the baptismal certificate of Karoline as given in the "Memoirs" † the publishers continue:—

We hope we may be allowed to take this opportunity of protesting against the term literary hoax as applied to these Memoirs. Whatever opinion may be entertained in regard to the trustworthiness of Karoline Bauer, there can be no doubt that these Memoirs are genuine, and were written by herself; and apart from the testimony of the present Baron Stockmar and the extracts from his father's letters, offer sufficient evidence as to the correctness of the main facts as recorded by Karoline Bauer.‡

The Professor replied in a lengthy letter, from which we have space only for these extracts. After contemptuously assuring the publishers that when he spoke of the "Memoirs" as a literary hoax, he fully expected to hear that they themselves were not the perpetrators, but the victims of it, and that how completely innocent they were of any intention to hoax they have shown by expressing their conviction that these Memoirs were genuine, and written by Karoline Bauer herself. He then proceeds to state, on the authority of the German editor, of whom the

* "Copies Correspondence," &c., p. 7. Conf. "Memoirs," *passim*, especially vol. i. pp. 38, 42, 43, 44. † Vol. i. p. 1.

‡ "Copies Correspondence," &c., p. 8. *Ibid.* pp. 9, 10.

Professor on the next page * admits he knows nothing, that Karoline Bauer was illiterate, that she could not have written these Memoirs, but that the merit of all her literary compositions belongs to the editor. The Professor adds this passage in the editor's own words :—"What she left me was merely canvas, and the many-coloured and often very tangled threads, wool, silk, and a few pearls. My pen was the hard-working embroiderer, bringing order into chaos, doing the work, and adding of my own and from other sources whenever it seemed necessary in order to give clearness and completeness to the picture." † Much is made of the fact that Karoline Bauer, "though an actress, should wish to appear just one year and two months younger than her certificate allows." Professor Müller says : "I thought I had sufficiently hinted at the real reason of this anachronism." ‡ No doubt it is our fault, but we can attach no meaning to this suggestion.

As to the correctness of the main facts "recorded by Karoline Bauer," the Professor emphatically gives his opinion :—

No historian will take the main facts, even of the *Chronique Scandaleuse* of the nineteenth century, from the Memoirs of Karoline Bauer; the editor of these very Memoirs, her best friend, attributes to her an immortal § delight in lying and intrigue, and brands her whole character as nothing but lying, fraud, hypocrisy, and acting. ¶ [But he makes this admission :] I know, of course, from letters which I have received, that men, and women too, who pride themselves on their superior knowledge of the world and the flesh, consider these Memoirs as very *vraisemblable*, and the facts stated in them as very natural. I feel quite unequal to contest such authoritative assertions but in my own special department, if there is a Sanskrit scholar who has once told an untruth, knowing it to be an untruth, I say to him *apage*, and he is to me as if he did not exist. Surely, then, after what the German editor of Karoline Bauer's Memoirs has said of her I was right to say *apage* to these Memoirs. ¶¶

He then quotes the well-known remark of Lord Palmerston : "Among politicians I have only met one man who was altogether disinterested, and that is Stockmar." Elsewhere Professor Müller quotes Lord Palmerston's words as being : "I never but once met a perfectly disinterested man of *this kind*, and that is Stockmar ;"*** but what "kind" of men did Lord Palmerston mean ? The words are ambiguous. We should say

* "Copies Correspondence," &c., p. 8. Conf. pp. 9, 10.

† *Ibid.* p. 9.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 10.

§ *Sic* in original, but surely immoral is intended. ¶ *Ibid.* p. 10.

¶ *Ibid.* pp. 10, 11.

*** The Professor's Preface to "Memoirs of Baron Stockmar," vol. i. pp. xiv. and 387.

the kind he meant was foreign adventurers. As to Leopold I., the Professor refers, without quoting them, to the memorable words in which the *Times* passed judgment on his public and private character at the time of his death.* Now, Stockmar may or not have been so disinterested as Lord Palmerston thought him, but we think *Truth* fairly and accurately sums up the facts:—

Leopold was not such a saint as to make Karoline Bauer's story inherently impossible. He was self-seeking, licentious, and stingy. Baron Stockmar was not mercenary, but he was precisely the man to play Sir Pandarus of Troy to a royal friend, and he probably thought he was doing his cousin a good turn. The episode occurred when in France, Russia, England, and Germany, the nobility competed for the honour of furnishing a *chère amie* to a royal personage out of their own families, and in this particular matter Leopold and Stockmar were neither better nor worse than their contemporaries.†

Professor Müller, in his rash zeal to save the reputation of his countrymen, discredits the reputation of his countrywomen, and injures his own character for discrimination. If every historical narrative found to contain one wilful misstatement is to be rejected as wholly incredible, how few memoirs, journals, or diaries, would be admissible as evidence. The historian's duty is to winnow the wheat from the chaff, and to utilize the grains of fact, however few, which may remain after that sifting process.

The publishers, in their last letter to the *Times*, accurately state the result of the controversy:—"Neither by Professor Max Müller, nor anybody else, has even any attempt been made to shake Karoline Bauer's main contention, that she was induced by her cousin to come to England to join his patron, and that she was subsequently sacrificed to political considerations.‡ This is the only matter of interest this book has for Englishmen, and we propose to consider Karoline Bauer's story, not that in itself it is of much importance, but Leopold I. and Baron Stockmar have been so ridiculously overpraised, especially by Sir Theodore Martin, that in the interests of historical truth it is well to show that these Germans were men and not angels. When the story of the relations between Leopold and Karoline is eliminated from this book, there remains little but the German editor's "embroidery," which, in English, is called padding, full of errors and blunders, and most of it

* We presume the Professor refers to the notice of King Leopold, reprinted in the "Times Annual Summaries for a Quarter of a Century."

† *Truth, ubi supra.*

‡ "Copies of Correspondence," &c., p. 13.

having little if any connection with Karoline Bauer. The Introduction prefixed to the "Memoirs" is, we presume, a bit of this "embroidery." It so closely resembles the rhapsodies of the editor of the Linsingen "Letters," that we are led to surmise that he is also the editor of these "Memoirs." If our readers remember, or will refer to our article on the "Letters,"* they will be struck by the likeness of the rhapsodies we there quote to what now follows:—

The pen trembles in my hand, for my heart—this old, storm-beaten, tired heart—still must tremble at the thought, that when the eyes of strangers read these lines, it—this heart—will have ceased to beat, this hand will rest stiff and cold under the earth! Dust—ashes of my life! This poor human heart, which once bloomed and laughed so full of youthful gaiety, like a flower of spring in the first sunshine which the young heart, bright with joy, took for an everlasting one, and which since then has erred and failed so much, suffered and wept! And of this heart, and its demons, and its old long-forgotten, long-dead stories, I will speak here; but must likewise speak of other hearts and *their* demons and *their* old scattered and forgotten stories, as life brought them under my notice, out of which I first learned to know life when I myself was still an innocent, stupid child. Of course, only much later, when I had myself tasted the tree of knowledge and forfeited paradise, all became so frightfully clear to me as I here relate it; but the terrified looks which the ignorant little girl even then cast into the depths and shallows of the heart, continued their effect during the whole of my after-life, enlightening and consuming.

And after referring to her earlier publications, in which her "career as an artiste lies open before a sympathizing reader," the introduction concludes: "Here now follows my life as a woman; but the life of a woman is her heart, and the life of the heart is love."†

On that portion of Karoline's life which preceded her introduction to Leopold we shall not dwell at length. Karoline Philippine Auguste Bauer was born at Heidelberg, March 29, 1807. The Bauer family are said in these Memoirs to be of Polish origin, "a modest branch of the illustrious house of Poniatowski, whose name the Bauers formerly bore. One of the family bought a small estate near Kassell, which he farmed himself, and thenceforth called himself simply Bauer. This is, of course, equivalent to Boer—a name not now very acceptable to English ears, and to the English "boor," now only used as a term of contempt. In this translation it is rendered husbandman, but we think "yeoman" would be the accurate rendering. Some of this Bauer's descendants entered the armies of various

* *Ubi supra.*

† "Memoirs," vol. i., Introduction.

German States; amongst them, Heinrich Bauer, Karoline's father, who became an equerry to Duke Alexander of "Wurtemberg," and at the time of Karoline's birth was "lieutenant and adjutant in the Grand Ducal Baden regiment of Light Dragoons."* Duke Alexander came to Koburg as a suitor for the hand of the Princess Antoinette, daughter of the Hereditary Grand Duke of Coburg. He was accompanied by his equerry, Heinrich Bauer, whom his daughter, or her editor, describes as "the wild Heinrich. In him the restless Polish blood was always foaming and boiling indomitably. He was handsome, vigorous, confident of victory as the war god, proud and bold as a young lion, wanton as a wild foal, generous as a Poniatowski, easy-minded as a cornet, a spoiled favourite of the gods and of women." Being what he was, we are not surprised to read that "at a ball he saw the fifteen-year-old Christine *Germanice* Christelchen Stockmar, and fell over head and ears in love with the sweet young child.† They were married, and Karoline was the fourth and youngest child of the marriage. Her father fell at the battle of Aspern in the May of the year in which she was born.

The head of the Stockmar family, into which Lieutenant Bauer married, was Ernest Frederick Stockmar, described as "Landkammerath in Coburg, a well-to-do merchant and manufacturer."‡ He directed the money transactions of the Ducal Court of Coburg, which was in perennial financial difficulties, and, we are told, "it was with positive terror at last that he used to see the Court messenger approaching his beautiful snug house at the market-place in Coburg, or his charming summer residence in the suburbs, called the 'Glockenberg,' carrying something wrapped up under his arm. He knew then that the Duke or Duchess, or the Princes or Princesses, were once more in great straits, and on the point of borrowing from him, 'on pledge.'" So oft-repeated were these visits of the Ducal messengers that they turned the poor old Landkammerath into a nervous hypochondriac during the last years of his life; "nay," so say the Memoirs, "from time to time he suffered from real mental derangement." There is a savour of "pawnbroking" in this description, which makes us think that the social status of old Stockmar was not so high as these Memoirs and those of his son represent. Be that as it may, on his death it was found that he had lent to the Ducal family 17,000 thalers, and neither he nor his family after his death ever received payment

* "Memoirs," vol. i. p. 1.

† *Ibid.* p. 21.

‡ "Memoirs of Baron Stockmar," vol. i. p. xxxvi. Landkammerath, we are there told, is literally "Counsellor of the Chamber of Provincial Finances."

of one penny of principal or interest. "But the Duke and his Court always remained the most gracious protectors of the Stockmar family."* The Landkammerath was twice married. His eldest son by his first marriage was Johann Ernest, the father of Baron Stockmar. By his second marriage he had one daughter, Christine, the mother of Karoline Bauer. Christine, we are told, became the playmate of the young princes and princesses of Koburg, including Ernest, the father of the Prince Consort; Victoria, afterwards the Duchess of Kent; and Leopold, the hero of Karoline Bauer's romance, who is described as being, even then, "reserved, cool, calculating, appearing almost always as if lost in thought."† At the age of eighteen he is described in the "Memoires d'une Jeune Grecque" as "a tall young man, with a false look and a disagreeable smile, and speaking wretched French."‡ This "Jeune Grecque" was Pauline Adelaide Alexandre Panam, the mistress of Leopold, eldest brother of Ernest, who had become the reigning Duke of Saxe-Koburg. Unfortunately, she inspired Leopold with similar feelings to those which she had kindled in his brother, which caused her "a scene of furious jealousy."§ This *liaison* between Duke Ernest and the young Greek, throws some light on an obscure passage in Sir Theodore Martin's "Life of the Prince Consort." We are there told: "In 1824 a separation was arranged between the Duke [of Saxe-Koburg] and the Duchess (followed by a divorce in 1826), but not before she had established a hold upon the affections of her children, which, although they never saw her again, remained with them to the last."|| Two years before, Karoline Bauer saw at Koburg "the mother of the young Koburg princes, the unhappy Duchess Luise, an elegant, attractive woman, with fair locks and blue eyes. Even at that time grave discords were troubling their married life, and darkened the sunny youth of their children. The scandal about the 'young Greek' was still going on, although she had had many successors in Koburg since Madame Alexandre Panam threatened the publication of her Memoirs. To avenge herself for the many acts of infidelity on the part of her husband, and to distract herself in the loneliness of her heart, the Duchess had now likewise begun to spin love-threads on her own account. In Koburg the very sparrows on the roofs twittered stories of the amours both of Duke and Duchess."¶

The following sketch of Baron Stockmar and his domestic

* "Memoirs," vol. i. pp. 13, 14, 15, 16.

† Quoted in "Memoirs," vol. i. p. 80.

‡ "Life of the Prince Consort," vol. i. p. 5.

† *Ibid.* p. 17.

§ *Ibid.*

¶ "Memoirs," vol. i. p. 44.

relations is valuable, because it shows what the man really was whom Sir Theodore Martin so extravagantly overpraises, and it also enables us to judge of the truthfulness of his cousin's story as to his treatment of her :—

Frau Fanny von Stockmar was always a puzzle to me, more especially as cousin Christian's wife. She was the only daughter of Christian Stockmar's maternal uncle, Sommer, a wealthy apothecary; she was by no means pretty; brought up in the style of the lower middle classes, she had a harsh character, which became more bitter and sour as she grew older, just like a mixture of gall-nuts and vinegar. It was a match without love. Christian married the 100,000 thalers to secure for himself a perfectly independent position in his relations to the Prince. He knew that in this independence lay his power. This political and personal power the Baron Christian von Stockmar managed to preserve, even to his death, during a lengthy career at the Courts of London and Brussels. He loved money, not for its own sake, but he loved it as a means to an end—to his ambitious ends. Love of honour and a desire to rule were the chief features of his character—the mainsprings of his action. And thus he married his unamiable cousin Fanny Sommer's money, and took reluctantly the wife into the bargain. But being a clever diplomatist, he knew how to arrange matters so that his wife was not peculiarly burdensome to him. He only married her that he might live free and unshackled in England, whilst she remained with their children in Koburg. Now and then he would visit his family in Koburg in summer,* and then brought with him for his wife beautiful diamonds in place of love, presents of princely personages to whom the clever diplomatist Baron Stockmar had been of service. Sometimes several years would elapse without Stockmar seeing his wife and children. So far as I know, he has never taken them with him to England or to Brussels.† She sat in quiet Koburg, consumed with jealousy, but scraping, scraping, scraping together money upon money. As years went on she hardened more and more, till she became avarice personified; and by means of this avarice she was able later on to take a terrible revenge on her poor, old, slowly dying husband for her neglected youth.‡

The early days of Karoline were spent in Karlsruhe, the small dull capital of the Grand Duchy of Baden. It was intended that she should be a governess, but early in life she became stage-struck. To use her own words, "All the abundance of earthly bliss I believed to exist upon those giddy boards. Happy child, who in her innocence did not dream how dangerous those boards may become for a poor vain foolish heart, and for a

* The accuracy of this statement is shown *passim*, not only in Martin's "Life of the Prince Consort," but also in the "Memoirs of Stockmar."

† The truth of these statements is also shown by the authorities referred to in the last note, especially "Memoirs of Stockmar," vol. i. p. lv.

‡ "Memoirs," vol. i. pp. 41, 42.

whole ruined human life!"* Her becoming an actress was repulsive to her uncle and godfather, General Bauer. He was indignant at the idea "that his name should be in a playbill, and that a *Bauer*, with the noble blood of the Poniatowskis in her veins, should stand on the ignoble boards. He had rather," he said, "she should be a farm servant."†

A more influential relative than the General was cousin Christian Stockmar, who by the time Karoline was fifteen years old had, from being the medical adviser of Prince Leopold, become his secretary and friend. He had also been created a baron by the King of Saxony. Prince Leopold also by this time had married the Princess Charlotte of Wales, and was left a widower, amply endowed by the English Parliament at the cost of the people. "Christian, says Karoline, was then (1822) the most amiable and charming of cousins. He quickly won my whole child-like confidence," and she confided to him her aspirations to become an actress. He expressed his approval, saying in his original humorous way:—

Aunt Christiane, that which is destined to be good vinegar turns sour soon. Hitherto our family has not been blessed with artistic talent. I shall be glad to call an artiste cousin, and a cousin an artiste; but one thing I must insist upon, Lina, that you turn out a true, dignified, and able *comédienne*, and that you put on every performance new shoes and gloves: *that* you owe to your art and to the respectability of your family.‡

The honour of the united families of Poniatowski Bauer, and Stockmar, the descendants of the yeoman and the pawnbroker, being secured by this stipulation as to new shoes and gloves, it was resolved that the wishes of the stage-struck girl should be gratified. "In that hour," she says, "there was hardly over the whole world a happier mortal than young Linchen."§ She had not attained sixteen years when she made her *début* on the Court stage at Karlsruhe. She says of herself: "I, a girl of fifteen, still a simple innocent child, who looked upon the tree of knowledge just as she would upon a beautiful apple tree, which bears rich juicy fruit for us! Alas! I was not to remain much longer so childlike and simple. In the new world of stage scenes one turns world-wise frightfully fast."|| If her own account of herself be to be believed, she at once achieved an easy and brilliant triumph, but certainly she was not less vain than others of her craft, and her account of her success is no doubt much

* "Memoirs," vol. i. p. 6.

† *Ibid.* vol. i. pp. 11, 42.

of the General's objection.

|| *Ibid.* p. 77.

There is a difference in the two versions
‡ *Ibid.* pp. 42, 43.

§ *Ibid.* p. 43.

exaggerated. She had other experiences which she thus alludes to :—

I was sixteen years old. I was pretty, sought after, and lionized. I was the *enfant gaté* of the Karlsruhe public, and I was a public actress! Under such circumstances it is surely but natural that love approached me—love in all its shapes, love tender and coarse, noble and vulgar—sweet, sweet, love that makes one happy and elevates one to the sky—and false love, that “vile passion,” as old Sophie Schröder used to call it—that dissolute demon of the heart that poisons the character and drags body and soul into the mire. I was [she adds] barely sixteen years old when I loved for the first time with the fervour and ardour of a pure young heart which has not been desecrated by any ignoble thought.*

The first object, to use the language of Mr. Sergeant Buzfuz, “of her young and untried affections,” was a young Hamburger of consumptive tendencies; but “the word love,” she tells us, “was never used between them.” Indeed, the relations between them remind us of those between Nicholas Nickleby and Fanny Squeers, described by the lady as “not exactly engaged, but going to be.” The gentleman going to a party at the house of another actress, was led captive by her at her will, and poor Karoline returned half dead from the party, “on the verge of despair with shame and woe. I had aged,” she tells us, “years that evening. The sweet dream of youth and innocence lay behind me spoiled. I had tasted of the tree of knowledge.” † She then became the object of the insidious attentions of a married man, General Count von Bismarck, of the family of the Bismarck of our day, of whom she details much unsavoury gossip, and who, she says, “ever remained to her an anxious friend and protector, though he never became her lover.” ‡ As to the truth of this last statement, we are free to confess we have grave doubts. The lady herself makes the frank and remarkable confession, that years afterwards the question forced itself upon her, “Wouldst thou have been happier, if thou hadst at that time waited—ignoring the dictates of conscience and heart—and, as reward, become at last Countess Bismarck.” §

Karoline also narrates that when she was but sixteen years old, she was subject to another temptation. “This time,” she continues, “it proceeded from no less a personage than the reigning Duke (of Baden). He was full sixty by that time, had never been married, but had been the most dissolute prince of his age.” ||

An engagement at the Court Theatre at Berlin prevented a

* “Memoirs,” vol. i. p. 83.

† *Ibid.* p. 100.

§ *Ibid.* p. 101.

† *Ibid.* p. 87.

|| *Ibid.* p. 101.

catastrophe. Her description of theatrical life in Berlin sixty years ago is amusing, but we cannot dwell upon it. At Berlin she became subject to an amorous persecution by Prince August, son of the youngest and least distinguished brother of Frederick the Great, and who, on account of his many gallant adventures, was known as "Prince Don Juan." To escape his importunities, Karoline on one occasion jumped out of a window, sought an interview with the King, Frederick Wilhelm III., and besought his protection. The King himself was accustomed to have what were called "patting flirtations" with his actresses, but he indignantly called out again and again, "vile, shocking, *mauvais sujet*—cause disgrace—be calm, child—shall have satisfaction; let justice take its course; but pray, spare Prince for my sake."* To the Prince himself the King in the same spasmodic manner jerked out these injunctions: "Bauer to be let alone—decent girl—don't like that—no scandal—enough talk already among the people—unpleasant."† After this Karoline attracted the admiration of one Samailoff, a Russian swindler, to whom she was publicly betrothed, but ere any marriage could be solemnized his real character was discovered, and he was sentenced to six years' penal servitude."‡

From all these temptations Karoline would have us believe she escaped scatheless, but what then mean her regrets over her knowledge of the tree of good and evil, and the loss of her innocence through becoming an actress? Besides, she admits the existence in Berlin of rumours to the contrary: § we cannot but believe that these rumours had foundation in fact, and that they reached the ears of her cousin Baron Stockmar.

The origin of the connection between Karoline and Prince Leopold is obscure. She states that at a ball in Berlin, in February 1826,

the King was present, attended by a large suite. At his side walked an illustrious English officer, in scarlet uniform resplendent with gold, with a mighty aquiline nose—the Duke of Wellington, the famous hero of the War of Independence. The King nodded to me with a gracious smile, as if he would say, "Ah! you have dressed yourself up very prettily." I also noticed how the King pointed us out to the Duke (Augusta Brede and me). The Duke looked at us very placidly, but then started, and gazing at me very searchingly, whispered a word to the King; he too stopped and fixed his eyes upon me in astonishment; and I could see repeatedly this evening that I was an object of very special attention both for his Majesty and his great English guest. A young officer from the King's suite, who afterwards engaged me to dance, at last satisfied my burning curiosity.

* "Memoirs," vol. i. p. 175.

† *Ibid.* p. 275 *et seq.*

‡ *Ibid.* p. 177.

§ *Ibid.* vol. ii. pp. 110, 131.

He had heard quite distinctly how Wellington whispered to the King in French: "What a remarkable likeness to our late Princess Charlotte of England, the wife of Prince Leopold of Koburg!" We shall soon see how portentous this likeness was to turn out for me.*

The Duke's whisper may have been subjectively interpreted in the officer's mind, as Caroline interpreted the king's smile; but the story is so far corroborated by the fact that early in 1826† the Duke of Wellington went on an embassy to Russia, and we may presume that *en route* he passed through Berlin. If there, he might have attended a ball, and he might have been struck by a likeness between Karoline and the late Princess Charlotte. That there was such a likeness we—if we may believe Karoline—have the testimony of Leopold himself:—

On one occasion, with the greatest equanimity [so she tells us] he compared our points of resemblance. Princess Charlotte had a more finely cut nose but not so pretty a mouth as Mizi. Charlotte was fuller in form; Mizi is the more graceful. The fair hair and the fresh complexion are common to both. And so he continued his complacent analysis, till I impatiently interrupted him. "Your Highness forgets the faithful hearts which in equal fulness beat or have beaten for you!" That put his Royal Highness a little out of countenance.‡

We reject, however, as in the highest degree improbable, what Karoline insinuates but does not venture to affirm, that the Duke reported to the Prince that there existed in Berlin an actress bearing a strong likeness to his deceased wife. According to Karoline, her first meeting with the Prince occurred two years after this. The Prince came to Potsdam on a visit to King Frederick Wilhelm III. His Majesty, according to his custom, appeared at dessert after the dinner given at his expense to the Court actresses, and said kindly to Karoline:

I am looking forward to the enjoyment of the "Hottentottin."§ You sing and dance charmingly. I have chosen a merry piece to cheer up my very taciturn guest. He has made inquiry for you; you are a cousin of Baron Stockmar's, who has unfortunately not accompanied him here; he is in Koburg: the Prince will give him a report about your play. Do your best: be very merry.

Her first impression of her future lover she thus records:—

During the overture I looked through the peephole in the curtain, and there I saw, scarcely five paces distant from the stage, beside the King, a tall, well-made gentleman in the scarlet uniform of an English

* "Memoirs," vol. i. p. 132.

† "Greville's Journal," vol. i. p. 78.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 209. Mizi (Missy?) seems to have been the name by which Leopold familiarly called the lady.

§ It seems to have been a burlesque.

officer, glittering with gold, with a pale, firmly cut face, short black hair, and large, dark, melancholy eyes. His face was more interesting than handsome, and he looked considerably older than I had fancied him to be. In his whole appearance I was soon struck by a look of weariness, almost amounting to exhaustion; there was weariness in his relaxed features, weariness in his bearing, weariness in his slow conversation, weariness in the dull look of his eyes. "The poor melancholy Prince!" [was her comment]. "Well, the Hottentot will do her utmost to-night to cheer him up; and I did my best" [and she had her reward. At her first entrance on the stage] "I noticed even then, with satisfaction, that Prince Leopold did not take his opera-glass off me, and that he sat there quite a changed person—in lively animation, all eyes and ears. During the performance the King and his Court laughed heartily, and even the melancholy Prince Leopold I caught several times faintly smiling.

She adds that the Prince's "opera-glass was again very busy following my merry leaps in my mad Hottentot solo dance." *

This passage is not without bearing on the truthfulness of these Memoirs. This sketch of Leopold is life-like. It may be verified by a glance at Winterhalter's portrait of him, † and it tallies exactly with another verbal sketch of him which will be found in "Villette." Karoline appeared before the Prince in other characters, and on each occasion found "the same favour before his eyes." At this time she and her mother were in pecuniary embarrassments through the extravagance of one of her brothers, a state of things which may easily have led them to listen to the Prince's invitations. She, the mother and daughter, were in a "gloomy mood," considering how they could raise money, when "one Herr Huhnlein was announced. A stout gentleman, looking very fresh and merry, elegantly dressed, his hair frizzled, stood before us, and introduced himself to us as Chamberlain to Prince Leopold of Koburg," ‡ and putting on a very significant air "announced he was sent to inquire if His Royal Highness could pay his respects to Frau Rittmeisterin and Fraulein Bauer the next day?" The request was of course granted, and the interview accordingly took place, "The ever cautious Prince" coming to the house of the actress, not in the Court equipage at his disposal, but in an ordinary hired carriage. The impression the Prince produced on the lady was not so favourable as made by him at the theatre. Instead of his uniform he wore

an unusually long surtout of black cloth, tightly buttoned from top to bottom. His short black hair, glossy with pomatum, seen by daylight, turned out to be a very ingeniously made wig. Add to this, his pale,

* "Memoirs," vol. ii. pp. 30, 32.

† An engraving from this portrait will be found in Martin's "Life of the Prince Consort," vol. ii. p. 249.

‡ "Memoirs," vol. ii. p. 34.

languid complexion, his weary, weary expression, his stooping relaxed gait, his slow, deliberate, subdued way of speaking: all this reminded one more of a pedantic recluse professor and old bachelor of upwards of fifty, than of a gay prince of eight-and-thirty. Only his finely shaped mouth, with its pleasing smile, and his large dark melancholy eyes, were exceedingly interesting and attractive.*

What the lady calls "a rather tedious conversation of about an hour" ensued, which she relates with a verbal precision which would require the services of a practised and dexterous shorthand writer. The conversation was certainly what she describes it, "remarkable, as it was to be decisive for her whole life. I remember," she says, "every word of the conversation between the Prince and myself, as if we had sat thus opposite each other yesterday, and not half a century ago," † but after such a lapse of time, this report of it cannot be verbally accurate. She has dramatized this conversation, and makes the Prince talk like "a heavy father" in a melodrama. The Prince avowed himself struck by the "literally astonishing likeness" in Karoline "to his lamented and ever-beloved wife," and after beating about the bush for about an hour, said suddenly, with a forced laugh and embarrassment: "*Apropos*, friend Stockmar has, besides, commissioned me to examine his cousin a little, 'unter vier augen' (quite privately). May I do so?" Permission was of course granted, and another long conversation followed, in which the Prince made many and close inquiries as to the lady's career and prospects, and above all her love affairs. At length he came to the point: "And your heart was never conquered?" "Never." "Is your heart quite free even this day?" "Quite free!" She forgot her betrothal to the Russian swindler.

The Prince seized my two hands, drew me quite close to him, and breathed into my ear—[what follows is in true "heavy father" style]: "And if a poor, weary, sorely tried man, whom the world envies on account of his high birth and worldly possessions, but who often feels very unhappy and lonely—if he came to you and said, 'Come with me into my golden solitude! I will love and honour thee as my dear wife, and guard thee against any new misfortune of thy heart! Thou shalt be relieved of all earthly care, and also thy family shall be provided for; but thou must also be able to renounce the glitter and glory of the stage—renounce homage and the loud pleasure of this world. Thou must devote thyself wholly and entirely to this man, in true love and sweet happy domesticity.' If this question were addressed to you, what answer would your heart prompt?" I trembled—the tears rushing from my eyes; for this poor, weary,

* "Memoirs," vol. ii. p. 37.

† *Ibid.* p. 39.

sorely tried man stood before me. Much touched, I uttered these words with difficulty, and hardly audibly: "If I were to follow this man into his solitude, I should need to love him more than my life." "And you would be able, in time, to love me so that you would sacrifice for me the stage and the world?" "I do not know, your Highness; but I would try to do so; and then I should tell you the truth only." I felt giddy, and had to hold on by the armchair, lest I should fall with agitation. I felt a soft kiss on my brow.*

The Prince then joined the mother, who was listening behind the door, and addressed her in another long monologue, in which he made this declaration:—

What kind of a position † I can offer your daughter by my side I hardly know as yet. But that it will be a thoroughly honourable one, founded on a moral basis, and that I stand before you with the purest intentions, I believe I cannot better prove to you than by confiding all particulars, formalities, and your Lina's future to the pure hand and to the faithful heart of Christian Stockmar. I shall at once make a full confession to your nephew, who is also my best adviser; he will advise you as well as me, and so well and rightly as no one else can. . . . The hearty affection I conceived for Lina when I first saw her has turned into passionate love this day.

He ended by begging both mother and daughter to visit Koburg while he was there.† If this representation be true, it was on the Prince's part a case of love at first sight, and Stockmar had not sent the Prince on a quest after his cousin; but we are by no means sure that the story is truly told. A long conference between the mother and the daughter followed, in which the mother said, "with wonderful firmness: There are but two advisers and guides possible in this matter—cousin Christian and your own heart." She also plainly told her daughter, "You can only become his morganatic spouse." Within a few days "a short friendly letter arrived from cousin Christian, who invited us to come to Koburg for some days, as soon as possible." Leave of absence from the theatre was obtained, and mother and daughter started away to meet a golden fortune.‡

At Koburg they saw Stockmar, who expressed a wish that they might one day look back with pleasure to the *romantic* cause of their visit. "He was," Karoline observed, "very much agitated. One could hear in every word he pronounced how his nerves vibrated." She found that his wife's surly disposition had grown all the surlier and harsher during the seven years of their strange loveless wedlock, in which the husband lived in

* "Memoirs," vol. ii. pp. 42, 43.

† *Ibid.* pp. 44, 46.

‡ *Ibid.* pp. 48, 49.

English Court circles, and the spouse with the children in small secluded Koburg. "This lady," she adds, "afterwards became my bitterest enemy from jealousy." Stockmar, she found, had become more decidedly Anglified in his dress and manners. "I was also much struck by a strange mixture of the *bourgeois* and courtier which showed itself in his deportment. However, his peculiar talent for dictatorial rule had developed itself most perceptibly in him." She reports, *quasi verbatim*, a long discourse of Stockmar's, "*mon fidèle soutien et ami*," as Leopold was fond of calling him. It is evidently dramatized, but the facts in it may be distinguished from the "embroidery." The Prince, his adviser frankly, indeed cynically said, amused himself with silly *liaisons*. Beautiful ladies of rank threw out their nets after him, but when they found they would have to become as it were dead to the world, "and that their allowance too would of necessity be small," they desisted in their attempts to catch him. The Prince was not rich; he had only an annual allowance of £50,000 from England, and with his great economy had saved out of that in the course of time. "Yes," he added, "the Prince is very economical. Great wealth, therefore, will not be obtained from him." The Prince's intentions towards Karoline were honest, and he wished to conclude nothing but an honourable union, and he had put the matter into Stockmar's hand, and given him *carte blanche*. What Stockmar's ideas of an honourable union were he plainly stated. A morganatic marriage would take place, and Karoline would receive the title of "Countess"—of course quite privately. Should the Prince be made King of Greece,* it is evident that he could not take with him to Athens a morganatic wife. In such an emergency the secret bond which alone could unite Karoline to the Prince would require to be untied again just as privately as it was tied. In the end Stockmar obtained a promise from his cousin that she would blindly follow his advice and guidance. The mother naturally took alarm at the prospect held out, and, deeply moved, cried, "Good God! What cliffs have we got between. My heart tells me, 'Lina, remain free; remain an artiste!' We are not a match for these dangers."† The first meeting in Koburg of Leopold and Karoline was at a popular festival at the Rosenau,‡ the summer residence of the Grand Dukes, and the birthplace of the Prince

* Negotiations for the Prince becoming the first King of Greece were then on foot.

† "Memoirs," vol. ii. pp. 50-58.

‡ An engraving of the Rosenau is one of the illustrations in the "Life of the Prince Consort." See vol. i. p. 285.

Consort. Karoline notes that he, then "a delicate boy of nine," was at this festival. Both Leopold and Karoline had been carefully tutored for the occasion by Stockmar:—

The Prince welcomed me [narrates the lady] only by a look, but there was a sort of understanding in our looks that made me blush. The Prince then said aloud, "I am delighted to see the charming 'Hottentot,' who delighted me so in Potsdam, spin around so merrily with our young Koburg farmers here upon the turf!" I replied: "Your Highness, it makes me very happy that you remember the poor Hottentot at all. The risk of dancing here upon the turf is hardly less than upon the little stage of the new palace before such critical eyes!" The Prince bowed with a smile, whispering to me as he did so, "I long for the hour of meeting you at Fulbach! Meanwhile, God speed!" This was accompanied by a bright flash from his eyes, which pierced me to the heart. I felt how my cheeks burned. The Prince captivated me more and more. Christian laughingly whispered to me, "So I have seen you play comedy for the first time, little cousin, and you played it very well *extempore*: it really looked as if you spoke to the Prince for the first time." He also behaved very well.*

The day following this festival "the Prince's faithful friend drove his aunt and cousin to Fulbach,† where by appointment they met the Prince. A long interview took place: we have space only for a few extracts from Karoline's lengthy tale. After relating how the Prince clasped her tenderly in his arms and kissed her on the brow and mouth, she puts into his mouth another speech of the "heavy father" kind, which, she says, he uttered "feelingly":

I may hope that your heart is favourably inclined towards me, and will gradually learn also to love me a little—me who am so much older than you, and who have been tried so deeply. I cannot expect more at present. I declare at once that you have become dearer to me from hour to hour since we first met—that I hope to find again by your side the happiness I lost so soon, together with quietness and peace. Only one thing I beg of you to tell me, even now, frankly and openly: is there a man whom you like more than me, whom you would find it at all hard to give up?

The lady reiterated, of course "from the bottom of her heart and with perfect truth," her former assurance: "No, your Highness, there is no man I like better than you, and my heart feels more and more drawn towards you!" "I thank you: that is quite sufficient for me to-day." After more talk of the same kind, the Prince, observing "that cousin Christian looked cross

* "Memoirs," vol. ii. pp. 62, 63.

† It seems to have been a country house of the Grand Ducal family.

and annoyed," said gaily, "No, Stocki, you have no occasion to be angry; all remains as your dictatorial will arranged it. Not before the spring, after my return from Italy, will the blissful love-knot be tied, if your lovely cousin should then please to have me still. . . . After a while my cousin looked cheerful again, and nodded to me approvingly." The lovers parted: the Prince went to Italy; Karoline and her mother returned to Berlin, where innumerable innuendoes and disguised allusions to Karoline's sudden journey to Koburg began to reach her ears, and she received this warning from a fellow-actress: "Beware, sweet floweret, beware of the fate of the beautiful Greek!"*

Some months passed with little communication between the ladies at Berlin and the Prince and his faithful friend, but at the end of April 1829 a banker's clerk called at the ladies' house, commissioned by Stockmar to pay the mother 1200 thalers, and to deliver a letter. This, which Karoline describes as "the fateful letter," is that letter of Baron Stockmar's to which the English publishers of this book triumphantly appeal in proof of the truth of Karoline's story as to her connection with Leopold, and Stockmar's complicity in bringing it about. It is in these words:—

MY GOOD KAROLINE,—Should you really feel able to renounce the stage, and your heart harbour the same feelings as your letter manifested, then quit Berlin at the latest in a few weeks. You are expected with longing, and may enter on this new path of life cheerfully and calmly. Kind regards to your mother. You must travel by way of Frankfort-on-the-Main and Brussels to Calais, without footman, and let nobody know anything about the object of your journey, otherwise I shall not be responsible for the consequences. Alight in Calais at the Hôtel Mesière; Hühnlein will be waiting for you there to accompany you to Dover and further. So apply without delay for your release from the theatre. If they should refuse to accept your resignation before the end of the contract, then appeal to the King's grace through your old friend and patron Timm, but with the request in the meantime that he will keep the matter a profound secret. All other matters can be arranged from here. To acquaintances you may state that you leave Berlin on a starring tour. Farewell; may God protect you, and may we meet again with glad hearts.

Your true and faithful cousin,

STOCKMAR.

P.S.—I hope that 1200 thalers will suffice for travelling and the sundry necessary expenses.†

* "Memoirs," vol. ii. p. 75.

† Vol. ii. p. 78; conf. "Copies Correspondence," &c., p. 13. 1200 thalers = £180 sterling.

Like a Crusader of old, Karoline "with unspeakable emotion" cried, "So it is to be! God wills it!" and locked her "mother passionately in her arms." * The mother, more prudent and experienced, was not so confident that she saw—to use a common phrase of our Puritan forefathers—"The hand of the Lord of hosts in the matter," and she uttered this marvellous invocation—"Oh, would that God had granted your prayer for your late sister Lottchen's intercession, to let us win something in the lottery, we should be free from all snares and temptations!" "Mother," replied the daughter, "Sister Lottchen's intercession has brought us good Prince Leopold!" I exclaimed once more, courageous and merry, "He is the highest prize that could have fallen to our lot, the luckiest that I could gain for my happiness!" † This display of piety on such an occasion reminds one irresistibly of Mrs. Cole and her Prayer Book.

In Prussia a Court actress, no more than a soldier, could quit the King's service without the King's permission. That permission was solicited by Karoline, and given her by Frederick Wilhelm III., who, if her report be true, was "visibly affected, put his hand on her head," and jerked out, "Prince Leopold is to be envied—may he make you happy! Farewell! Keep us Berliners in your friendly remembrance, and let Timm know how you are getting on." ‡ "Oh, why"—such is Karoline's subsequent reflection on this scene—"did I not fall at the feet of the most excellent monarch at that moment, as my heart prompted me to do? *Why did I not embrace his knees, imploring his Majesty to grant me a contract for ten years with raised salary?* For otherwise my mother and I could not get through all the difficulties in which we were involved. §

The mother and daughter then left Berlin, and travelling by the route prescribed by Stockmar, arrived in the highest spirits at Calais. "I remembered," Karoline says, "the 'sentimental journey' which the good, cheerful, yet melancholy Yorick began here What wisdom there is in his words!" At Calais she expected to meet the Prince's factotum, M. Hühnlein, who on this, if no other occasion, performed for his master a service like that which, if history|| be true, Chiffinch, Charles II.'s confidential servant, was in the habit of performing for him, and whom Stockmar had promised should meet the travellers

* "Memoirs," vol. ii. p. 79.

† *Ibid.* p. 80.

‡ Timm was an official connected with the theatre. Frederick Wilhelm III. himself had not long before this time made amorganatic marriage.

§ *Ibid.* p. 83.

|| *Vid.* Macaulay's "History of England," the account of Charles II.'s death, chapter iii.

there. On their reaching Calais they found Hühnlein had not arrived, at which they were surprised and indignant. Nor did he come for some days. "His Highness," he said, "had suffered from megrim, and had been unable to do without his accustomed personal attendant."* Under the auspicious guidance of M. Hühnlein, the ladies travelled *vid* Dover to London. On the way Karoline was much exercised in mind by the question: "Did the Prince wear a wig as a bridegroom? For the thought of a wig surely affects the flame of love"—the simile is the lady's own—"much as a seidlitz powder does the stomach;" but Hühnlein assured her "that had only come about little by little, and that in reality his Highness need not wear a wig even to-day, if he were not so dreadfully afraid of catching cold in his head."†

A villa in the Regent's Park, which appeared to Karoline "a charming golden cage," had been taken by Stockmar, but both mother and daughter were inflamed with grief and rage because neither he nor his master were at the house to welcome them. The next morning Stockmar came, and in reply to Karoline's indignant remonstrances at the Prince's non-appearance, coolly told her, "You must never forget that Prince Leopold is, and ought to be, a man of circumspection. . . . Do not forget, dears, that *first* stand political considerations, and *then* comes love. Altogether you must not regard these new relations from the standpoint of sentimental Germans, but as strong-minded creatures, who unconditionally confide in my integrity, and fearlessly look into the eyes of the future."‡ The same evening the princely lover came, circumspectly "muffled up like an Arctic explorer, or like a light-fearing highwayman;" he scrutinized Karoline carefully, then he uttered slowly, "Oh, how the spring sun has burnt you on the journey."§ A scene ensued, in which the lady, provoked to the utmost, indignantly, almost hysterically, exclaimed, "I hasten here in devoted love, staking my future as an artiste—nay, my reputation as a woman—and your Highness has no other word of welcome for me than a remark about my sun-burnt complexion! I shall leave England again to-morrow."|| The reason for the Prince's cold demeanour towards the lady seems to have been, that he had received from Berlin an anonymous letter giving a very different account to that given in these Memoirs of Karoline's relations with Prince August of Prussia, the Russian swindler, and other persons, and stigmatizing both mother and daughter as a couple of the worst

* "Memoirs," vol. ii. p. 91.

§ *Ibid.* p. 105.

† *Ibid.* pp. 94, 95.

|| *Ibid.* p. 106.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 103.

intriguers,* who would do anything for money. The version of these affairs given by the anonymous writer seems to us to be quite as—if not more—likely to be true, as Karoline's own version. Karoline, however, maintained her innocence to Stockmar, and affirmed that Prince August himself was her anonymous slanderer. Stockmar issued this fiat, "You remain here as *my guests* till I have compelled the Prince to declare himself whether and when he intends to make you hismorganatic wife in legal and moral form, as *far as circumstances permit*. But let us give the Prince a few weeks' time to settle the matter with his heart in calmness."† The same afternoon, however, Stockmar, after a conference with the Prince, cheerfully said to Karoline, "The Prince has got his lesson, and is quite humble-mouthed. Now, Lina, it rests with you to be prudent as the serpent and lovable and gentle as the dove," ‡ with which scriptural admonition he departed, leaving the Prince and the lady together. "I never," writes Karoline, "spent a more dismal June than that of the year 1829, under the moist sky of England. The life I led was that of a poor, petted, and daintily fed bird in a golden cage." § The Prince's behaviour to her verifies Stockmar's description of him as being "incapable of feeling a deep, ardent love, totally *blasé*, always bored, an egotistical pedant." || "He came," says Karoline, "driving up daily, for a call of an hour or two, dignified, cold, reserved, dreadfully wearisome. We had music, sang from Arion or Italian duets. I played the piano untiringly, and read aloud Henriette Hanke's prosy 'Pearls,' while the Prince diligently and indefatigably *drizzled*." ¶ The singular occupation here mentioned was invented at Versailles in the time of Louis XVI. and Marie Antoinette. Drizzling in French *parfilage* is thus described:—

The most-fashionable ladies of the Court felt no compunction in asking the gentlemen of their acquaintance for cast-off gold and silver epaulets, hilt-bands, galloons, and tassels, with which, according to the fashion of that period, all dresses were overloaded. Then in society they would pull out the gold and silver threads, and finally sell them. . . . A *parfileuse* might make over 100 louis d'ors a year by this industry.**

It was introduced into England by the French emigrés, and was here called "drizzling." Prince Leopold was the most indefatigable of "drizzlers."

On the loveliest days of June, for hours, for deadly hours, the tall

* "Memoirs," vol. ii. p. 110.

† *Ibid.* p. 112.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 113.

§ *Ibid.* p. 114. || *Ibid.* p. 112.

¶ *Ibid.* p. 116.

** *Ibid.* p. 118.

Prince (he measured six feet one inch) with the most solemn earnestness, bending over his elegant drizzling box of tortoise-shell, carefully picking thread after thread out of dirty cast-off silver galloons, as earnestly as if his task had been to unravel the threads of the Fates.*

During these deadly hours the unfortunate Karoline read out page after page till a yawning fit seized her, and she ran to the piano and rattled over some favourite piece, while her mother would turn pale, rub her eyes and temples with eau de Cologne, play with her dog, and finally run into the garden, to avoid yawning in the Prince's face. He, not noticing the ladies' distress, went on unweariedly, and on leaving always showed Karoline how much he had made by drizzling that day. During the year of her stay in England, so much did he make by this pursuit, that, if she may be believed, he "earned a handsome silver tureen," which he gave as a birthday present to his young niece, our present Queen.† At first sight this appears to be a very odd occupation for a man reputed to be of great ability. Probably it may be accounted for on this hypothesis—that the Prince was one of those who can think best when their physical activity is employed. Our readers may remember the instance mentioned by Sir Walter Scott of one of his schoolfellows who remained immovable at the head of his class. Sir Walter noticed that the boy, in saying his lessons, always played with a particular button on his jacket. Sir Walter cut off this button, the boy missed it, blundered in his lesson, and lost his place, which Sir Walter took. We remember also reading of a blind man who could say by heart the 119th psalm. During his repetition of it, he moved the key of his house from one hand to the other; if the key was removed he broke down in his repetition. We have also heard of an eminent contributor to the *Times*—formerly an ornament to the House of Commons, and now of the Upper House—who, while dictating his articles to an amanuensis, occupied himself either at playing at cup and ball or in making nets. In like manner, Prince Leopold may have found that, while engaged in "drizzling," he could better think out any question which engaged his attention. Karoline complained of her monotonous life to Stockmar, who admitted that "drizzling was dreadful," but said that "it must still be endured for a time," and urged that matters should be left in his hands, for, said he, "as yet I have always managed his Highness as it suited me"—a confession which we have no doubt was true, but it is not reconcilable with the vaunted reputation of Stockmar for "disinterestedness." ‡

At length a crisis came. Rumours came from Berlin that

* "Memoirs," vol. ii. p. 119.

† *Ibid.* p. 120.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 121.

Karoline had become the Prince's mistress, and Stockmar, who, as his cousin said, "ruled his master by the superiority of his intellect," declared he would force the Prince to declare whether he loved the lady and intended to give her "a place at his side as his companion for life, a place legally and morally sure," or he would at once conduct her back to Germany.* How strong a control Stockmar had over the Prince is shown by what followed. The next day the Prince came to see Karoline "quite a different man." In dignified "winning words he spoke to me of his love, and of his ardent desire to win me for himself for the rest of his life, and to attach to himself with sacred ties a being who had conquered him by storm."† If this be true, the Prince and his adviser's ideas of sacred ties were singularly lax, for the narrative continues:—

On the 2nd of July, 1829, there took place a kind of marriage ceremony in our little house in Regent's Park, but so drearily desolate that my heart quakes even to-day, and the pen trembles in my hand when I think of it. What wretched notions the Prince and Stockmar had of matrimony and domesticity! No clergyman placed his hand on my head to invoke a blessing, no bridal wreath adorned my locks. Stockmar had drawn up the marriage contract. He, his brother Charles—who looked after the Prince's money matters, and afterwards undertook also many a confidential diplomatic mission—and another witness, whom I dare not name even to-day, signed the marriage contract. In it I received the title of the Countess of Montgomery, and a moderate allowance was settled on me.‡

We agree with our contemporary, *Truth*, in suspecting that this mock marriage is an invention of the lady; indeed, she does not affirm that there was any marriage ceremony. No doubt there was, in consideration of her cohabitation with the Prince, "a modest allowance" settled on her. The invincible ignorance of foreigners as to English titles might make all parties think a German prince could confer on a German lady an English title. A few weeks—limited to the honeymoon—of happiness for both the Prince and the lady followed. "He was as if metamorphosed. His eyes, otherwise so melancholy, beamed; his whole gait appeared more animated, fresh, and gay. He even left off 'drizzling.' These short weeks were," says the lady, "the last romantic weeks in the life of the Prince. It was the last youthful blazing up of his burnt-out heart before it burned down for ever as a heap of cinders."§ The so-called "honeymoon" soon ended. The Prince went to Karlsbad to take the waters. Stockmar paid one of his angel

* "Memoirs," vol. ii. pp. 131, 132.

‡ *Ibid.* pp. 133, 134

† *Ibid.* p. 133.

§ *Ibid.* p. 134.

visits to Koburg, while it was settled that Karoline should live in one of the first hotels in Paris as Countess Montgomery, together with her mother, and under the protection and guidance of her brother enjoy all the splendours of Paris; but she was to avoid all old acquaintance and make no new ones. To Paris she went by "the same road which Yorick, with his great ingenious heart, had once travelled."* In these admiring references to Yorick we are at a loss to discover whether the lady thought Yorick was a real person, or whether she admired Sterne under the name of Yorick. Sterne and Karoline would have been a well-matched pair. Later in the year, Prince joined in Paris "the young blooming creature who was before God his legitimate wife" †—so she describes herself. Karlsbad had not agreed with the Prince. "He was still more taciturn than formerly, went on 'drizzling,' deeply lost in thought, whilst Karoline read out to him mechanically. There was not a vestige of heartiness, not to mention affection." ‡ From Paris Karoline followed the Prince to a solitary and gloomy villa near Claremont. Here the Prince came every day. "His salutations and conversation were grandfatherly." For half an hour before dinner Karoline played the piano with numbed fingers, and sang some songs with blue lips, whilst the Prince, wrapped up like a grandfather in a fur cloak and in fur boots, sat in front of the chimney poking the fire. "Then came dinner; and after dinner, and whilst coffee was being served, I read out," says the poor victim, "page after page of a novel, while Prince Grandpapa, with terrible dignity and perseverance, drizzled till I was threatened with lockjaw by my vain attempts to conceal yawning."§ This monotonous life was sometimes interrupted by horse exercise in Claremont Park, when "His Royal Highness appeared mounted in so comical a way that I," says Karoline, "was seized by an uncontrollable attack of laughter. The cavalier, who was over six feet in height, sat on a small stout pony, his thin princely legs almost touching the ground—a picture à la 'Don Quixote'—and with this *chevalier de la triste figure* I rode up and down upon the narrow lawn. There was little pleasant in it." ||

Karoline sometimes accompanied Stockmar in a ride into the country. On one occasion a handsome elegant cavalier, whom she calls Mr. Somerset, joined them. On taking leave he asked politely if he might be favoured again with the pleasure of meeting the lady in her rides. Stockmar was alarmed lest the Prince's secret should be discovered. "We must," he said, "give up these rides." The gentleman sung abroad "the

* "Memoirs," vol. ii. p. 138.

† *Ibid.* p. 193.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 199.

† *Ibid.* p. 193.

|| *Ibid.* p. 202.

praises of the German beauty who was said to resemble so much the Princess Charlotte." The Prince complained of the lady's "indiscretion in riding outside the park."* This led to "a revolt" on her part. A more awkward meeting was with the Duchess of Kent, who "durst not recognize and salute friendly her early playmate and her daughter. We had become in her eyes," says Karoline, "very doubtful persons." †

Karoline for some time had been anxious to return "to the free, happy life of the stage," and solicited Stockmar's permission to quit her captivity. He advised patience! "Wait," he said, "till the Greek question is settled. ‡ Within the next few weeks or months we shall see clearer in the matter. I should much prefer such a dissolution of your union—no *éclat*; just brought about naturally." § At length, one morning in February 1830,

Stockmar came galloping up, greatly excited. His face, ordinarily so pale, looked flushed, and his eyes sparkled, when, without having exchanged salutations, he called out to us as he approached, "The hour of deliverance is come! The crown of Greece has been definitely offered to the Prince! Karoline, you are free." I went into transports of joy, embraced and kissed my cousin, and laughed and sobbed in the same breath, exclaiming, "Delivered from the night of the grave! Awakened to a new life! My God, I thank Thee that this luckless bond is being dissolved in peace, and not torn asunder in wrath! I thank Thee that I can leave without rancour and in peace a man whom I once thought I loved." Cousin Christian said gravely, "Karoline, I rejoice with you that you are free." ||

In May following, "the Prince declined the Greek crown;" so, said Stockmar, "we shall stay in England, and all remain as before." ¶ A violent quarrel as to money matters between the Prince, Stockmar, and Karoline followed. "Stockmar called her and her mother the most insulting names—'adventuresses,' 'crafty intriguantes,' who had drawn the wealthy Prince into our nets, and had only come to England in order to sponge upon him." ** If these things were really said by Stockmar, their falsehood is manifest from his own letter. "In June following, my union with Prince Leopold," writes the lady, "was dissolved by our mutual representative, Karl Stockmar, in the same mysterious manner as it had been formed the year before." The severance was final and complete. Karoline never saw either the Prince or Baron Stockmar again, nor ever exchanged a line with them. She returned to the stage; ††

* "Memoirs," vol. ii. pp 213, 214.

† The question of the Prince's acceptance of the crown of Greece.

§ "Memoirs," vol. ii. p. 201.

** *Ibid.* p. 313.

† *Ibid.* p. 308.

|| *Ibid.* pp. 206, 290.

†† *Ibid.* pp. 314–323.

¶ *Ibid.* p. 305.

but at some time or other she lived as Countess Montgomery with a Count Montgomery, on a solitary "hill house on the lake of Zurich."* She received the interest of "the modest capital" settled on her by the so-called marriage contract, till new troubles necessitated the payment of the capital itself. Elsewhere she says her pension was one of those for faithful "services" during Leopold's sojourn in this country "which were deducted from his English income before it was repaid to the Treasury, as was the case after he became King of the Belgians."†

The two male characters in this melodrama of "Leopold and Karoline" appear in a bad light. If the case of Leopold be, as Baron Ernest von Stockmar says, "an error not beyond everyday experience,"‡ still, he is shown to be mean, cold-hearted, and selfish, and not the intellectual man he was generally reputed to be.§

We cannot speak in such lenient terms of Stockmar. It was in order, he says himself, to "do the Prince a kindness" that he voluntarily and deliberately brought his cousin from Germany to England to live with the Prince as his mistress,|| but it really was to do himself a service. If the Prince was to have a mistress, it was all-important to Stockmar that she should be "no rival near the throne." We assent to what Karoline says: "He knew that neither I nor my mother would ever try to interfere with his own influence with the Prince. Nay, that this influence could not but be strengthened through us." And further: that, "as their noble, unselfish adviser, he ought sooner to have sacrificed his position with the Prince than to have allowed that Prince to allure us to England into an equivocal relationship."¶

But if Stockmar sinned, he was punished, and that severely. After his final retirement to Koburg he wrote to his old friend "Leopold"—"I confess I was not prepared for so comfortless an old age: often, very often, I am near despair."** The Princess Alice visited him at Koburg, and wrote to the Queen: "The dear old Baron . . . was very kind, but so desponding as to everything! In England and abroad he looks at everything in a black light."†† It was not only public but private and personal matters which troubled him.

* "Memoirs," vol. i. p. 77.

† *Ibid.* vol. ii. pp. 314, 326, 327. At another page she makes Stockmar admit that this capital was paid to him before she left Berlin. ‡ *Ubi supra.*

§ Conf. the interesting sketch of Leopold I. in Sir John Bowring's "Autobiographical Recollections," p. 265; though laudatory, it is consistent with Karoline Bauer's description of Leopold.

|| "Memoirs," vol. ii. p. 122. ¶ *Ibid.* pp. 319, 320. ** *Ibid.* p. 329.

†† "Biographical Sketch of the Princess Alice," p. 35.

“ Old, broken, dying Stockmar [says Karoline or her editor] had most to suffer from the hard hand of his unloving wife, who now most bitterly revenged herself for all the neglect and want of love on his part when he was young and away from her. And the man who had once ruled princes and peoples was now powerless, face to face with the tyranny and sordid avarice of his wife. During his illness, which lasted several years, he could not always, either by prayers or commands, procure in his own house even a bowl of broth, and felt grateful when his two aged sisters brought him the refreshing food! And how keenly must he, the generous, noble courtier and man of the world, have felt when his wife, the Baroness Fanny von Stockmar, was fined fifteen thalers in a Koburg court for having set before her servant food unfit for human consumption!”

Terrible was the last scene of this domestic tragedy :

On the 9th June, 1863, Freiherr Christian von Stockmar died at Koburg. His last hour was terrible. When he lay at the point of death, his hard wife took off his back his shirt and flannel jacket, that after his death, according to Koburg custom, the undertaker might not claim these objects. Then the dying man once more opens his eyes, already dimmed by death, and looks into eyes full of hatred and scorn and satiated vengeance.

In this comment on the sad scene all will agree : “ What an awful dying hour! The most wretched and forlorn beggar would not have exchanged his hour of parting, with the rich, powerful, celebrated Baron Stockmar.”*

ART. VIII.—PRIVATE BILL LEGISLATION.

A Bill to Amend the System of Private Bill Legislation in the United Kingdom. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed Oct. 31, 1884. Brought in by Mr. Sellar, Mr. Davey, Mr. Raikes, Sir Lyon Playfair, and Sir H. Holland. See also debate in House of Commons, Feb. 25, 1885.

THE subject of Private Bill Legislation has been for a good while before a very inattentive public. It has always been a grievance with certain ambitious members of Parliament that they had to sacrifice a good deal of time to the unostentatious work of Private Bill Committees while their tastes would have led them to posture on the larger stage of the House itself in connection with Public Measures. Consequently, the necessity for reform in the method of Private Bill Legislation has never

* “Memoirs,” vol. ii. pp. 329, 330. This account of Stockmar’s illness and dying hours is said to be derived from his sister Friederika.

wanted advocates. There have been several parliamentary inquiries into the subject, and the records of the House bear many resolutions which have been urged upon it from time to time.* But Parliament really cared very little about the matter, and the public cared less. Corporations and companies, upon whom the expense of promoting and opposing Private Bills principally fell, were perfectly satisfied with the tribunal to which such Bills were referred.† The authorities of the House felt some satisfaction in the fact that the revenue arising from the fees paid to Parliament in connection with Private Bills amounted on the average to £70,000 a year, and was sufficient to meet all the expenses which were incurred in maintaining the somewhat crumbling fabric of St. Stephen's, and the entire expenses of the staff of the House of Commons.‡ There was no real anxiety for reform in this matter in any authoritative quarter, and the question would probably have remained simply a topic for grumbling had not some new circumstances, quite unconnected with Private Bill Legislation, arisen, which have given an importance to the question which it did not formerly possess, and make it necessary that the public should give some of that attention to the matter which it has hitherto wisely withheld. But although all those who were mainly concerned in the matter were, as we have said, satisfied to let things alone, it was not to be expected that the duties in connection with Private Bill Committees, which are to some members exceedingly irksome, would fail to prompt some one to demand reform. Nowadays when a man enters the House of Commons, if he desires to do more than enhance his social position by belonging to what *used* to be called the "best Club in London"—an epithet which is, however, ceasing to be applicable—he must make it his duty to look about him for a political hobby on which he may rock, if not ride, into public notice. For comparatively small men to attempt to be "all-round" statesmen seems to be a mistake.

* A Committee investigated the matter in 1863. A joint-Committee of the two Houses inquired into it in 1869. Mr. Dodson proposed his resolutions in 1872. Mr. Sellar proposed his resolutions in March, 1883, and March, 1884. It appears that there have been some fifteen Committees and Commissions to inquire and report as to this matter in the last fifty years, and yet nothing has been done.

† See "Notes on Private Bill Legislation," by Sir Theodore Martin. The testimony of such men as Lord Bury and Mr. Leman in 1872, and of Sir Joseph Pease, Mr. Laing, and Mr. Gregory in 1883 and 1884, ought to have convinced the House that those who were principally concerned in the matters brought before Private Bill Committees were satisfied with the tribunal. That these persons were more likely to form a just conclusion than Mr. Sellar's colleagues at the Scotch Bar is obvious.

‡ See speech of Sir John Kennaway in the House of Commons. (Hansard, vol. cclxxvi. p. 1639, March 6, 1883.)

"Names" are most easily made in connection with some small measure, and by "pegging away at it." Now, Private Bill Legislation was a good safe nag for any man who did not feel inclined to bestride the more spirited and risky "mounts" which the course offered. Lord Monk-Bretton (then Mr. Dodson) had in 1872 made a little name out of it; and it was not to be wondered at that when the new member for the Haddington Burghs came into Parliament, and sought for a hobby, he should adopt this one. Mr. Sellar is a member of the Scotch Bar, and from his training ought to be in a position to express an opinion upon such matters. But we are far from certain that Mr. Sellar, before the mantle of Mr. Dodson fell upon him, had any special knowledge of the subject. He had not, if we are rightly informed, practised his profession in Scotland; had never held a brief before a Parliamentary Committee; and he had not up to the time he took this matter in hand—a month after he took his seat in the House—served as a member of any Private Bill Committee. Since he identified himself with the subject, we believe he has had some experience of the duties of members on Committees. But, apart from the disqualification of want of experience, we say at once that we do not think the Bill could have fallen into better hands.* The Bill for which he is responsible is, we think, the best solution of the problem of Private Bill Legislation Reform, if it is admitted that reform is necessary or expedient. But, as we said, the subject has at the present time an importance not its own. The matter has got mixed up with the whole subject of Parliamentary Procedure. This reform is urged on the ground that the time of the Legislature must not be wasted in the consideration of Private Bills, that the duties which members have now to perform in relation to Grand Committees make it impossible for them to devote time to the long and tedious inquiries which have to be made into the merits of Private Bills, and consequently that it has become necessary to delegate certain of the functions of Parliament in relation to these measures to a special tribunal. It is because this comparatively small matter of Private Bill

* We prefer to put a qualification of this statement in a note. In his first speech in the House on this subject, Mr. Sellar made some rash and erroneous statements; for instance, he stated that "there are always five or six counsel on a Bill;" that "fees of 500 or even 1,000 guineas for brief fees are not uncommon;" that the expenses in the Hull and Barnsley Railway Bill were "so lavish as to be almost inconceivable." (See Hansard, vol. cxxlvi. p. 1611, March 6, 1883.) These statements were both rash and erroneous. His statement in the following year, that Committees had a deadening effect upon enterprise, was, to our thinking, equally foolish. But it is only fair to say that his recent article in the *Nineteenth Century* is not marked by such exaggerations, although his arguments are precisely the same.

Legislation has got entangled with these graver issues that we think it demands consideration. And first it may be well to consider the matter apart from these important connections; and the question to be answered is: Is the present system of Private Bill Legislation satisfactory? and, if that question is answered in the negative, How is it to be reformed?

Now, in endeavouring to answer these questions, it is well to bear in mind what Private Bill Legislation really is. Most people are aware that, when a railway has to be made, or when water has to be brought from a distance for a town supply, it is usual to apply to Parliament for its sanction; but the fact that in relation to the rights of certain individuals the Bills which are promoted for these purposes stand upon precisely the same footing as Public Bills is often lost sight of. Even Mr. Sellar does not seem to understand the similarity of these two classes of measures. He says: "A Private Bill has been defined as a Bill for the particular interest or benefit of any person or persons; and the distinction between a Public and a Private Bill is that, whereas the former deals with matters of public policy, in which the whole community is interested, the latter deals with matters of private interest only, whether that be the interest of an individual, or a public company or corporation, or of a parish, city, county, or other locality."* Now, this seems to be an entirely erroneous definition, and the distinction which is founded upon it is equally wide of the mark. In old days the policy of the State was to leave many matters which were in reality public duties to be performed, in the interest of the public, by private enterprise. It is only recently that the State has become a carrier of letters and telegraphic messages, and at the present time, although the matter has been mooted, the State purchase of railways has not come within the range of practical politics. Indeed, there was wisdom in this policy. Many speculative matters which involve public interests will be undertaken by private adventurers for the sake of gain which Government could not properly have anything to do with.† The acquisition of railways, gas, and water works by the State, or by the Local Governments of towns and districts, is advocated only when these have become paying concerns, and there are grave and weighty doubts expressed by many whether even then it is a wise thing

* *Nineteenth Century* for February, 1886, p. 351.

† This statement is illustrated by the history of enterprise since the Electric Lighting Act, 1882, became law. That Act was of a blighting nature, and very little has been done in connection with the development of electric lighting since it passed. But we are convinced that nothing has been done by corporations, commissioners, vestries, and others, except to attempt to secure licences with the view of preventing companies securing consumers within their boundaries.

to fill the hands of Government with these semi-commercial undertakings. But this matter is apart from our present purpose, which was to show that every Private Bill had to do with the devolution of certain public duties upon private persons for the benefit of the community. It is not enough for the promoters of a Private Bill to show that the proposed railway will be a remunerative undertaking; they must prove that its construction is in the public interest. It is upon the latter, not upon the former, ground that they are given compulsory powers for the acquisition of land, and that they are enabled to charge tolls for the use of the railway. It is evident, then, that a Private Bill is not a Bill "for the benefit of a particular interest or a particular person;" it is a Bill for the devolution of certain powers upon a private company or corporation, which powers are to be exercised for the benefit of the public. The remuneration of the promoters for the capital invested and for the risks they run is a secondary consideration with Parliament, and the ordinary rights of traders to make what profits they can out of their trade are carefully restricted in the case of parliamentary companies, both by clauses limiting the amounts they may charge the public, and by other clauses limiting the profits they may divide amongst their shareholders. Indeed, so far is Mr. Sellar's definition from being correct that it is a fatal objection to a Private Bill, both in the eyes of the Chairman of Committees of the House of Lords and in the eyes of a Committee, that parliamentary powers are sought with the view to promote a private interest. Let us illustrate this. A Bill was promoted to authorize the construction of a short railway to connect a certain wharf, which was in the hands of a company, with a main line leading to London. The proposed railway ran for two-thirds of its length through the lands of A. B., who objected to the line, and opposed the Bill in Parliament. It was shown to the Committee that it was a line promoted in the interest of the wharf company, and the Bill was rejected. We see, then, that Private Bills are not in principle different from Public. That the latter measures deal frequently with the rights of larger classes than the former is an accidental circumstance. A Bill such as that which was promoted two years ago to authorize a railway from London to Brighton would affect the rights of a very large number of property owners. The Private Railway Bills of the various companies which are before Parliament this session, which propose to authorize the charging of terminals and the raising of other rates, affects the interest of large bodies of traders in every part of the country. Take, on the other hand, a Public Bill. That which made a licence necessary to any person who wished to perform vivisection experiments curtailed the liberty of only a very small class in the community. Now this mistake of Mr. Sellar's is a more serious

error than might at first appear. Were the matters dealt with by Committees merely private interests, there would be no better reason for withholding them from the cognizance of judges of position and ability than for withdrawing ordinary actions as to private rights from the Courts of Law. It is because every Private Bill involves considerations of public expediency, it is because every such Bill abrogates some private right which is conferred upon individuals either by the operation of previous Acts of Parliament or by the Common Law, and because every such Bill confers upon private persons or companies the semi-public duty and right of taxing or taking tolls or rates (water or gas) from the public, that there is a reason for Parliament retaining its duties in relation to Private Bills. It is in these days, when Land Nationalization has become a current subject, rather an archaism to talk about the "sacredness of property." But there can be no question of the expediency of guarding each man carefully in any proprietary rights which the State allows him to possess. If a man's property can be lightly taken away, there is a premium upon imprudence, and imprudence is one of the worst sins which can be committed against the State. But, at the same time that you make a man safe in the possession of his property, you must acknowledge the right of the State, when the public necessity demands it, to deprive him of that property, upon making fair and full compensation to the person expropriated. But this supreme legislative act ought to be performed by the supreme power in the State, by Parliament itself; and it seems to us you open the door to many abuses if you delegate this power to any person, however able. But it is said, in answer to such arguments, that, in passing Private Bills, Parliament acts in two characters. It is legislative at one moment and judicial at another, and while the advocates of reform ask Parliament to part with its judicial functions, they do not ask it to delegate any of its legislative duties.* Now this would be a good argument if it were founded on fact. But really the similarity which exists between the inquiries before Private Bill Committees and those which take place in Courts of Law is only a superficial one. There are real and fundamental differences, which Mr. Sellar ought not to have overlooked. It is true that in both there are speeches made, witnesses called, examined and cross-examined, and a decision given. But the issues which are submitted to the two are entirely different. In Courts of Law the matter that has to be determined is a matter of fact, and the duty of the

* "In passing Public Bills," says Mr. Sellar, "Parliament acts strictly in its legislative capacity. In passing Private Bills, Parliament acts in its legislative capacity, but its action in this capacity is for the most part formal. The real and effective proceedings in handling Private Bills by Parliament partake more of the judicial than the legislative character."—(*Nineteenth Century*, p. 353.)

judge is to apply the law to certain definite sets of circumstances. In Committees the question to be determined is one of expediency. Are the advantages which a certain scheme offers to the public so great as to justify the interference with private rights which the Bill proposes? Now, these latter questions can as well be answered satisfactorily by men of sound common-sense as by trained judges. The distinction which we wish our readers to understand is clearly made by a well-informed writer on this subject in the *Law Magazine*.† “There can,” he says, “we think, be no doubt that at one time Parliament exercised functions which were not purely or to any great extent legislative; but were, in fact, judicial or administrative. And the acts by which Parliament endeavoured to separate those two functions were, we think, called for, and the result has been, in our opinion, beneficial to the public. Wherever the determination of the question of rights depends upon the application of fixed rules to various sets of circumstances, then the inquiry is a judicial one, and a mind stored with, and largely under the influence of, decided cases is the proper mind to decide the matter. In the case of Divorce Bills and Election Petitions, the determination depended solely upon the decision of plain issues of fact, and the application to these of strict legal principles. In such matters it is much better that a judge should decide according to law than that Parliament should come to a decision without the requisite knowledge. But to the Private Bills which come before Parliament to-day, no fixed rule can be applied any more than in the case of Public Measures. One would be laughed at if one proposed to have all Public Bills submitted to a Committee of Judges or a Special Tribunal, and why the proposal to submit Private Bills, the expediency of which must be determined by precisely similar considerations, to such a Court should be received with the compliment of seriousness it would be difficult to say. The Committee which hears and disposes of a Petition for a Private Act is performing a purely legislative act. The judge who hears and determines the truth of the allegations in an Election Petition is performing a purely judicial one.”

But it may be worth while to listen to some of those who

* Mr. Sellar not only makes the mistake of asserting that the functions of the Private Bill Committee are judicial, but he also says that the legislative acts of the House in relation to Private Bills are “mere formalities.” This again is an error. The proceedings of the last two sessions show that there have been numerous divisions in the House on the second readings of Private Bills, but we know of numerous instances where Bills have, after having passed through Committee, been committed for further consideration, in some cases to the same Committee, in others to an entirely new Committee. That fact shows that the House retains a real control over the doings of its Committees, and exercises real functions as to Private Bills.

† “Private Bill Legislation,” *Law Magazine*, November, 1880.

have spoken of this matter from within the walls of Parliament itself, in answer to Mr. Sellar's assertion that the duties of Committees are judicial. Mr. Dodson, who submitted a series of resolutions to the House of Commons in 1872 bearing upon this subject, and whose object was to improve and extend the system of Provisional Orders as a substitute for Private Bills in considering how the tribunal which was to decide as to the merits of these should be constituted, said that it ought not to be constituted of judges, on the ground that "there could not be found amongst them the elements best constituted for a tribunal inasmuch as the whole habit of their mind was to adhere strictly to precedent."* Sir William Harcourt, who practised for many years very successfully at the Parliamentary Bar, in the course of the same debate said, "The question for discussion in the case of Private Bills is not essentially, or even mainly, a judicial question; it was an administrative question; in many cases the question involved one of public policy;"† and Mr. Chichester Fortescue (now Lord Carlingford), in speaking in the same debate, said "it was a mistake to suppose that the business before the Private Bill Committee was judicial, and of the same nature as that with which the House had already parted."‡ But it is unnecessary to accumulate authorities on a matter which is so plain. It is quite true that the expediency of passing a Private Bill necessitates an inquiry into facts, but, in this country, we have always thought that twelve honest men in a jury-box were competent to come to a sound conclusion as to such matters, and why a Committee of Parliament should be incompetent to do so it is difficult to see. But Mr. Sellar seems to think that in the case of Public Bills no such inquiry is necessary, and that that fact differentiates the one class of Bills from the other. But is that so? No doubt there are many Public Measures in connection with which the question of expediency is determined upon the facts which are stated in the House itself, but these measures deal with matters that all the members are supposed to be familiar with. In most cases, however, when a Public

* Speech in the House of Commons, 1872. (Hansard, vol. ccx., p. 17, March 15, 1872.)

† Speech in House of Commons, March 22, 1872. (Hansard, vol. ccx. p. 512.)

‡ Speech in House of Commons, March 22, 1872. (Hansard, vol. ccx. pp. 512-6.) Mr. Sclater Booth, a gentleman who has had very considerable experience as a Chairman of Private Bill Committees, said that "the questions which went before Committees were mostly questions of policy and not of law; that the system was generally approved of by the country; and that as to the complaint of the capricious decisions of Committees, if these cases were examined, it would be found that a change of decision was due to fuller information or the altered position of affairs." (Speech in House of Commons, Feb. 25, 1885.)

Bill proposes to deal with a matter which is not thoroughly and currently understood, the necessary preliminary is an inquiry before a Select Committee or by a Royal Commission. We hear of changes in the Lunacy Law. A Select Committee sat and took evidence upon the matter three or four sessions ago. Last year, Mr. Chamberlain introduced a Regulation of Railways Bill, which was founded on the Report of the Select Committee on Railway Rates, which sat in the sessions of 1881 and 1882. But illustrations will be in everybody's mind. It may be said, however, that just as Parliament entrusts certain inquiries to Royal Commissions composed of persons not necessarily members of either House, so it would be only a small and unimportant extension of the principle if it entrusted the inquiry into the proof of the preamble of a Private Bill to an extra-parliamentary tribunal. But there is this distinction to be drawn. A Royal Commission exhausts its functions when it has collected evidence and reported to the House or Government. It does not follow that any legislative action should be founded on the Report; on the other hand, in the case of an extra-parliamentary tribunal to decide upon Private Bills, Parliament must, in almost every case, indorse the decision of the tribunal, it being impossible to try the whole case over again upon a third reading.* What we desire to point out is, that the inquiry which takes place in relation to Private Bills is not an incident of the progress of such measures only through the House, and that that fact does not serve to found any distinction between such Bills and Public Measures.

Having, as we think, disposed of the two initial fallacies upon which the advocates of reform found their argument, it may be worth while to listen to their objections to the present system of Private Bill Legislation. There are, so far as we have read the debates in the two last sessions of Parliament, no new arguments adduced, although one of the old arguments, as we shall point out, has assumed a new importance. The objections, then, to the present system are three. It is, say the

* There seems to be some doubt about this point. Those who advocate delegation are in favour of Parliament retaining a strong hold over the measures submitted to the substituted tribunal. In that case there would in many cases be practically an appeal to the House itself, which would discredit the tribunal, and waste the time of Parliament to an intolerable extent. This fact, if we remember aright, was pointed out by Sir Joseph Pease in the debate which took place in 1883. (Hansard, vol. cclxxvi. March 6, 1883.) This argument was strongly used by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his speech on February 25, 1885. He pointed out, too, that such matters as great Railway Bills could not be trusted to a single judge, and that, if the three judges to be created by the Bill were to hear a single case, the Private Bill Legislation of the country would be at a standstill.—*Times*, February 26, 1885.

opponents, a very costly system. The decisions of Committees, it is asserted, are capricious and uncertain. The hearing of the merits of Private Bills involves an undue consumption of public time. To support the first contention, certain returns of the expenditure in connection with Private Bills were moved for, and furnished. It appears that between 1872 and 1882

Municipal Bodies (spent)	£1,289,757
Railway, Gas, and Water Companies	4,664,874
Canal and Tramway Companies	416,043
Harbours and Docks	360,574
Or together	<u>£6,731,248</u>

Now, these are large figures, and large figures have a way of imposing upon the public, and are often supposed to mean a great deal more than they really do. It appears that on the average some £750,000 has been spent annually in connection with Private Bill Legislation. Now, we conceived that the use that was to be made of these figures was by comparison. The reformers might have founded a strong argument upon them if they could have shown that these large sums had been spent under the old system, and that much smaller sums would have to be expended under the new. That would, we say, have been an argument of some weight, and it is, we think, a proposition which it is incumbent on the reformers to prove if they wish these returns to stand there in any stead. Merely to say the cost is enormous, and quote the figures, is a futile argument, unless it is shown that the contemplated change will reduce it. But would it be believed that this is just what Mr. Sellar does not do? * That he did not attempt it is of itself significant. But we think we can give our readers reasons for believing that under the new system there would be no saving of expense. First of all, one of the great expenses in connection with Private Bills is the House fees. These amount, on an average, to £70,000 or £80,000 a year. Now, there is to be no reduction in this item, for Mr. Sellar proposed to pay the salaries and expenses of his three new parliamentary judges out of it. But, again, these returns are large, but vague, and we should have desired to have further and better particulars. It may not be known that the Private Bill which comes before a Committee in May or June has been a source of expense for

* In his speech of 1883 he said, with *naïveté*, "I think I have now said enough to show that this is the most expensive tribunal that exists anywhere" (Hansard, vol. cclxxvi. p. 1616), but, although he had quoted some quite erroneous figures as to the expenses of promoters and opponents, before Private Bill Committees, he had not referred to the expenses of suitors before any other court or tribunal whatever. Such "showing" may satisfy an advocate, but can scarcely convince any other body.

many months before that. When a railway or a canal is going to be constructed it is necessary, under the Standing Orders of Parliament, not only to prepare plans and sections and to deposit copies of these in the Private-Bill Office of Parliament and in the office of the Clerk of the Peace in the counties in which the railway or canal will be situated, but to give every owner and occupier whose property will be taken under the powers of the Bill notice asking each whether he assents or dissents or remains neuter to the proposal. The amount of labour and expense that this very necessary precaution entails upon promoters of such Bills is enormous. In the case of a railway like the Hull and Barnsley Railway and Dock, which was authorized in 1880, it will be understood that the surveying for plans and sections of a railway sixty-five miles in length, with a dock at one end, and the "referencing" and serving notices upon the owners of property along the line must have been a most serious labour and a very considerable expense.* The work requires to be very carefully done, as will be shown by the fact that the London, Reigate, and Brighton Bill, 1883, was thrown out on Standing Orders because a clerk, in enumerating the working-classes displaced by the railway works, if constructed, had counted two children as one adult. Now, all this work is left untouched by Mr. Sellar's Bill. These are essential preliminaries, whatever tribunal is to dispose of the Bill on its merits. But these very serious expenses are included in the big figures which we have given above, and would not be subject to reduction if Mr. Sellar's Bill passed into law.

Where, then, is the economy which is looked for to be effected? A very large item of expense in connection with Private Bills at the present time is the shorthand writing and printing. If the returns had shown on what the large sums included in them were spent, they would have been much more instructive, and they would have disclosed the fact that shorthand writing and printing absorb very large sums of money. But there is nothing in the new system which will minimize these expenses. Witnesses will have to be paid, whether they

* In such a case we are informed that the "preliminary" expenses would probably amount to £15,000. We should have liked some information as to the actual cost incurred in the Committee stage of the Bill. It is said vaguely that the promotion of the Ship Canal Bill cost £100,000, but how much of that was incurred in connection with expenses which would be affected by Mr. Sellar's Bill? Besides, these expenses are not so enormous. A local inquiry before an Inspector of the Local Government Board in the Lower Thames Valley Drainage cost £45,000, and the taxed costs of the defendants in the action of *The London Financial Association v. Kelk and others* amounted to £30,000, the case only lasting twenty days in the Chancery Division, while the Ship Canal Bill was some seventy or eighty days before Committee.

give evidence before a judge or before four or five members of one of the Houses of Parliament. It is undoubtedly true that very large sums are paid to expert witnesses for giving evidence before Parliamentary Committees. It is said that 1,000 guineas has been given to engineers and traffic managers upon many occasions. But these payments are in relation to the value that the expert himself and those wishing to have the benefit of his opinion and evidence put upon his evidence, and not to the existing system. Indeed, there can be little doubt that, if the inquiries were held locally instead of in London, the sums which would have to be paid to such "swagger" witnesses would be very much greater.* There is nothing in the Bill which will prevent such expenses being incurred. Where, then, does Mr. Sellar expect the economy of the new system to come in? From one of his speeches in the House of Commons † we suspect that he thinks there might be a saving in the fees paid to counsel. The writer in the *Edinburgh Review*, ‡ who is particularly well informed in such matters, has shown that the fees paid at the Parliamentary Bar are by no means excessive.§ The incomes that are nowadays made at that Bar—even in such busy years as 1881—are much smaller than the incomes which are made by successful men practising before the Queen's Bench or Chancery Divisions. Mr. Sellar speaks of the fees being high, but it is in such points that his want of practical experience tells against him. The fees paid to leading counsel and to the veriest junior are at the Parliamentary Bar (with the exception, of course, of the brief fee) the same, and while five guineas for a consultation and ten guineas for a refresher are large fees for a young gentleman who has just been "called," and who has got a brief because his father is chairman of the company, or because his uncle or brother is engineer to the scheme, they are, as compared with the fees paid to leaders in other cases—not parliamentary—exceedingly small. It is true that the fee for consultation with a "silk" is two guineas; but in many important cases, and in most arbitrations, a good leader's "refresher" will vary from thirty-five guineas to fifty guineas a day. But whatever the fees are, is there any probability that the fees paid before the new tribunal will be

* Such witnesses have been taken down to some of the local inquiries held before the Railway Commissioners.

† March, 1883.

‡ January, 1885.

§ In the House of Commons Mr. Dick Peddie said that the opponents to the change would be the parliamentary lawyers and counsel, and those who had vested interests in the existing system. We cannot see how the change proposed would affect the interests of those gentlemen to any appreciable extent, and we are fortified in this belief by the fact that the writer of the article proposing or advocating this change must from his thorough knowledge of the subject be a member of the Parliamentary Bar.

on a lower scale? If not, the argument that a change will be economical must be abandoned. Perhaps the best way of arriving at a conclusion upon such a point is to see what has happened. As we know, the jurisdiction to hear and determine on the truth of the allegations in Election Petitions was transferred to judges under the Act of 1868. The fees while such matters came before Committees were, as a rule, much the same as those which are now paid in connection with the promotion of, and opposition to, Private Bills. Has the change effected economy in this respect? Those gentlemen who have paid their lawyers' bills will know. It is certain that the fees now paid to counsel are, on the average, five times heavier than those which used to be paid. A brief fee of 300 guineas is a common one, and the ordinary refresher is fifty guineas a day. These fees are justified by the fact that the counsel who accepts an Election Petition brief has to leave London—for the inquiry is a local one—and must sacrifice some of his practice. In the old days he could combine his work before the Election Committee and before other Committees or Courts. But let us see what is the experience in connection with an entirely new tribunal. Is the Railway Commission a cheap court? So far as the court fees are concerned, we believe that it is; but, of course, the revenue derived from these goes a very little way to meet the expenses of the court. So far as the fees paid to counsel are concerned, it is decidedly a dear court. One of the heaviest cases before Parliament in recent years was the Manchester Corporation Water (Thirlmere) Bill. It occupied some three weeks in the hearing before a Committee presided over by Sir Lyon Playfair (then Dr. Lyon Playfair). The leading counsel for the Corporation of Manchester had a brief fee of exactly the same amount as that which was given to the Solicitor-General in a recent case before the Railway Commissioners, which was settled five minutes after the parties went into court. But, generally, the fees paid to counsel in cases before the Railway Commissioners are higher than those paid to counsel before Committees of Parliament. Where, then, does Mr. Sellar find ground for the hope he expresses—that, if his Bill passes, there will be “greater economy” than in the past. It is quite easy to express expectation: it is somewhat more difficult to show that that expectation has a rational basis, and it is in the latter point that Mr. Sellar has failed.

Let us pass, then, to the second objection to the present system—viz., that the decisions of Committees are uncertain and capricious. This objection goes to the question of the capacity of the tribunals, and if it could be shown that their decisions were frequently erroneous or unsatisfactory—that, on the whole, justice was not done—that would undoubtedly be a

strong reason for saying that a change must be made. But mark, the allegation is not that injustice is done—indeed, all the advocates of the change repudiate such a suggestion—but that the decisions are uncertain. Now this objection arises only from a misunderstanding upon the part of those who make it. Uniformity of decision upon matters of law is of course to be desired. It is true it is far from attained, and it is one of the complaints against the whole system of law that common men are expected to guide their conduct and practice by rules concerning which a dozen judges in different, inferior and superior, courts differ diametrically in opinion. But, although it is difficult to arrive at, uniformity of decision in mere matters of law is to be desired and striven for.* But in matters of fact there can be no uniformity of decision—the results must be uncertain. Whoever complained that the verdicts of juries at *nisi prius* were uncertain? And yet they are uncertain, and lack uniformity in precisely the same way as the decisions of Committees of Parliament do. Sir Edmund Beckett, who is an authority on most subjects, but is certainly more than an authority on questions affecting Private Bill Legislation, has said: “‘Uniformity of decision,’ which can only be opinion on the balance of evidence on different questions of fact and expediency, is a phrase that has no meaning. Uniformity of practice is quite another thing, and the suitors have a right to expect that the practice should be uniform, and not capricious.” But it is evident that the questions which are submitted to Committees are questions of policy in relation to which uniformity would be altogether out of place. But the advocates of this change have, or think they have, a “modern instance” of “uncertainty” of decision which helps them. Both the writer in the *Edinburgh Review* and Mr. Sellar in his *Nineteenth Century* article have pitched upon the Manchester Ship Canal Bill as a glaring instance of the uncertainty of parliamentary tribunals. It is, of course, quite certain that if there is to be only one inquiry before the parliamentary judges, instead of two, as there may be at present (one before a Committee of the Commons and another before a Committee of the Lords), the chances of detecting “uncertainty” are, of

* We admit that we were amused by Mr. Sellar’s argument on this point. He quotes from Mr. Hope Scott, who said, as to Parliament, “It is a lottery, and which ever side comes to me I say you may win or you may lose; I cannot tell you which,” and goes on to assert that in ordinary law cases your lawyer can tell you whether you will succeed or not, and will never wait to express an opinion on that point until he knows the judge the case is to be tried before. This confirms us in the belief that the member for the Haddington Burghs has not practised his profession. Our experience of lawyers and counsel is not parallel to his. Lawyers express confident opinions, and, when the case goes against them, hold out that the court is wrong; but that certainty of prediction as to what the court will do is altogether outside our experience.

course, diminished; but it is equally true that the reputations of courts of first instance would be better preserved if there was no opportunity of testing their correctness by a court of appeal. And, before further examining the meaning of this foolish demand for "uniformity of decision," it may be as well to deal here with the question as to whether there should be one inquiry, as proposed by the Bill, or two, as exists under the present system. It is very often taken for granted, quite erroneously, that every Bill has to be heard on its merits in two Committees. If returns were asked for by members of Parliament with the view of showing the whole truth, instead of merely eliciting the information that is required to support their particular views, the return as to the expenses of Private Bills might have been supplemented by another showing how many Bills have been referred to Committees in both Houses. No doubt, important schemes like the Manchester Ship Canal Bill, the Regent's Canal Railway Bill, and the like, involving the expenditure of very large sums of money, and consequences of a very serious nature to various persons and companies, would be contested in both Houses, but a very large majority of the opposed Bills are opposed in one House only. And the opponents either manage to get the redress they desire in that House, or extort it from the promoters before the Bill goes into Committee in the second House. But in the cases where Bills have been referred to Committees in both Houses in the past, it is only fair to say that, according to the scheme of Mr. Sellar's Bill, they would only have to be considered once in future, and, when we were considering the question of the possible saving to be effected by the change, we ought to have given him credit for this, although, as we have pointed out, the saving would not be very large, as the number of Bills which are twice opposed before Committee is not great. But here there arises a question of efficiency, which must be set against the saving. Will it be satisfactory in future only to have one hearing, and no possibility, in cases of error in the first instance, of appeal? The amounts of money at stake in these parliamentary contests are often enormous. If a judge goes wrong in that, is there to be no possibility of setting him right, although in a court of law a costermonger who has been run down and had his cart damaged has a right to have his twopenny-halfpenny case heard on appeal? Is it reasonable to suppose that the great interests affected by these Bills will suffer themselves to be disposed of thus summarily? Mr. Sellar does not propose to allow any rehearing. Mr. Dodson, when he had charge of this matter, and wanted to relegate the business to a "permanent tribunal," proposed to allow an appeal in cases where Parliament thought fit to do so. The present Home Secretary, however, was of opinion that the

appeal should be one of right, and not conditioned by the consent of Parliament or left to the discretion of any intermediate tribunal. One or two of his remarks on this subject are worth quoting. "Objections," he said, "had been taken to the proposal of an appeal to the House of Lords. He did not think it was a bad thing. Over and over again he had known decisions reversed by the House of Lords, and he never recalled any in which the reversal of the House of Lords was not right. That was natural, because, when the case went from the House of Commons to the House of Lords and received a second hearing, it came naturally to be better understood. It would be a mistake to make one Standing Committee which could give only one hearing, because second hearings in cases of great importance were very valuable."* There are, too, one or two words in Sir Theodore Martin's "Notes on Private Bill Legislation" which are worth reproduction in this place.

The interests dealt with [he says] by Private Bills are of such magnitude as to entitle them to the review of a second tribunal; and promoters who are seeking great privileges from Parliament have no right to complain of an appeal against an adverse decision by those whose rights or properties are affected by it. Committees, whether of Lords or Commons, may be misled, as even tribunals purely judicial are liable to be, by circumstances which prevent the discovery of truth—such, for example, as partial representations or evidence which has come upon one of the parties by surprise. A tribunal of appeal, before which the true issue is raised more clearly, and on sifted evidence, is not liable to the same chances of error.†

But we have a little case in point. When the Regulation of Railways Act, 1873 was passed, it was thought well to make the proceedings before the new railway tribunal final, for it was said, with some truth, a comparatively poor trader may be ruined by a wealthy railway company in appeals from one tribunal to another. But the unsatisfactory working of this system has led to the necessity for a change. The Select Committee on the Railway Commission and on Rates and Fares reported in favour of an appeal, and the Bill introduced by Mr. Chamberlain last session provided for carrying out that recommendation. But if the

* Speech in House of Commons, March 15, 1872. (Hansard, vol. 210, p. 512.)

† Quoted in the article on "Private Bill Legislation," *Law Magazine*, November, 1880. It is worth while noting that it is the great railway companies, through Sir Joseph Pease and others, who are in favour of this "one-hearing system." Of course it would be a change eminently in favour of promoters. The promoters of the Ship Canal Bill saw this, tried, through Mr. Jacob Bright, to have their Bill of this session referred to a joint Select Committee. The opponents, however, strongly objected, and the Bill was dealt with in the ordinary way.

interests of railway companies dealt with before the railway tribunal are so important as to make an appeal of right a necessity, it is certain that the interests which are involved in Private Bills are so great as to demand and require a second hearing. Even the *Edinburgh Reviewer* proposes to allow an appeal in important matters like the Parks Railway Bill of 1884.*

Now let us return to the question of the want of uniformity, and see whether the instance which has been selected bears out the allegation. We do not think it does, and we believe the reader will come to the conclusion that it is a case which bears out Sir William Harcourt's opinion that a "second hearing in cases of great importance is very important." The *Edinburgh Reviewer* evidently liked the quip, that a Bill (the Manchester Ship Canal Bill) which had passed both Houses was rejected, too well to think about the facts or to inquire into the circumstances. But those who followed with any interest the proceedings on that very important Bill will remember the facts. The scheme of the promoters of the Ship Canal was to make an ordinary canal from Runcorn to Throstlenest in Manchester. That canal was to be of such dimensions as to allow large ocean-going cargo vessels to reach the dock which was to be constructed on the site of the race-course in Manchester. But from the Runcorn end of the canal the Bill proposed to authorize the construction of a deep-water channel, ten miles in length, through the upper estuary of the Mersey, terminating opposite the Garston Docks of the London and North-Western Railway Company. But, although a clause in their Bill of 1882-3 authorized the construction of that deep-water channel, the promoters had not deposited plans and sections showing the position and dimensions of the channel they proposed to construct. The Examiner of Private Bills reported non-compliance with Standing Orders, and the Standing Orders Committee allowed the Bill to proceed only on condition that the promoters struck out the clause authorizing the estuary works. The Bill thus altered was referred to a Committee presided over by Sir Joseph Bayley. Of course, on the face of it, it looked a very absurd scheme, for it was only to make a canal from Manchester to Runcorn, and there was by confession no means by which large sea-going vessels could get through the sands of the Upper Mersey to or from the sea. But when the Bill came before the Committee, counsel for the promoters argued that, although the clause authorizing the deep-water channel was struck out, the

* When the trial of Election Petitions was delegated by the House of Commons to the election judges, such cases were in the first instance tried by one judge sitting alone. But that failed to give satisfaction, and the law was altered, and Election Petitions are now heard before two judges.

promoters were by the Bill to become the owners of the Mersey and Irwell Navigation and the Bridgewater Canal, and that under the statutory powers of these companies the Ship Canal Company, when incorporated; could construct the seaward communication of the canal. This point was argued at great length on both sides, but of course the Committee was incompetent to decide the point, as it turned upon the construction of Acts of Parliament. They did not decide the point, but seem to have come to the conclusion that there was so much in it as to make it worth their while to hear the promoters' evidence. They did so, and the Committee inserted in the preamble a recital that the construction of a ship canal to Manchester would be a great benefit to the trade of South Lancashire, and they passed the Bill, with a clause preventing the promoters beginning the canal until they had applied for, and got, the permission of Parliament to construct a deep-water channel. That Bill, of course, did not authorize any estuary works, and when it came before the House of Lords, and it was evident that even if the Lords Committee passed the Bill the promoters would have to come to Parliament again to sanction the construction of the works in the Upper Mersey, Lord Camperdown's Committee rejected the Bill. The phrase of the chairman in announcing the decision was not without its significance. The Commons, when they report a Bill, declare that the preamble is not proved. The Lords declare that the Bill may not proceed. Lord Camperdown, in that instance, said that it was inexpedient to proceed with the Bill in the present session of Parliament. Now, although these decisions were opposed to one another, they were both in a sense defensible. They were conclusions on complicated questions of policy and expediency to which any two different sets of men might readily and rationally have come. They are not such as to found a charge of incapacity against the tribunals which heard the cases. The Commons sanctioned the canal to Runcorn, but said, "You must not begin that work until you have got power to make the deep-water channel." The Lords in effect said, "You have got to come to Parliament again; come with a complete scheme next year." Now we come to the year 1884. In that year the promoters came with a complete scheme. This time plans and sections had been deposited, and the Bill, commencing in the House of Lords, came before the Duke of Richmond's Committee. The inquiry lasted forty days, and was conducted with admirable patience. The real question was not as to the making of the canal, but as to whether the construction of the deep-water channel would have the effect of causing accretion in the upper estuary of the Mersey. Of course there were minor issues of facts, like the sufficiency of the estimates, and the probability of the canal being remunerative if it

was constructed ; but the main issue was whether the estuary works would cause silting in the estuary to the injury of the ports of Liverpool and Garston, and possibly to the detriment of the bar of the Mersey. It seems to have been practically conceded that the construction of the canal would be a great advantage to the trade of Manchester and the whole of South Lancashire. But of course the free access to ports like Liverpool and Garston was a matter of the utmost importance. It was a question of more than local—it was of national importance. The promoters called some of the most distinguished engineers, amongst others Mr. Leader Williams, Mr. Adamson, Mr. Deas, Mr. Messent, Mr. Fowler, Mr. Giles, and Mr. Abernethy, who expressed a very confident opinion that the stereotyping of the channel would not cause any silting in the Upper Mersey, and that the effect of putting an end to “frets” would be the improvement of the bar. But, on the other hand, the Mersey Dock and Harbour Board relied upon the evidence of gentlemen like Mr. Vernon Harcourt, Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Eades, Sir William Thompson, and others, who were equally confident that the effect of these works would be disastrous. It was a question which it was most difficult to determine, and it is curious that in the science of engineering there should be a possibility of question about such a matter. We think that probably the truth was with the promoters, as they founded their case upon the effects of similar works which had been carried out in the Clyde, the Tyne, and especially in the Tees ; but it would be foolish and rash to hold a decided opinion. When the noble Lords came to consider their decision, three were in favour of the Bill and two against it. We think the three were right, but we think they were bold. There was a grave doubt as to the effect of these estuary works. When the matter came to be thrashed out again in the House of Commons before Mr. Sclater Booth and his colleagues, the doubt seemed to be, if anything, strengthened, while at the same time an alternative scheme was suggested by which the promoters’ object could be effected without running the imminent risk which was involved in the proposals of the Bill. The alternative scheme, too, it was said, if carried out, would not be opposed either by the Corporation of Liverpool or by the Dock Board. Under the circumstances, the House of Commons Committee unanimously rejected the Bill. No one will say that their caution was not justified. Here, then, we find no such uncertainty of decision as condemns the tribunal. The Bills in the two sessions were not the same Bills, and the rejection of the one by the House of Lords, and the other by the House of Commons, is to our mind a proof not of a want of uniformity of decision, but an indication of the necessity in such cases of a second hearing by

way of appeal. But this complaint is, as we have said, ill founded. The duty of Committees is far more similar to that of an arbitrator than to that of a court of law, and to ask for "certainty" in the awards of arbitrators, to demand uniformity in the decisions of referees, is to make a demand which only indicates an ignorance of their functions. No doubt you would, if you had a permanent tribunal of a judicial character, have a judge with a crotchet, who might make his decisions very uniform, at the expense of justice. But the past is always an assistance in speculating as to what will happen in the future, and there are two experiments in the same direction as that proposed by Mr. Sellar which have been tried, and which seem to have failed, to which it may be worth while to call attention. All those who are familiar with parliamentary procedure are aware that there exists a Court of Referees, who determine whether petitioners against Private Bills shall or shall not be heard before the Committee on the Bill on their petitions. There did seem to be some grounds for believing that the law of the right to be heard might be crystallized into a system, and be well administered by a court having more permanence than Private Bill Committees. The case was forcibly put by Mr. Lowe (now Lord Sherbrooke) in the House of Commons in 1864:—

Although [he said] decisions are continually being given upon points of the greatest consequence to the public, no rule, no law, is created. A judicial decision is of value to the litigants, but it is of still greater value to the rest of the community, who steer their course by it, and are thus enabled to avoid litigation. Such a result has not been attained by the action of our Committees. One does not know what another has done or is doing. No record is kept. Although a point may have arisen twenty times before, it is treated as a case of first impression, and the same question is often decided by different Committees in diametrically opposite ways. The result is that no one knows when he is sure to maintain his own rights, and no one can tell that he may not overthrow the right of another person. If a judicial and permanent element be introduced into the Committees, their judgments will be reported and gathered together, and will form precedents which will guide future decisions.*

It was upon this advice, which, as we have tried to show, was in many respects erroneous, that the House of Commons established the Court of Referees. But the results are far more convincing than any arguments. At first the duty of hearing and reporting upon all questions of engineering was entrusted to this new court. But that was found to work so badly that their functions were curtailed; for many years they have only deter-

* Hansard, vol. clxxv. pp. 1563-4.

mined the question whether a petitioner is entitled to be heard upon his petition. But even with these smaller duties to perform, the court has failed to give anything like satisfaction. The decisions of the court have been carefully reported in five very full volumes,* but for any one who hopes for uniformity of decision from such a body these volumes would be disillusionary reading. There is in these pages, to the diligent searcher, a precedent for anything he wants to argue. We do not go so far as Sir Edmund Beckett—who had an unhappy knack of putting things a little offensively—when he said, “I have no hesitation in saying, after eight years’ trial, that the Court of Referees has become a nuisance to the suitors and the laughing-stock of the profession.”† But we do say that it has failed to command the respect of those who are in a position to form a valuable opinion of its working. And that, remember, we would add, notwithstanding the fact that several of the members of Parliament who have sat upon the court have been exceedingly able and competent men, and that the Speaker’s counsel, who is also a referee, is generally a man of legal training and admitted capacity. It is not because the men composing the court are incompetent. It is because the Legislature made a mistake when it made up its mind to do by a permanent tribunal what could be far better done by the common-sense of the Committee on the Bill.‡

The history of the Railway Commission is equally instructive. After many inquiries into the matter of the regulation of railways, and particularly after that of Lord Cardwell (then Mr. Cardwell) in 1853, a very important Act of Parliament was passed, which is known as the Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1854. That Act was passed in the interest of traders and travellers, and extended in their favour the provisions of the “quality clauses” which were contained in various special Acts, and which was contained in the Railway Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845. The Railway and Canal Traffic Act provided that every railway company (1) should give facilities for traffic; (2) and should work its railway so that it might be used as a continuous line of communication with other railways; and (3) forbade every such company to unduly prefer or unduly prejudice any person or description of traffic. The duty of enforcing these provisions devolved upon the Court of Common Pleas in England, the Court of Session in Scotland, and the Four Courts in Dublin.

* Clifford and Stephens’ and Clifford and Rickards’ Reports of Cases before the Court of Referees.

† Letter to the *Times*, May 21, 1872.

‡ We might too have mentioned Lord Dalhousie’s Commission, which was appointed in 1845 to report upon Private Bills, which lasted five years, and which gave so much dissatisfaction that at the end of that time it was done away with.

Now, at first sight it might have seemed easy to compel obedience upon the part of railway companies to these statutes ; and judges of capacity and training, it might have been thought, were the very persons to administer the Act well and judiciously in the interest of the public. But a closer scrutiny shows that the matters to be determined under it are not questions of law, and are only in a vague sense questions of fact. What are due facilities ? What is an undue preference ? This was very soon perceived by the judges themselves. Lord Campbell protested in the House of Lords against such duties being cast upon them. "The code," he said, "was not one which the judges could interpret ; it left them altogether to exercise their discretion as to what was reasonable, with no statutable or common law authority to guide them." Lord Lyndhurst, too, observed that "the questions that would arise under the Act were so vague and so incapable of being reduced to fixed rules that it was impossible conflicting decisions should not be given." The judges who had to administer the Act spoke in a similar way. Thus, Mr. Justice Creswell, in giving judgment in one case, said, "The questions above suggested assume a very complicated and difficult character, and are such as we feel but little qualified to decide. Nevertheless, as the Legislature has thought fit to impose on the judges of this court the duty of dealing with such questions, we must do so to the best of our abilities whenever it becomes necessary."* It did not become necessary very often, for, although in the first few years after the Act was passed there were some applications to the court, and one or two in Scotland to the Court of Session, the Act soon became a dead letter. It was because of this failure that it was thought necessary, after the Report of the joint Select Committee of 1872 on Railway Amalgamation had been presented, to establish another tribunal to deal with these matters. And hence the passing of the Act of 1873, and the appointment of the Railway Commissioners. This court was less judicial in its character, for there was only one lawyer on its bench, one railway chairman, and one gentleman who had been a politician. The experiment is going on now—with what result the public are aware. We note that the *Edinburgh Reviewer* protests against the establishment of a second-rate tribunal to hear and determine the merits of Private Bills. But is it quite certain that the tribunal is a second-rate one, or, on the other hand, is not its failure a necessary incident of the policy which hands over to permanent tribunals, either judicial or semi-judicial in character, duties which cannot properly be discharged by them ? One thing is quite certain, and that is that

* *Ransome v. Eastern Counties Railway Company*, 1 C. B. N. S. 437.

the Railway Commissioners, notwithstanding the ability of the gentlemen forming the court, have failed to secure the confidence of the public. They are kept alive by an association of traders, who are associated more for the benefit of the professional gentlemen who act for them than for any benefit they (the traders) have derived from the Commissioners' decisions. But even the Traders' Association cannot keep the court fully employed, and the experiment has hitherto been an expensive one for the country. At one time the Commissioners only gave one judgment. Latterly, however, they have changed their practice in this respect, and the various judgments disclose an almost hopeless divergence of opinion in almost every case. These two instances, then, which we have referred to at some length, ought to convince those who seek a remedy in the direction suggested by Sir Erskine May, in his evidence before the Committee of 1863—viz., making the tribunal as judicial in character as possible—that if they do so they will be going in the wrong direction. There are things which can best be done by men of legal training and judicial capacity and experience, but the determination of the questions of policy involved in the passing or rejection of Private Bills is not one of them.

We come now to the third objection which is made to the present method of dealing with Private Bills in Committee; and that, put shortly, is that Parliament cannot spare the time to deal with these measures.* Now, it is at this point that the inquiry touches upon the broader questions of parliamentary procedure to which we alluded. It is certain that, owing to various circumstances, the time at the disposal of Parliament is very much less, for real work, than it used to be. The main evil is to be found in the unlimited "gift of the gab," as the Scotch call it. We are becoming a talking, instead of a doing, nation, and all the froth or scum seems to come to the surface in the halls of St. Stephen's. The "silent member" is almost an extinct representative. It is partly because of the torrents of speech, partly because in some minds obstruction has become more identified with opposition than it used to be, that we have seen the House, session after session, having recourse to new rules of procedure—rules which, by-the-way, seem to be of

* Mr. Sellar in one of his speeches complained of the "short hours" Committees sat. Committees of the Commons sit from twelve to four; Committees of the Lords from eleven to four; Courts of Law sit from half-past ten or eleven to four o'clock, with an interval for lunch, which Committees do not allow themselves. It would be easy for Committees of the Commons to sit at eleven. Indeed, Mr. Foljambe's Committee, which heard the Barry Dock and Railway Bill in 1884, did, we believe, sit at that hour.

very little use when they are added to the written law of Parliament. But the "clôture" and other matters which were the subject of the consideration of a special autumn session of Parliament have been fully considered in the pages of this Review.* And most of these rules are foreign to our purpose in this place. There was one change then made, however, which has a direct bearing upon our present subject. Mr. Gladstone, when he submitted the first of the Procedure Resolutions to Parliament, said that his plan divided itself into two parts, "one of which relates to procedure, and the other relates to devolution or delegation," and he added that, although he regarded the measures of procedure as vitally essential, he regarded the device for the delegation of the labours of the House as more important. We agree that the question of the delegation of the functions of Parliament is far more important than any of the Procedure Rules. So important is this question that we have thought it well to give some grave consideration to the matter in connection with the present proposal to devolve the functions of the House of Commons in relation to Private Bills upon a permanent tribunal. It seems to us that some very serious issues are involved in the principle of devolution, and that every proposal to delegate functions which are really legislative ought to be carefully considered, and, unless very good grounds can be shown for it, ought to be resisted. It is because Grand Committees require a large number of members to devote their mornings to their service that Mr. Sellar says it will become impossible to get members to serve on Private Bill Committees. But that raises the important question whether Parliament has not already gone too far in the direction of delegation, and whether it is not expedient to attempt to find time for the necessary work of Parliament by other means than that of giving the work to some other body to do. Up to the present time only two Grand Committees have been appointed—one the Committee of Trade, and the other the Committee of Law. But there is talk about another being appointed—namely, a Committee of Finance. And it is true, as has been pointed out, that these Committees already absorb the time of about 150 members of the House. There is too another proposal, which seems to us to be a natural development of the principle of delegation, but which seems to us to be fraught with serious mischief. Up to the present time Grand Committees have consisted of from sixty to sixty-five members, with some fifteen or twenty special members added to the ordinary Committee on account of special knowledge of the subject of the

* WESTMINSTER REVIEW, October, 1883.

Bill. But it is found that these Committees are too large, and it is proposed that they should consist of a smaller number of members. Now, at first sight there may seem to be very little harm in making this instrument of legislation a truly effective one, and it will commend itself as reasonable to suppose that a body consisting of from eighty to eighty-five members may be too large and cumbrous for deliberation. Why, then, it may be said, should not those large bodies be reduced to manageable proportions? No doubt this reasoning is of the character that commends itself to most of our "hand-to-mouth" politicians. Wherever a need is felt they look about for the readiest remedy. This is very natural conduct, but it does not deserve the name of politics, far less the appellation of statesmanship. A large view of emergencies would often convince men that the remedy proposed was only another departure from the healthy state. It is no doubt a part of medical craft to administer poisons as an antidote for noxious drugs, but there is a transcendent practice, and that is, not taking the poison. Many of the evils in our laws are to be traced to the laws themselves, and call for wise repeal, and not for an exacerbation of the evil by a continuance in the course of legislation. Now, that a large deliberative assembly like the House of Commons should waste time is an incident of its existence. Prompt action is the action of one man. But assemblies, if they would be "rightly great," do "not move without great argument." The complaint that the House of Commons talks too much is, in one respect, founded on error. The object of its existence is to talk. It is the school of politics for the country, and, if every member held his peace and voted straight, the constituencies would have a right to complain. Now, it is a fact that the speech of the House of Commons has passed beyond the bounds and measure of wise utterance. Words have been used for the purpose, not of elucidating, but of delaying. That fact, to some extent, accounts for the failure upon the part of the Lower House to make any progress with its real work of legislation. It is true, too, that the notion of the duties which a wise Legislature ought to discharge have been greatly extended of recent years. It is no longer thought sufficient for the supreme authority of the State to protect the subject from the external violence of foreign foes and from the internal violence of the criminal classes—it has burdened itself with all sorts of duties, which lead it farther and farther afield from the narrow path of legitimate governmental action. We do not desire to comment upon these essays upon the part of the State to extend its action, which, according to the present Postmaster-General, have "received much of its impulse from philan-

thropists, philosophers, and political economists." But here we only point out that this new view of the beneficial action of the State in every direction has led to the overloading of the House of Commons with more work than it can, with all its talkativeness, do. But this is an illustration of what we said, that one step in the wrong direction will initiate a whole dance of folly. The House of Commons attempts to become guide, philanthropist, friend, banker, librarian, and what-not to the subject, and the next step is that the House of Commons desires to delegate its functions first and in some cases to sections of itself, Grand Committees, and second, in the case of Private Bills, to a separate tribunal. Now, at first sight, it might not seem to be a serious step in the direction of delegation to depute the Committee-work on a Bill to a large Committee consisting of members of the House. But we think it is a step in the wrong direction, and we will see further excursions. In the first place, every constituency has, in our view, a right to its say upon every Bill which may affect the country. That seems to us to be the principle upon which our representative system rests. Now, if the member for, say, Glasgow is excluded from one of the Grand Committees, say of Law, the voice of that great constituency is excluded from the deliberations during the Committee stage of any purely legal Bill which is referred to that Committee. *Quoad* the particular legislative acts which are involved in adjusting the clauses of that measure, Glasgow is disfranchised. But, it is said, "That is true, but the member for Glasgow can express the view of his constituents either upon the second or third reading of the Bill in the House itself." The effect, however, of his protest, after a Committee of eighty members had considered the Bill, might be anticipated; and while it is true that the House still retains its control over the Bill in so far as its principle is concerned, it has parted with what is in some respects quite as important a function. It was said that it was in the Committee stage that time was lost, but that fact shows that it was in the Committee stage that the constituents had something to say. Besides, it is by no means an unimportant stage in the progress of a measure which is thus handed over to the Grand Committee. "A Scotch poet," said a writer in the *Times*,* "would have let anybody legislate for a country, if he had leave to make its songs. And so a wise Committee might be willing to allow any assembly to enunciate the principles of a measure, so long as it had the settlement of the clauses." We do not say that at present the devolution has been

* The *Times*, October 10, 1862.

productive of mischief to the State, but we do say that the tendency is evil. No one supposes that a House of Commons could codify the Criminal Law; and it was a wise thing to appoint a highly competent Commission to draft the Bill for that purpose. But, when the draft came before the House, it was proposed by some persons that the House of Commons should simply *enact* the Code, and should exercise no discretion in modifying one of the provisions. Now, that proposal, it seems to us, if it had been acted upon, would, in effect, have changed for the nonce our form of government from a representative one to a bureaucratic one. The same tendency is, we think, to be seen in the delegation to Grand Committees, and it will be more and more distinctly seen as the Committees are made smaller and smaller. Besides, there is another evil. The public should have its eye fixed on the Legislature. It is only while the strong light of public opinion plays upon it that it will remain healthy. But if you have legislative work being done by three or four different bodies, that attentive attitude of the public must necessarily be relaxed. There is another obvious objection to the delegation of any large powers to those Committees, and that is that it places the power to produce any desired result in the hands of the persons who appoint the Committee. At the present time the Grand Committees are appointed by the Committee of Selection, but the Committee of Selection is nominated by the Government. We do not say that such a thing has been done, but we do say that it would not be impossible or difficult to "pack" a Grand Committee. Select Committees, which to some extent resemble these, have many times been constituted in a way which has led to complaint in the House itself. Now, it is with the view of freeing members for service on these Grand Committees, which, as things go, according to the *Edinburgh Reviewer*, afford to members a very good parliamentary audience, that Mr. Sellar desires to abolish Private Bill Committees. To give the members time, which he seems to think is at present wasted in relation to these private measures, is one of his proposed objects. We differ from him in our opinion as to this matter.* We think that members are usefully employed

* We have too pointed out that there would, in order that the House might retain control over Private Bill Legislation, require to be an appeal to the House itself. That these appeals would involve a huge waste of public time is certain. Already the House of Commons has during the last three sessions been groaning under the weight of Private Bills, which, like the Regent's Canal, the Parks Railway, the Irish Narrow-Gauge Railways, the Hull and Barnsley Mills, and others, have been discussed on second reading. But the future would be as scorpions to whips in comparison with the past.

in considering these measures. When it is remembered that all the railways in England have been made under the sanction of Private Bills, it will not be denied that the policy of the Committee-rooms has fully as great a bearing upon the national prosperity and happiness as the policy of the House itself in connection with Public Bills. We think that this argument of Mr. Sellar's is well met by what fell from Mr. Gathorne Hardy (now Lord Cranbrook) in 1872, when he said "that, while members were anxious to be relieved from unnecessary work, none would wish to shirk work if they deemed it essential to the interests of the public."* We have endeavoured to show that it is essential to the public interest, and that, when Mr. Sellar talks about saving public time, he is endeavouring to do so by shirking public duty. We have, however, admitted that, if there is to be a change at all in the method of dealing with Private Bills, the change must be in the direction indicated by Mr. Sellar's Bill. We agree, too, with the writer in the *Edinburgh Review* that the judges must be made entirely independent of the Courts of Law, which have an awkward habit of encroaching upon all new tribunals by means of their writ of prohibition; and, further, we hold with the same writer that the judges, if there are to be judges, should be chosen from the ranks of the Parliamentary Bar. To take the judges, as was at one time proposed, from the existing Bench would be a mistake. In the first place, it is not so strong as to be able with impunity to part with a good judge, and, in the second place, the special training required for such an office is not to be had in the ordinary work of the Bar, but in connection with the measures which the tribunal, if established, will be called upon to pass or reject. The proposal that the tribunal should sit for a certain time in Ireland and Scotland is a foolish one. It is made in the interests of the members of the Scotch and Irish Bars. But the matter to be considered is not the interest of a profession, but the interests of the public. Sense would be better served by leaving the court an untrammelled discretion as to the place where it will hold its inquiries. These latter suggestions are made, not because we lack any confidence in the earlier arguments, but because we have seen so many convincing arguments go by the board in other cases. We would ourselves say that from the change, if it is carried out, there will result an increase

* Hansard, vol. ccx. (March 22, 1872), p. 524. Lord Lynton, too, in the last debate objected to the delegation of the House's powers upon public grounds. Hansard, vol. cclxxxv. (March, 1884), p. 1554.

instead of a diminution of the expenses to which the promoters and opponents of Private Bills will be put. We believe that, however able the judges may be, and however carefully they are selected, there will be a diminution and not an increase in the efficiency of the methods of dealing with these Bills. That some members will have more time on their hands is not to be denied. That they may make more noise in the House itself, or in the Grand Committee room, is not improbable, but that they will be as well or as usefully employed in these new spheres as they have been in the unostentatious work of the Private Bill Committees we think more than doubtful.

Mr. Sellar's Bill was rejected by a large majority. But the "hobby" members are never convinced, and we believe that the member for the Haddington Burghs will still keep "pegging away." It is in view of any future agitation in this direction that we have still thought these arguments in season.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

THEOLOGY.

M. RÉVILLE'S new work ¹ contains the substance of a course of lectures delivered by him last summer at the College of France; and is a preliminary sketch of the science of religion, and the nature of the object with which it has to deal. Prefacing his account by a review of the contributions of previous thinkers, he regards Hegel's definition of religion as nearest to the true historical view; but it cannot be applied to Buddhism, and philosophy is not merely the clearing up of religion, while Max Müller's definition, "religion is the apprehension of the infinite," is also insufficient; "for," remarks M. Réville, "a reality is wanted as a predicate of the infinite." His own definition (p. 25) is worth quoting in extenso: "Religion is the determination of human life by the sentiment of a bond uniting the human mind to that mysterious mind whose domination of the world and of itself it recognizes, and to whom it delights in feeling itself united." Man sees in Nature an order and an intelligence, and desires to come into union with it. Partly his desire for union is, M. Réville admits, prompted by the expectation of advantage; partly, however, he finds in the union the satisfaction of a need. Whence does he derive this notion of another mind? Of the theories of a primitive revelation and a primitive tradition, there is no adequate evidence. M. Réville finds the explanation in animism. Man at first conceives the universe as animated by minds like his own; then he transfers to them some of his own passions and aspirations; and then he identifies them with the spirits of his ancestors; so that among backward nations, animism is replaced by ancestor worship. But Nature myths are prior to ancestor worship, which, indeed, M. Réville seems to regard as a sort of bye-product, a passing divergence from the direct line of development. On the basis of development, M. Réville classifies religions (p. 100) and then, in Part II., treats of the symbol, the sacrifice, the festival, and the various other manifestations of the religious consciousness, and then passes to the relations of religion to morality, philosophy, civilization and science. Philosophy is essential to religion as a purifying and rationalizing agent. Science and religion, he points out, deal with different aspects of truth; we might summarize his chapter by saying that Science is of the phenomenal, Religion is the aspiration of the human mind after the transcendent. "You," says Religion to Science, "worship the Eternal in seeking your aspect of truth; leave me to seek in him the complete ideal, the presentiment of which raises me from earth, the prevision of which procures me ineffable delights, and let us live in peace." The work, we need

¹ "Prolegomena of the History of Religions." By Albert Réville, D.D. Translated by A. S. Squire. London: Williams & Norgate. 1884.

hardly say, contains many ingenious explanations of the phenomena of religion. Such is the account of the apparent monotheism which travellers have sometimes reported among savages. The worshipper, explains M. Réville, worships one god at a time, and that one with all his heart. So, too, the similarity of the myths of like peoples is explained by the psychological similarity of primitive men, and not by derivation from any common source. The spiritual worship of modern times is traced to its true source in the synagogue. But is M. Réville sure that cannibalism is primarily a religious act? He explains it by the pleasantness of human flesh to the taste; men are eaten and the gods are summoned to participate in the feast. We cannot help thinking that this reverses the true order. The savage, whose flesh is pleasant apart from association, must, we think, have been the noble savage of moralists of the last century, rather than the filthy omnivorous animal depicted by modern anthropology. What little evidence we have examined seems to show that the basis of cannibalism is physiological rather than religious. The savage eats his adversary to acquire his adversary's brave qualities. Then the enemy is destroyed in the most effectual way by devouring him. His consumption is an act of triumph, and the gods of the tribe are summoned to participate in the triumph of their descendants. Here, then, cannibalism becomes a religious act, and in the joyful associations of extermination of the foe and presence of the tribal gods is the source of the pleasantness of human flesh. But M. Réville's book has, we think, the fatal defect which is the glory of the professors of the science of religion. He utterly fails to recognize the importance of the most important of the religious factors in the growth at a certain stage of civilization—we mean ancestor-worship. M. Réville admits that there may be a stage prior to religion; but he makes religion arise when man reaches the fetishist stage, and begins to account for the actions of the not-self by supposing it animated by other spirits like his own. Now, we cannot but think that the personalizing tendency is perceptible even in the higher animals, but that the gap—and it is a large one—between that and Nature-worship is bridged by the ghost theory and the worship of ancestors. Such early society as we can figure to ourselves has hardly the imaginative and poetical power ascribed to it by the science of religion; the members have not the energy or intelligence for direct speculation on the causes of natural phenomena. But they do dream of their ancestors, and extend the conception of the soul thus obtained to material objects. Then perhaps the animistic stage may arise, but ancestor-worship everywhere persists, even along with the Nature-myth. The great agent in the stereotyping of the Patriarchal family, the bond of early Aryan society in family, gens, and tribe, the basis of the household in India, Greece and Rome, of the *jus imaginum*, and the model of all the associations of antiquity, ought not to be passed over briefly, as if it were a mere casual incident in the history of backward races. It is surely ancestor-worship rather than the Nature-myth which has been the most potent influence in the formation of Aryan civilization.

But here is the weakness of the science of religions; we know comparatively little about most of the forms of ancestor-worship, while we know a great deal about the developed religions which may or may not be transformations of it, but which are manifestations of the developed religious consciousness. The science of religions disengages a common element but declines to penetrate behind it, and is naturally influenced by the great mass of its subject-matter rather than by the limited phenomena of the house worship. With Professor Max Müller's Preface before us, we still maintain that comparative religion ought to seek its basis in anthropology. But the science seems to us to begin near the top of its subject, and to decline to penetrate to the bottom. The translation of the book is well done; but we wish there were a few notes. A book of mere generalization seems to us to foster a worse sciolism than that sciolism of the amateur anthropologist to which we take Professor Max Müller to refer. But we thankfully accept a great part of it; and though we ourselves believe that the religious sentiment takes one form that is right and many that are wrong, we fully concur in his main position. And the statement that the religious consciousness posits a transcendent object—that, in short, it involves "other-worldliness" is, we think, timely, in view of certain tendencies of popular religion with which we shall presently have to deal.

Mr. Baring Gould's work² ranges over a wide field and contains many strange statements. Cerebral physiology, mythology, primitive history, philosophy, and the various religions of the heathen world, are all examined in his first volume to illustrate and explain the religious sentiment and its various satisfactions; while the second volume is an attempt to show that its needs are best satisfied by Catholic Christianity. Religion has to develop equally and harmoniously the cerebrum, and the sensory and ganglionic tract which is the seat of the emotions (p. 31). The work abounds with curious statements. "Mysticism is produced by the combustion of the grey vascular matter in the sensorium" (p. 360). Asceticism has a similar physical explanation (p. 351). The Aryan, Turanian and Shemite, with their several *Weltanschauungen*, are now, we hope, as dead as the Caucasian. The tribe is hardly "the expansion of the family" (p. 196). Sixteen years ago it might have seemed to be so; but Mr. Baring Gould should revise his anthropology. Kant's labour, too, seems to have been as vain for him as for other theologians. He indicates his obligations to Hegel and Feuerbach, but his own philosophy seems to be a modernized scholasticism (*cf.* the "four planes of life," p. 3), and he often quotes Balmez. His first volume, perhaps, has a value as indicating the bases of some future science of religion. Otherwise we cannot say much for it. With his second volume we must totally disagree. We do not think the Incarnation gains by connection with

² "The Origin and Development of Religious Belief. I. Polytheism and Monotheism. II. Christianity." By S. Baring Gould, M.A. New Edition. London: Rivingtons. 1884.

Hegel's dialectic, or that Christianity can dispense with historical evidence. Hell is a place of protracted stagnation (p. 354); the pains of purgatory are unsatisfied longing for perfection (p. 347); the Sacraments a concession to idolatry and fetishism (p. 280). Well—is this exactly Catholic doctrine? Catholicism is essentially tolerant, Protestantism as mere negation essentially persecuting (p. 161). It is a pity that the essence should have been so overlaid in history with inseparable accidents. We do not think any of the sciences from which he draws his contributions gain very much from his syncretistic theories.

Every year witnesses new fulfilments of the predictions of Auguste Comte. The intelligence of the artisan classes has obtained its due consideration; the Middle Ages are at least not undervalued; the man of science is a prophet; political economy is fast adopting the historical method, and sociology is more than a hope; the position of women steadily rises, though their political equality seems still distant; the individual in his atomicity is recognized to be a mere figment; the necessity of a religion is almost universally admitted; and less place is assigned in it to pure theology, and more to active work for mankind. The movement, which numbered among its leaders Professor Green and Arnold Toynbee, is nothing if not Comtist. The former may speak the language of an obscure and moribund metaphysic, but his meaning is that of the founder of Positivism; the latter devoted his life to Economic History and lost it in a struggle against a form of Communism. And now here is Canon Fremantle³ announcing that the Church "is the Social State in which the Spirit of Christ reigns," that it is not in conflict or antithesis with the world, and that this life is not a mere stage on the road to heaven. God is immanent in Nature and man (p. 17), and perfect righteousness is to be found in the perfect social life. The neglect of the conception of God's transcendence would indeed be a great spiritual loss (*ibid.*). Canon Fremantle, however, certainly dwells upon the immanence of the Deity in such a manner as to neglect His transcendence. Accordingly, Israel, as represented in Scripture, foreshadows the type of the perfect Christian society; its law represents the sum of its relations, covers its whole life; so that the highest expressions of its religious feeling—the Psalms—are moral rather than ritual or ceremonial (p. 53). The same is true of the early Christian Church. Its organization was civil as well as religious (pp. 122, 125), and its aim was to spiritualize the whole society (pp. 127 *seq.*). The mediæval church and the Puritan communities indicate that Christian life has always implied membership of a social organism. And so it must to-day. The Church is not to be a mere assemblage for prayer and praise, but to cover the whole of life. The parochial system may serve as the means for the promotion of social intercourse (note xxv.), and of a kind of State

³ "The World as the Subject of Redemption," Bampton Lectures, 1883. By the Hon. and Rev. W. H. Fremantle, M.A., Canon of Canterbury. London: Rivingtons. 1885.

Socialism (pp. 111, 112, 322, 352). So the Church, by making little of theological dogma and much of practical altruism, will fulfil its destiny, and so become co-extensive with the world. It is this world with which it is concerned; we are not very clear from the book that there is any other. The "New Jerusalem" is this world under the dominion of Christ, and St. Paul's account of the Resurrection is largely "literalism" (pp. 135, 136). The genesis of Christianity requires us to conceive of God, "not as separate but as a spirit pervading the universe" (p. 285). The goal of religious development, then, is not the co-existence of many conflicting sects with incompatible and unverifiable beliefs, but the union of all men in the task of elevating humanity after the example of Jesus Christ. Canon Fremantle's view of Church and State is the descendant of Dr. Arnold's, whose religious spirit he inherits in no small measure. But does he seriously think that Religion can be kept up with so little insistence on a transcendent object of the religious instinct? Religion, M. Réville has told us, is the sense of a bond between the individual mind and another mind. We cannot think that that sense can be satisfied by the abstraction which is "God immanent in man"—in short, the mind of humanity. Humanity, indeed, has usually seemed too abstract and shadowy an object of worship, even with the symbols proposed by Comte; would it be easier with fewer symbols and a large secular element to outweigh the religious portion of the creed? Does not Canon Fremantle see that his humanitarian church must be degraded into a social club, a Charity Organization Society, a purely secular association, unless there is a transcendent element to counterbalance its secular functions? He himself (following Rothe, though not without reserve) looks forward to a possible decline in public worship. In the New Jerusalem there is no temple (p. 300). Is he quite sure that there would eventually be any God?

We, ourselves, believe that the same kind of fate would await Canon Fremantle's Church—should it come into existence—as befell that Greek city-State by which its idea has been so largely influenced. There were those to whom the varied life of the Greek State appeared meaningless and idle; and it was the mission of Greek philosophy as a whole to break it up, and to supply that religious need which the Greek life and Greek religion did not adequately meet.⁴ The two greatest of Greek philosophers tried to use the State as the chief instrument in the revelation of ultimate truth; but the modern upholders of the National Undogmatic Church and the Collectivist State seem to leave the Ultimate Reality out of the question. To Aristotle, and still more to Plato, the social life is only a stage in the way upward to ultimate truth; to the Collectivist, God is most truly realized in the social life of man. It matters not whether we hold with the

⁴ Cf. J. Bernays' "Phokion," p. 21, "Die Grundlagen des entwickelten griechischen Lebens waren der Anthropomorphismus und die Stadtgemeinde. An diesen beiden Grundlagen hat die griechische Philosophie in allen ihren vielartigen Formen unablässig gerüttelt, und ihr Entwicklungsprozess ist der Zersetzungsprozess des griechischen Sonderlebens."

late Professor T. H. Green that there is a spiritual principle realized in all men, and only gradually perfected, or with Canon Fremantle that God is immanent in Nature and man; in either case God is in the phenomenal, and the true end of man is there also. Such a Church as Canon Fremantle's would—if there is any truth in the science of comparative religions—drive the religious consciousness, by mere repulsion, into the most eccentric forms of mysticism. A Salvation Army for the uneducated, with those developments which will assuredly come when General Booth leaves his followers time to think, and a Swedenborgianism or Irvingism or Esoteric Buddhism for the educated classes, is, we think, the inevitable product of the revolt of the religious consciousness against the fetters of the merely phenomenal world.

We fear that these good Collectivists, if we may apply a term which has another sense, will one day experience that terrible awakening which awaited their forerunners, the Hegelian Left. God with Hegel was immanent in the world; and His manifestation was completed in the development of humanity. What, then, is God, asked Hegel's followers, but the system of relations of a perfect society; and is it not simpler to drop the term God, since the God whom man worships is only man's own shadow projected into the external universe? Hence an atheism more stringent than ordinary atheism, because the result of accepted doctrines, and therefore dogmatic and apparently demonstrated. We do not suppose for an instant that Professor Green saw the tendency of his speculations, still less that Canon Fremantle does. But we think the history of philosophy shows what is their goal. We, ourselves, should directly contest Mr. Fremantle's main position. We hold that the course of human development tends to the distinction of the individual from the social organism, and the development of individual consciousness and personality. We hold that the social, moral, economic, and political organisms, at first all but identical, as in the primitive tribe, or the more backward of the Greek city-States, are in the course of evolution differentiated; and that meanwhile there is developed in man a faculty which must of necessity posit a transcendent Deity; or, in other words, as men progress their opinions become more diverse, though extreme diversity is checked by the survival of the fittest, and the highest good is revealed to each in a different measure. Those who hold like views will group themselves together, whether there is a national church or not; and they will appeal to their own views of the Ultimate Reality as a principle of action more powerful than the good-will and beneficence of the Collectivist. In short, we do not believe that religion can subsist without a transcendent Deity, a notion to which, even if Christianity be abandoned, the mind of man will supply a concrete content. Directly the transcendent gives way to the immanent, Christianity must pass into a feebler kind of Comtism.

While Canon Fremantle reduces Christianity to a form of social activity, and Mr. Baring Gould treats it as the adequate satisfaction

of a ganglionic tract, the next work^a upon our list restores the mystic element. A theology of some sort, the authors hold, is a necessity of life; and they try to formulate a rational creed to suit the needs of the many who cannot accept dogmatic Protestant Christianity as it stands. But the faculty appealed to is, we think, that of the mystic. Theological knowledge, they hold, is the result of spiritual discernment. It has, however, become petrified into dogmas, and is therefore repulsive. The dogmas are inadequate; the authors therefore try to penetrate behind them. That which they most emphatically reject is the doctrine of substitution in its ordinary legal form. That Christ's merits can be imputed to us, they regard as but another form of the doctrine of supererogation. God is our Father and is not angered against us. He manifests Himself in the seen world through a personal Saviour (p. 31). Atonement is but reconciliation; and Christ's work is not to be regarded as finished; atonement is always proceeding through union with Him. Christ's physical sufferings were not in payment for our sins, but as an example to us that the sufferings and sorrows of human life are not overwhelming (p. 87). In this sense "we are more than conquerors through Christ." The plenary inspiration of Scripture is of course abandoned, and shown to be unhistorical (p. 94); the teachings of Scripture, though full of precious revelations (*ibid.*), yet are subordinate to the teaching of the Spirit. The Bible is a record of a progressive revelation which still proceeds in the soul of the believer. Now we think that this represents the true essence of religion better than Canon Fremantle's diluted Positivism. The doctrine of substitution in its ordinary form is perhaps no more than an attempt to rationalize the inexplicable—an overstated expression of one side of a Christian doctrine. Perhaps it ought to have received fairer treatment at their hands. But we do not quite see that their theory leaves sufficient place for the sinfulness of sin. If God is not angry with man, wickedness cannot be so very bad after all. Nor do we think they sufficiently emphasize our duties to mankind. The Christian, like Plato's philosopher, must return into the world of sense. If Canon Fremantle is too collectivist the Friends seem to us hardly so collectivist even as their own religious body.

Of the eleventh edition of this well-known work^b we need say very little. Some improvements, according to the present editor, have taken place in the style and diction in order to maintain and raise its character as a readable and stimulating work. The matter has also undergone some rearrangement, especially the portion dealing with the recent history of Old Testament criticism. Large additions have also been made to the lists of works on Church History, Textual Criticism, and other subjects. In short, the book is one of those exhaustive manuals of the literature of a subject which seem only to

^a "A Reasonable Faith: Short Essays for the Times." By Three "Friends." London: Macmillan & Co. 1884.

^b "Hagenbach, K. R., Encyklopädie u. Methodologie der Theologischen Wissenschaften." Elfte Auflage revidirt ergänzt u. herausgegeben von E. Kautsch, ord. Prof. d. Theologie in Tübingen. 1885.

be produced in Germany, and which undergo successive revisions with the advance of knowledge.

The two new volumes of this vast work⁷ seem to us not to call for any very detailed notice. Mr. Cheyne's name should be a sufficient guarantee of the correctness of the Hebrew scholarship of his commentary on Jeremiah and Lamentations. We might say the same of Professor Barker's work on I. Chronicles. We think, however, he seems rather to exaggerate the unity of the work. Is any book of Chronicles likely to be the work of one writer? The Homiletics make us wonder why so many sermons contain so little. The rich stores of the "Pulpit Commentary" would give to the feeblest of curates the reputation of a "thoughtful" preacher. And if he supplemented it by the book of "tips"—to use the language of undergraduates—which is next on our list,⁸ tips collected from the works of (*e.g.*) Coleridge, A.K.H.B., "Dulce Domum," L. M. Stretch, and the "turnover" articles in the evening papers (*sic!*) he would be amply supplied with popular sermons as well. We are reminded of the story of a very junior curate who undertook to preach a thoughtful sermon every Sunday morning, a children's sermon in the afternoon, and a popular sermon in the evening. He must have possessed the earlier sections of "Thirty Thousand Thoughts," and some volumes of the "Pulpit Commentary."

This is a remarkably complete compendium of all the information that can possibly be required by teachers of the Bible.⁹ As a rule, the information is admirably accurate; but ships of Tarshish did not habitually double the Cape of Good Hope (p. 260), and "Allophylian" is hardly a "race." A very liberal view is taken as to the composition of Genesis and Canticles. The maps are excellent, and the book can hardly have an equal of its kind.

Canon Rawlinson's work¹⁰ is an excellent popularization of some of the recent results of Egyptology and Assyriology, by connecting them with the various Biblical notices of Egypt and Babylon. The Scripture narrative, we need hardly say, is viewed from the strictly conservative standpoint. We may refer to the emphatic assertion of the unity and genuineness of the Book of Daniel (p. 400). The Jewish Temple, founded in Egypt by Onias (p. 376), is treated as a specific fulfilment of Isaiah xix. 18-22. Canon Rawlinson is never addicted to generalization; and the book is almost entirely a collection of material, much of it naturally of great interest even to the general reader. The monotheism or kathenotheism of Nebuchadnezzar (p. 76),

⁷ "The Pulpit Commentary." I. Chronicles. Exposition by the Rev. Prof. P. C. Barker, M.A. II. Jeremiah and Lamentations. Exposition by Rev. T. K. Cheyne, M.A., D.D. Homilies by various Authors. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1885.

⁸ "Thirty Thousand Thoughts." Sections x. xi. Virtues including Excellences. The Mosaic Economy. Same Editors and Publishers.

⁹ "Helps to the Study of the Bible." Oxford: Printed at the University Press; London: Henry Frowde.

¹⁰ "Egypt and Babylon from Scripture and Profane Sources." By the Rev. George Rawlinson, M.A., Canon of Canterbury, and Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1885.

is a welcome illustration of M. Réville's explanation of the semblance of monotheism among polytheistic peoples. The unalterability of the "law of the Medes and Persians," is, according to Canon Rawlinson, a special feature of the Persian limited monarchy, as distinct from the old native and despotic monarchies of Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar. We are afraid this weakens the conclusions of Sir Henry Maine as to the history of the notion of law. The Babylonian monarchs seem to have conceived themselves as "sovereigns" in Austin's sense. There are numerous and interesting illustrations of Babylonian commerce (p. 128). The Egyptian novel based, as he thinks, on the story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife (pp. 229 *seq.*), may also be noted. We are glad to find that he rejects Lenormant's doctrine, that the Jewish profile is perceptible on the portico of the Bubastites (p. 336). We might go on for an indefinite period referring to interesting topics dealt with in the book; but we have said enough to show that its interest is more than merely theological. We need hardly point out, moreover, how much more effectively a popular work on Egypt and Assyria appeals to the average reader when thus directly connected with the Scriptural record.

Of Canon Spence's edition of the "Teaching of the Apostles,"¹¹ another edition having been noticed in the last number of the Review, we need only say that it seems to be intended mainly for the general reader. As such, it is a welcome relief from much of the thin religious literature of the present day. Here and there, indeed (pp. 23, 26), we have notes which look like hints for popular sermons, to be inserted in some future edition of "Thirty Thousand Thoughts;" but it is fair to say that they are exceptions. Canon Spence accepts the work as authentic, and inclines to identify it with the "Two Ways; or, Judgment of Peter," mentioned by Rufinus of Aquileia (p. 82), and to refer it to Symeon, son of Cleopas and nephew of Joseph. Its date, he thinks, is between 50 and 90 A.D. The work is admirably got up, and the Greek text strikes us as particularly pleasant to read. The sermon appended is an application of the treatise to enforce the duties of Churchmen at the present day.

Mr. Reichardt's work¹² is a dissertation written for the Hulsean prize at Cambridge, in 1881. It obtained honourable mention from the examiners. His object is to show that the Jewish Christians were closely connected with the Jews, and undistinguished from them by the outside world until the persecution at the time of Bar Cochba. A very large portion of the work, therefore, consists of quotations from the Talmud, indicating the elements common to both. Christ himself, the author points out, lives strictly in accordance with the Mosaic law. The Jewish Christians live as Jews, separated outwardly

¹¹ "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles." A Translation, with Notes and Excursus (I. to IX.) illustrative of the "Teaching;" and the Greek Text. By Canon Spence, M.A., Vicar of St. Pancras. London: James Nisbet & Co. 1885.

¹² "The Relation of the Jewish Christians to the Jews in the First and Second Centuries." By the Rev. F. H. Reichardt, B.A., late Scholar of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. London: Seeley & Co. 1884.

only by the assertion of the Messiah, and most of the Christian usages have a Jewish origin; while the Rabbis possess the main elements of Christian doctrine. The author should, perhaps, have noticed the possibility of an alternative interpretation of the facts. The work is overloaded with material, and is, we think, here and there defective in clearness of arrangement. It is, indeed, less an essay than a very interesting collection of extracts from the Talmud. Of its value to the expert, some guarantee is afforded by the fact that the quotations from the Talmud have been revised by Dr. Schiller-Szinessy, of Cambridge, who, however, declines to adopt some of Mr. Reichardt's renderings.

This is a convenient summary of the literary evidence in support of the orthodox view of the Gospels,¹³ derived from allusions by writers nearly contemporary, and similar sources. An interesting feature is the treatment of a number of classical writers in the same manner, by way of illustrating the author's position. The work seems fair and temperate in tone, and so also are the prefatory remarks.

Herr Franke's work is of some interest as a sign of the conservative reaction in the criticism of the New Testament.¹⁴ The author, an avowed opponent of Baur and his school, proposes to establish the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel by the substantial identity of its doctrine with that of the Old Testament (Pref. p. 4, *cf.* p. 9 and p. 91). The hypothesis of its Alexandrian origin, which naturally results from its terminology, he meets (with considerable courage) by an absolute denial of the presence of any Alexandrian or Philonian element (p. 91). The universe of John consists of "the above" and "the beneath," or "not this world" and "this world" (John viii. 2, 3; iii. 3; vii. 31; xix. 11). "In heaven above, or on the earth beneath" is the antithesis of the Old Testament; but Philo and Plato contrast the *κόσμος νοητός* and the *κόσμος ὀρατός*. In the Fourth Gospel the heaven opens and is in space; things cannot be said to be regarded as copies of heavenly models (p. 95). The reality of the devil; the appearance of Christ in bodily form; the relation (outside of chap. I.) of the Father and Son, and of matter and spirit, cannot be brought into relation with Philo's doctrines. The doctrine of the Logos is dealt with pp. 112 *seq.* Philo's logos-theory is part of his dualism. God and matter are contrasted, and connected only by the *κόσμος νοητός*. The highest *λόγος* is only one among many; called, indeed, *ὁ πρῶτος* or *ὁ μονογενής*, but only as being the direct result of the Deity; but there are many other *λόγοι* (p. 114). Philo and John agree (p. 117) only in using the Biblical statements, that creation is by the word of God and in hypostatizing the Logos. Herr

¹³ "The Antiquity and Genuineness of the Gospels. With some Prefatory Remarks on the Remoter Sources of Modern Unbelief." London: W. H. Allen & Co. 1884.

¹⁴ "Das Alte Testament bei Johannes. Ein Beitrag zur Erklärung und Beurtheilung der johanneischen Schriften." Von Lic. A. H. Franke, Privat-dozent in Halle. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; London: Trübner. 1885.

Franke then assigns Old Testament authority for the specific doctrines of John, and deals with his treatment of the Old Testament. His book seems mainly directed against Thoma. We think he is too anxious to pin his opponent to a definite issue, of which he himself has the defining. Nobody can surely suppose that the author of the Gospel studied under Philo; what is meant is that a Jew with a taste for syncretism picked up an Alexandrian theory, and tacked it on to Old Testament doctrine. But Herr Franke's work is worth examination, if for nothing else, as a sign of the reaction against the excess of negative criticism.

In this work,¹⁵ reprinted, with some additions, from the *Expositor* Dr. Cox seeks to elucidate the character of Balaam by a full examination of all the passages of Scripture concerning him, and by the "application of the comparative method." We must enter a passing protest against this use of the latter term. Dr. Cox fills up no gaps and examines no characters in different stages of development, but merely illustrates Balaam's conduct by comparing him with Jacob, Saul, Jonah and Caiaphas. The author thinks that the view hitherto taken of Balaam has generally been too unfavourable; and after an effective criticism of the opposite view of Kalisch (p. 22), and a full examination of all the references to Balaam in Scripture, concludes that he was an independent prophet to whom special revelations were vouchsafed; but whose lower nature so perpetually conflicted with his higher as to draw him to choose the evil and refuse the good, whence the uniform condemnation which he receives in the New Testament. Balaam was a teacher of a pure and noble morality, and yet was as venal as Jacob and as sensual as a Corinthian convert (p. 192). Dr. Cox's liberalism as to Balaam's ass, and the canonicity of the Second Epistle to Peter, is in curious contrast to his unquestioning acceptance of the oracles of Balaam. He has, however, we think, succeeded in his attempt to rehabilitate his subject. We may draw attention to his elucidation of Micah ii. 5, 8, as possessing considerable interest.

M. Reinach's excellent little work¹⁶ begins, as he says, where most of the histories of Israel end: at the destruction of the second temple and with it of the Jewish nationality. He deals with the fortunes of the Jews in Europe during the successive periods of relative tolerance, persecution, exhaustion and revival, the latter dating from the time of Moses Mendelssohn and the French Revolution. The work, of course, touches on an immense amount of interesting matter, and is accompanied by a good bibliography. We may refer to the curious chapter on the Cabbalists and Jewish sects (pp. 269 *seq.*) and on Moses Mendelssohn (pp. 286 *seq.*); the interesting references to the Beni Israel, and the quotation from Réclus as to the Chinese Jews, a remnant of the tribe of Asher, and the treatment of the part taken by Jews in the early Middle Ages in spreading Arabian culture in Europe.

¹⁵ "Balaam: an Exposition and a Study." By Samuel Cox, D.D. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1884.

¹⁶ "Histoire des Israélites, depuis l'époque de leur dispersion jusqu'à nos jours." Par Théodore Reinach. Paris: Hachette.

In his last chapter he effectively exposes the absurdity of many of the current charges against the Jews. His conclusions seem to us to point to the ultimate absorption of the Jewish nationality, though he himself expects it to last as long as any other (p. 390); the only real obstacle is the ceremonial usages, and these, he thinks will mostly disappear (p. 385). Even mixed marriages are now generally permitted. The unity of the race, indeed, now subsists only in the recognition of the duty of charity towards Jews as especially binding (p. 389). The Jewish race has, no doubt, shown tendencies to lose its identity, but the singular revival of the sentiment of nationality among it, seems likely, we should think, at least to retard the process.

"A Year's Ministry"¹⁷ is a collection of twenty-six sermons of a popular straightforward kind; not too rhetorical on the whole, though perhaps more impressive when spoken than when read. We note the declaration that "for fresh impulse in unbroken fields you have to look outside the cultivated classes" (p. 173), and the emphatic assertion of the antithesis of the Church and the world (p. 24), as expressing precisely our own view with regard to that collectivist church which is virtually a church led by the cultivated, and with the theological element reduced to zero. Dr. Maclaren has escaped the pitfalls of inaccuracy and cheap learning which beset the popular preacher; but we do not know that his sermons call for more detailed notice than most other volumes of the class.

"Laws of Christ for Common Life"¹⁸ is a reprint of articles contributed to periodicals, and is marked by the strong common sense of the practical good man, informed and pervaded by the Christian spirit. The quotation of a few of the titles, "Political and Municipal Duty," "The Sacredness of Property," "Sowing and Reaping," "An Ethical Revival," will give a sufficient idea of the scope of the work.

Mr. Beet's "Commentary,"¹⁹ while thoroughly deserving the attention of scholars, is also intended for the use of every intelligent reader of the English Bible. The convenience of the latter is provided for by exact literal translations prefixed to each section of the commentary of the verses therein commented on. The author's scholarship is guaranteed by Professor Sanday, and the style of his exposition is clear and direct, and free from the unnecessary verbiage which marks so many commentaries sacred and profane. His object is to use St. Paul's line of thought in the Epistle as a means of arriving at his general conception of the Gospel and of Christ. His standpoint is that of a liberal orthodoxy, and his work is marked by wide reading and careful research. The dissertation on the relation of the Jewish Sabbath to the Christian day of rest seems to us to call for attention. We can cordially recommend Mr. Beet's work, not only to experts, but to the religious world in general.

¹⁷ "A Year's Ministry." By Alexander Maclaren, D.D. Second Series. Office of the *Christian Commonwealth*, and Hodder & Stoughton. 1884.

¹⁸ "Laws of Christ for Common Life." By R. W. Dale, LL.D., Birmingham. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1884.

¹⁹ "A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians." By Joseph Agar Beet. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1885.

"Whenever this Church of ours has lacked *Episcopacy*, in our colonies or on our mission fields, the work has languished" (p. 8).²⁰ We should like to hear this passage commented on by some representative of the largest of our missionary societies with special reference to its recent experience in connection with two active and energetic members of the *Episcopate*. "How was it she (the American Episcopal Church) was not born to great endowments? Why not, at least, to her natural position of establishment with its great advantages and opportunities? . . . It can surely have been only because the first sonship in spiritual life is chastisement" (p. 8). How the American Episcopal Church must long for the *congé d'élire*, issued, let us say, by a Unitarian President under the influence of the prototypes of Senator Radcliffe! We are afraid recent history is not the Primate's strong point. The Episcopal Church has, indeed, done great things in the States; we believe that in several of the newer States it is the leading religious body. But it has been able to undertake mission work because it has dispensed with all but the most urgent requirements, and has had full freedom of action to organize itself as it pleased.

We have left ourselves less space than we should like to comment upon this curious set of dialogues between an educated sceptic and his Roman Catholic friends.²¹ Mr. Ward's object is to emphasize the doctrine that belief necessarily implies a state of the emotions and an act of will. As we wish, or as we fear, so in doubtful cases do we believe in the affairs of ordinary life. Religious belief, also, is not purely intellectual; it must begin by a voluntary acceptance, and to this we are predisposed by the sense of a need, which is best satisfied by Roman Catholicism. Mr. Ward has not predisposed our emotions towards Roman Catholicism by his picture of the mild and rather insipid conversation of the Northern monastery in which the scene opens; but we cannot but recognize its fidelity to life. The externals of the creed, here as elsewhere, seem to us to present a very trivial appearance. Is the Roman Catholic Church "large-hearted and liberal wherever she can be without compromising principle"? (p. 51). It is unfortunate that her tendencies have been so persistently repressed in history. The work possesses a good deal of literary merit. Mr. Ward has "got a good sceptic," and one, moreover, who declines to be converted. The capital stories, all warranted genuine (p. 44), of the eccentricities of "verts," indicate that Roman Catholicism does not tend to develop their mental power. Perhaps, the best is that of the man (p. 49) who used to let two large dogs, with bells round their necks, run about during Mass because it reminded him of Rome, and had a devotional effect. As Mr. Ward has insisted on the necessity of an act of will in belief, we may, at least, commend him for having

²⁰ "The Seabury Commemoration": a Sermon preached in St. Paul's on November 14, 1884, being the Hundredth Anniversary of the Consecration of Bishop Seabury. By the Archbishop of Canterbury.

²¹ "The Wish to Believe." By Wilfrid Ward. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1885.

a truer perception than most apologists of the proper standpoint of apologetics.

Mr. H. C. Lea's work is a book of formidable size (642 pp.), and dealing only "with the enforced celibacy of the sacerdotal class."²² But as the survey ranges from the Essenes to the priesthood of modern Catholicism, the field is sufficiently wide. The author's reading has been extremely minute, and his monograph appears to be exhaustive. We notice that he takes a very unfavourable view of the morality of the priesthood of Continental countries (pp. 621-638). We should like especially to direct the attention of those who believe in the present value of the monastic orders in education to the appalling statistics on pp. 636-637. More, of course, we cannot say on this subject.

We have no space for more than a bare notice of Mr. Kegan Paul's charmingly got up translation of the "Pensées" of Pascal,²³ based on M. Molinier's recension of the text; of the "Sunday Home Service,"²⁴ a devotional work for those who are prevented from joining in public worship; and of Vol. vii. of the translation of Ewald's "History of Israel,"²⁵ containing, by the way, a sketch of Philo-Judæus.

PHILOSOPHY.

IT is too soon yet to attempt to estimate critically Dr. Martineau's "Types of Ethical Theory."¹ For the present it may suffice to describe briefly the general scheme and the contents of the two volumes. In the preface there is an extremely interesting description of the mental development through which the author arrived at his final ethical position.

The mixture of exposition and search in these volumes (he says) is the involuntary expression of personal experience. I have always been a teacher; I have not ceased to be a learner; in the one capacity, I must tell the little that I know; in the other, I must strive after some glimpse of the immeasurable light beyond. . . . The concurrence of criticism and construction is but the renunciation of individual self-sufficiency, and a homage due to the cumulative continuity of human thought.

²² "An Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy in the Christian Church." By Henry C. Lea. Second edition, enlarged. Boston, U.S.: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1884. London: Quaritch.

²³ "The Thoughts of Blaise Pascal." Translated from the French of M. Auguste Molinier. By C. Kegan Paul. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1885.

²⁴ "The Sunday Home Service." By the Rev. Donald Macleod, D.D. London: Wm. Isbister, Limited. 1885.

²⁵ "The History of Israel." By Heinrich Ewald, late Professor of the University of Göttingen. Vol. vii.—The Apostolic Age. Translated from the German by J. Frederick Smith. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1885.

¹ "Types of Ethical Theory." By James Martineau, D.D., LL.D., Principal of Manchester New College, London. Two vols. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1885.

The historical part of the book consists, as is suggested by the title, not in continuous exposition, but in the study of particular thinkers, selected according to the author's view of philosophical evolution. First of all, ethical systems that are "psychological" are distinguished from those that are "unpsychological," and this difference is traced to differences between ancient and modern thought. The fundamental antithesis of modern philosophy is the antithesis of subject and object, while that of ancient philosophy is the antithesis of being and becoming. Hence the ancient philosophers could only develop their ethical doctrines by a "metaphysical" or a "physical" method; ancient thought, in its absence of clear distinction between subject and object, being always essentially objective. Physical and metaphysical doctrines of ethics have reappeared in modern times; for although the influence of Christianity determined a subjective direction of thought, this natural influence was counteracted by Augustinian theology, which, wherever it prevailed, reduced man, as an ethical agent, to a nonentity. The psychological tendency has, however, reasserted itself, and we may say generally that

the controversy between the prevalence of change and the unchanging is common to ancient and modern times; but in the former the stress of the battle was thrown upon the macrocosm, and fought out between the real and phenomenal, and then the victory was pushed home into human nature; while in the latter, the tug of war is in the microcosm, between the maxims of reason and of sense; and this outpost being carried, the field of the great universe is won.

This difference of starting-point is of the highest importance.

In the last resort, the difference . . . will be found to consist in this: that when self-consciousness is resorted to as the primary oracle, an assurance is obtained and is carried out into the scheme of things, of a free preferential power; but when the external whole is the first interrogated, it affords no means of detecting such a power, but, exhibiting to the eye of observation a course of necessary evolution, tempts our thought to force the same type of development on the human soul. In the one case we obtain a volitional theory of Nature, in the other a naturalistic theory of volition.

But the true view can only be arrived at when, starting from the subject, we go beyond it to its objective conditions. A "subjective monism" which explains everything from the self is as much to be rejected as a metaphysical or physical monism which explains everything from God (like the "acosmism" of Spinoza) or from Nature. In the moral consciousness, in the feeling of duty, are implied certain propositions, the denial of which leads to a denial of the supreme authority of conscience. This supreme authority disappears with the disappearance of belief in the reality either of the self, of Nature, or of God. Ethical theories, whether psychological or not, are to be rejected if they "fail to satisfy the whole feeling of which they profess to display the content." No attempt to explain the ethical feeling by feelings that are not ethical can be successful; the true ethical theory must be "idiopsychological" not "heteropsychological." Thus the central part of Dr. Martineau's work is the first book of vol. ii,

entitled "Idiopsychological Ethics." Here his own intuitionist doctrine is set forth. In the second book of the same volume "heteropsychological theories" are criticized. These include "hedonist ethics," both purely psychological (the older utilitarianism) and of a mixed psychological and physical character ("hedonism with evolution"); the "dianoetic ethics" of Cudworth, Clarke and Price; and the "æsthetic ethics" of Shaftesbury and Hutcheson. The first volume treats of the "physical" and "metaphysical" systems of ancient and modern times. Metaphysical theories are classed as "transcendental" and "immanent:" of the first the doctrine of Plato is taken as an example, of the second those of Descartes, Malebranche and Spinoza. Comte's system is selected for criticism as an example of the physical treatment of ethics. At the end of his examination of the disqualifications of these theories to explain the sense of obligation, Dr. Martineau remarks on the "noble inconsistency" of the writers reviewed; they betray, he says, "the tenacious vitality of the intuitive consciousness of duty throughout the very process of cutting away its philosophic roots." Although detailed criticism cannot be attempted at present, one suggestion may be permitted here that will perhaps contribute to the explanation of differences between Dr. Martineau's mode of thought and that of some of the philosophers referred to. Just as an artist may feel that no analysis of a work of art can ever render its effect in full, so Dr. Martineau, as a moralist, feels that philosophic analysis must always be an inadequate expression of the philosopher's moral personality in action. Now, while the desire for complete theoretical explanation may cause suppression of some elements of actual moral life, the desire to set forth everything that is implied in moral life before attempting a deduction of ethics, and especially to let go no belief that strengthens the feeling of obligation, may, on the other hand, prevent the philosopher from giving full play to his analytical power; and hence (it might be said) we have systems of intuitionist ethics. This, however, it must be admitted, does not explain the whole of the difference between types of ethical theory. Differences of moral personality also have their effect. The Stoic and pantheistic doctrine of Spinoza, for example, must always remain alien to Christian theism with its "sense of sin," on which Dr. Martineau insists so much.

"*Metaphysica Nova et Vetusta*," the appearance of which was noticed last October, is now followed by "*Ethica: or the Ethics of Reason*." The author's mode of working out his thought may seem to symbolize his ethical theory itself. The sense of effort that is a part of all moral action ends, as he shows, in a sense of harmony. Now "*Scotus Novanticus*" requires from his readers a distinct intellectual effort in order to grasp his thought; but if they are willing to make this effort they are really rewarded by having in their minds an idea of a coherent system which has many features of originality, and which,

³ "*Ethica: or the Ethics of Reason*." By Scotus Novanticus, Author of "*Metaphysica Nova et Vetusta*." London: Williams & Norgate. 1885.

regarded as a whole, produces (whether we agree with it or not) that sense of power to contemplate the world and action from a general point of view, which is characteristic of the philosophic attitude as distinguished from the attitude of science and common sense. There is in this new volume some very good criticism of intuitionism, which ought to be read along with Dr. Martineau's defence of the intuitionist position in his "Types." The author's view of the method of philosophy, already explained in "Metaphysica Nova et Vetusta," is that it should be at once metaphysical (since it has to interpret experience from a general point of view) and psychological (since it finds its material in the facts of consciousness). The transition from theoretical philosophy to ethics is made by means of the doctrine that human consciousness, properly so called, is first attained when the "will-reason," the highest expression of personality, emerges and subdues to itself the sensible material of the merely "attuent" or animal consciousness. The ethical end, the good for man, is "self-realization." The nature of this "self-realization" and its conditions must be determined by study of the idea of man as an organism, with a view to discern the law implicit in this idea. An essential character of the self-realization of man is that "he has to do for his own organism what Nature through necessary laws does for all else;" man has to "organize himself from within." "Ought" is moralized "must." "The moral life is the life of duty to law in ideas; the spiritual life, again, is life in the ideas of reason consciously contemplated as impregnated with immanent Reason their source." An indispensable condition of the self-realization of man is the State; but, since self-realization is realization of the self *by* the self, the State exists for the individual, not the individual for the State. "In determining the conditions of the $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$, or good for man, we must regard him—*first*, as an organic unit; and *secondly*, as the unit of an organism; but this in subordination to the former." Self-realization is attained when there is harmony among the elements of sensibility of the subject: the test of this harmony (imposed by the "will-reason") is a feeling of harmony; a feeling which is to be described as "joy," although among the elements of sensibility harmonized pain (and not pleasure) may preponderate. When there is a perfect interpenetration of the formal (having its source in the "will-reason") and the real (the elements of the "attuent consciousness") pain disappears. "The virtuous state thus passes into the state of blessedness or holiness." "Freedom of the will" consists in its "autonomy" as distinguished from the "heteronomy" of volitions determined by impulses from "the attuent subject." The proof that "the altruistic emotions and their satisfaction contain the governing end of man's conduct," is found first in a "qualitative" superiority of these emotions to the "appetitive desires," then in a "quantitative" superiority to "the feeling of the beautiful" and "the emotion of reason activity." "The characteristic of the altruistic emotions," as distinguished from these last, "is that they contain in themselves the well-being of others than self and of self *through* others as their essence." Thus our own self-

realization must be "in subordination to the supreme end," which is "the love of our fellows." But this "love of others" must be "rationalized." "My personality has its own claims and restricts even the supreme emotion of love." "The very term harmony implies that there are other desires and emotions which enter into the notion of man which, as such, are to be regulated but not repressed. A true philosophy of ethics will not admit either of the fanaticism of austerity, or the fanaticism of the enthusiasm of humanity." The quotations here may seem rather numerous, but apart from their interest in relation to the author's system, they have a special interest of their own. "Scotus Novanticus" may, if he likes, call his ethical doctrine "Christianity as opposed to Buddhism." Others may find in it the higher merit that it brings into relief the Greek ideal of a harmony of the whole nature. In a passage following closely on the one last quoted, it is pointed out that before we can promote the good of others we must first settle "what the conditions, or law, of self-realization may be for man;" "and if so, then the supreme ethical question is settled *before* I begin to consider the question of quantitative distribution."

Are we not under obligation, then, to promote the happiness of society? I answer, in the teeth of current sentiment, that we are *not*. It is not a duty for all men. Individual men will find philanthropy their special vocation, just as other men find science or art to be their vocation. It is a noble thing to live for others, and the world owes much, perhaps most, of its progress to such nobility. But it is not a matter of universal obligation. I go even further, and say that the positive promotion of happiness in society concerns first a man's own personality, and its realization for himself and by himself. My duty is so to realize myself as to present to the world a harmonious life (p. 118).

The "joy conditioned by pain," which "Scotus Novanticus" makes the ideal of virtue, has again little in common with Christian ascetism, with "the worship of sorrow." He finds the realization of this ideal not in the submission of the saint, but in the rebellion of Prometheus. "Prometheus, on the Caucasian rock, was happier far than he could possibly have been had he submitted to the tyrant Zeus" (p. 145).

A doctrine of "free-will," such as that which is developed by "Scotus Novanticus," the doctrine that freedom consists in self-determination according to "the universal of reason," is found by Dr. Hutchison Stirling in Milton, especially in two passages of "Paradise Lost," where it is said that "what obeys reason is free," and that "true liberty" "always with right reason dwells." In the same opening lecture to the Edinburgh Philosophical Society³ it is pointed out that in Milton's distinction of "reason discursive or intuitive," a characteristic distinction of Kant is expressed. The address contains a good deal of literary as well as philosophical criticism. The poetry of "the first period" of

³ "Of Philosophy in the Poets." Opening Lecture to the Edinburgh University Philosophical Society, November 5, Session 1884-5. By James Hutchison Stirling, LL.D., Edinburgh. Published by request. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd. 1885.

English poetry (Chaucer to Milton) and of "the third period" (the beginning of the present century) is happily characterized as poetry of "nature and the soul" in distinction from the poetry of "society and wit" of the intermediate period. There is an interesting passage (pp. 85-89) on a certain "staginess" of the English as distinguished from the Continental theatre, and its causes. The passage that comes next in philosophical interest to the discussion of free-will already referred to is a development out of Shakespeare of the theory of "success in life," the relations of fortune and the individual.

Perhaps the great advantage that science gives to the modern over the ancient world is that imaginings such as those of the author of "Sympneumata"⁴ are of no avail. In an age when the *Zeitgeist* is scientific, thaumaturgy and mysticism have no chance. The insight of a few who have arrived at a clear view of Nature as a whole cannot control the tendencies inherited from ghost-worshipping ancestors; but the scientific spirit, with its appeal to experiment, can: and the circumstance that some men of science are spiritualists is no argument to the contrary. Such general reflections as these may seem out of place in discussing a book so amusingly absurd as "Sympneumata." Speculations of the same general type, however, have their danger, as might easily be shown historically. The author seems to feel what a potent adversary he has to contend with in modern science; see for example a denunciation (pp. 280-32) of the tyranny of intellect which "compresses in an iron grasp the sacred vigours of the spirit." Mr. Laurence Oliphant is not the author of "Sympneumata." "The following pages," he says, "were dictated by one who, never having appeared in print before, shrinks from the publicity attaching to it, and desires, for the present at all events, to remain unnamed." These pages, however, embody Mr. Oliphant's own "convictions and experiences." Imagine some one who, his nervous system being in a morbid state, should talk in his sleep under the influence of sub-conscious reminiscences of the Platonic myth of the original "dual nature of man," of say Balzac's "Seraphitus-Seraphita," and other modern romances, and of a little knowledge of comparative mythology; imagine these reminiscences to get expressed in a kind of semi-spiritualistic jargon; now suppose the dreamer to wake up and to take a report of his utterances for a divine revelation: the result will give some idea of "Sympneumata." Man, we are told, had originally a "fluid organism," was "bisexual," and worshipped a bisexual divinity, a "primal dual godhead" ("as Baal-Sidon and Ashteroth at Sidon; Baalath and Thammus at Gebel; Shed and Shedath among the Hittites; Hadad and Atarzath among the Aramæans; and Reseh and Anath in other parts of the country; at Carthage as Baal-Hamoh and Tanith; and under the name of Aphrodite, the androgynous Syro-Phœnician Nature-goddess was worshipped with the surnames of Cyprus and Cytherea in Greece and on the shores of

⁴ "Sympneumata: or, Evolutionary Forces now Active in Man." Edited by Laurence Oliphant. Edinburgh and London: Blackwood. 1885.

Italy. At Afka, where the river Adonis gushes from its rocky source, and furnishes the scene of the mythical legend, are the remains of the temple dedicated to the rites arising out of this dual sex-worship, which was celebrated with great pomp at Byblos;” &c.) Man is now, however, “very far gone from original” resemblance to the “Baalim and Ashtaroth” of Milton’s catalogue of the fallen angels. His dual unity has become divided and his spiritual organism incrustated with matter attracted from the lower creation. But there has always been a “subsurface world;” and with the progress of civilization it is gradually acquiring the power of getting free from its superficial crust of baser matter: there are besides, in space, innumerable “beings whose bodies are of the subsurface degree.” The complete casting off from itself of all material incrustation is for the human race only a question of time; some “spiritual scientists” are perhaps already on the point of attaining this result. To become perfect, each human spirit must attract from the aerial regions his or her complementary “sympneuma,” and, having again become dual and being no longer weighed down by a material organism, fill up eternity, as we may conjecture, with worship of “the primal dual godhead.”

The sober philosophy of Dr. J. M. Hodgson’s “Plea for Agnostic Belief”⁵ is not so entertaining as the production of the author to whom Mr. Laurence Oliphant has served as amanuensis; but perhaps the real importance of “Philosophy and Faith” is about equal to that of “Sympneumata.” Dr. Hodgson, like a judicious apologist, tries to “steer a middle course.” “The business of philosophy,” he holds, “is simply, reverently to attempt to set forth the relations of the elements of our Religious Faith to the conceptions and inferences with which reason and experience themselves have furnished us, and to trace as far as possible the harmony and compatibility of the contents of our Faith with those of our Philosophy.” Thus he avoids “the Scylla of rationalism and the Charybdis of authoritative dogmatism.” But did any “authoritative dogmatist” ever give to philosophy less than is here claimed? In order to represent his position as a compromise between the position of “the Middle Ages” and that of modern “Rationalists, Sceptics and Agnostics,” the author has to misrepresent the Middle Ages. What was scholastic philosophy in its most orthodox form but an attempt to harmonize the elements of “faith” with “reason”? No doubt the “Professor of the Science of Religion and Apologetics, Lancashire Independent College, Manchester,” has a different set of dogmas to harmonize with his philosophy; but intellectually his position is indistinguishable from what he himself describes as the position of the dogmatists, “that Reason is absolutely incompetent to examine or criticize, still more to sit in judgment upon the religious ideas and convictions which have been received by men through Divine Revelation, or through some similarly authoritative

⁵ “Philosophy and Faith: a Plea for Agnostic Belief.” By James M. Hodgson, D.Sc., B.D., M.A., Professor of the Science of Religion and Apologetics, Lancashire Independent College, Manchester. Manchester: Brook & Chrystall; London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co. 1885.

process." An illusory appearance of difference between this and his own position is given (probably without any Jesuitical intention on the author's part) by his assigning to the dogmatists the statement of what philosophy must not do, to those who agree with himself the statement of what, according to exactly the same general view of the relations of reason and faith, philosophy may do.

When a reader, on first opening a book, comes across a paragraph such as the following, he ought to know at once what to think of it:—

Even supposing the theory [of evolution] to have been established on a false basis, yet every one admits that great praise is due to Darwin especially, for the careful and impartial manner in which he has treated the subject, giving full weight and prominence to the weak points in his chain of Nature, and leaving the reader to form his own judgment from the evidence.

If any one should be tempted to read "Scientific Theology" through he will find, on coming to the second chapter, that Mr. Barber does not approve of "the endowment of research." He fears "that scientists, like engineers and inventors, will have to look to the results of their researches, as a reward and a means of supporting themselves." "Our idea is that this class of subsidy-mongers are hungering, possibly, for the emoluments and endowments that now reward the teachers of the Gospel." Nevertheless, Mr. Barber trusts "that the time is not far distant when Scientists and Religionists will work more harmoniously together towards the same object, and when this happens there will be some results achieved worth chronicling."

Mr. C. Davis English, having been inspired by a well-known passage, which he quotes from Mr. Herbert Spencer's "First Principles," to "give full utterance to his innermost conviction, leaving it to produce what effect it may," and not having found any valid arguments for a future state, has written a pamphlet⁷ to prove that on this question we must assume a position of "complete agnosticism."

The title of Dr. Webb's book⁸ is a very good one: for the author's final conclusion, after his historical study of modern idealism, is that the question as to the reality behind phenomena remains insoluble. The advantage of going through a course of philosophy is, he maintains, that having been at length convinced of the futility of all speculation about the reality of things, we see clearly that it is necessary to act according to the dictates of the "practical reason."

⁶ "Scientific Theology. Essays towards the Development of Religious Truth on the Basis of Modern Science." By Thomas Walter Barber. London: Elliot Stock. 1884.

⁷ "The Philosophy of a Future State. A Brief Demonstration of the Untenability of Current Speculations." By C. Davis English. Philadelphia: Stern & Co.; Boston: Cupples, Upham & Co.

⁸ "The Veil of Isis: a Series of Essays on Idealism." By Thomas E. Webb, LL.D., one of Her Majesty's Counsel; sometime Fellow of Trinity College and Professor of Moral Philosophy, now Regius Professor of Laws and Public Orator, in the University of Dublin. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co.; London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1885.

In one of Leopardi's dialogues it is concluded that the effect of all true philosophy is to prove to us that we ought not to philosophize : but, as the interlocutor who represents Leopardi goes on to show, the same result may be arrived at without philosophizing at all; and the habit of philosophizing, once acquired, is more difficult to get rid of than any other. Dr. Webb does not quote Leopardi, and does not put his conclusion in this way; he seems to have no suspicion of the pessimistic character of his recommendation to act and not speculate. It is clear that he has himself retained the taste for philosophical study. The chief interest of this, as of his former book on "The Intellectualism of Locke," is in the attempt to show how far English philosophers usually classed as empiricists have anticipated ideas supposed to be characteristic of German schools. In the present volume, the leading place is given to Hume. The author finds in Hume anticipations of everything in Kant, and of much in Hegel. Kantians will say that it would have been difficult to bring out clearly the element of intellectualism in the empirical philosophers if it had not been for the Kantian criticism; and perhaps on this point Dr. Webb would not differ from them; what he would deny is that the element of intellectualism undoubtedly present in Hume as well as in Locke, Berkeley and Bacon, is an inconsistency.

The author of the present work on "Buddhistic Psychology,"⁹ has already written much in advocacy of the general view he takes of problems of the philosophy of religion and of comparative mythology. His aim is by the study of historical documents, and of primitive modes of thought as revealed by observation of savage races, to construct an "objective" psychology. Study of the modes of thought of savages may be compared, in his view, to study of the separate elements of an organism. By means of special sets of documents, such as those which he has here used, a detailed comparative psychology of man may gradually be constructed. In the present volume he puts forth some translations of new documents from which, he believes, a more accurate view of Buddhism (on its philosophic side) is to be gained than from the less technical sources that have hitherto been accessible. On the ground of this evidence, he disputes the ordinary view of Nirvana, arguing that it is not a mere negation, but is conceived as positive and as the highest reality. In the chapters that are concerned with more general anthropological researches, abundant information is given from all possible sources. The extracts from other writers are always quoted in the original languages. This gives a certain first-hand character to the evidence. But in the case of the translations from the Pali it might perhaps have been better not to leave the technical terms of the original so frequently untranslated.

Dr. Asher undertakes to show the identity of Schopenhauer's

⁹ "Religions-philosophische Probleme auf dem Forschungsfelde Buddhistischer Psychologie und der vergleichenden Mythologie." Von A. Bastian. In zwei Abtheilungen. Berlin: A. Asher & Co. 1884.

doctrine of Will with the philosophy implied in primitive Judaism.¹⁰ In making a living Will the source of all things, Judaism, he contends, had anticipated the final result of the philosophy of Schopenhauer. But, it may be objected, Judaism is essentially optimistic; and, indeed, Schopenhauer saw in it the complete antithesis of his own pessimism. This Dr. Asher fully recognizes; but, like some other admirers of Schopenhauer, he does not admit pessimism to be a necessary deduction from the metaphysical doctrine which finds the reality of all things in "the will to live." His divergence from Schopenhauer manifests itself in the effort to substitute for Schopenhauer's ethical deductions from his metaphysics the view of life as a good in itself which has always been characteristic of Judaism. Schopenhauer's doctrine, interpreted in this way, is found to be in harmony, ethically as well as scientifically, with Darwinism. The working out of this view has much interest; for it has hitherto only found incidental expression, and Schopenhauer has come to be regarded simply as an adapter of Buddhism to European modes of philosophic expression. Dr. Asher's book has, besides, other merits of its own. It is interesting to read and not technical in style; and the account of the later forms of Judaism, and of the way in which the idea of life as the final end and as the source of things has always been present both in Jewish systems of philosophy and forms of devotion, is especially interesting.

Other books received are the second part of Miss Hennell's "Comparative Ethics" ["Present Religion," vol. iii.], on the "Moral Principle in regard to Brotherhood,"¹¹ and a new volume of the American translation of Lotze's "Outlines" ("The Philosophy of Religion").¹²

POLITICS, SOCIOLOGY, VOYAGES, AND TRAVELS.

BY far the most important contribution to political philosophy which we have to notice this quarter is Mr. Montague's remarkable essay on "The Limits of Individual Liberty."¹ The author describes it as being neither complete nor philosophic, and as aiming merely at "carrying political reflection one or two stages beyond the point reached by those whose sole interest is in party politics. It cannot

¹⁰ "Das Endergebnis der Schopenhauer'schen Philosophie in seiner Uebereinstimmung mit einer der ältesten Religionen dargestellt." Von Dr. David Asher. Leipzig: Arnoldische Buchhandlung. 1885.

¹¹ "Comparative Ethics, II." Moral Principle in Regard to Brotherhood. (Present Religion, vol. iii.) By Sara S. Hennell, Author of "Thoughts in Aid of Faith," &c. London: Trübner. 1885.

¹² "Outlines of the Philosophy of Religion." Dictated portions of the Lectures of Hermann Lotze. Translation edited by George T. Ladd, Professor of Philosophy in Yale College. Boston: Ginn, Heath & Co. 1885.

¹ "The Limits of Individual Liberty." An Essay by Francis C. Montague, Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, and University College, London. London: Rivingtons, Waterloo Place. 1886.

assist the scientific inquirer; but it may interest some of those who like to criticize their own opinions." This description is misleading. Complete, in the author's sense, the essay is not; but philosophic it most certainly is, and scientific, too, in tone and essence, if not in form.

Mr. Montague believes the time has come for a criticism of the old formulas about liberty. A reaction has set in against the striving after individual liberty, which for many years, and till recently, has mainly occupied political energy both here and in other European countries. The modern theory of liberty—the doctrine of negative freedom—has broken down, after as fair a trial as any political theory ever got in practice. Political and social perfection are as far off as ever. Discontent, the most universal attribute of our generation, shows itself in the pessimism which pervades our best literature and art. Socialism, the central doctrine of which is that "co-operation, not competition, is the true principle of social life," expresses the practical revolt against the doctrine of negative freedom.

The State has, in fact, been compelled to change its policy. A change which was necessary must be justifiable by some principle of political philosophy. This leads us to ask "Whether the merely negative conception of civil freedom is complete or fragmentary? If it be fragmentary, can we form any theory of freedom more scientific, that is, capable of explaining with accuracy a wider range of facts?" The essay is an attempt to find a basis for such a theory. Naturally, the author adopts the historical method. He begins by sketching the history of English ideas on individual liberty, and he finds that the three great English schools of political philosophy—that of Hobbes and Locke, that of Bentham, and that of Herbert Spencer—substantially agree in taking a physical view of society. The Sociologist, under which "barbarous and unmeaning epithet" he includes M. Comte and Mr. Spencer, "applies to the interpretation of political and social facts, the supposed methods of physical science. He explains the aggregate by deducing it from the individual. . . . He looks upon society as a natural organism, upon history as a natural evolution." In that view competition—the struggle for existence, resulting in the extinction of the unfit—is the only possible principle of progress for the individual and for his society. But Mr. Montague rejects this view. We cannot, he holds, deduce society from the individual, any more than we can deduce the individual from society. Society and the social unit so involve each other that neither can be deduced from the other, or, at least, either can equally well be deduced from the other. In order to understand either "we must know not one person, nor a multitude of persons, but those persons in their mutual relations"—*i.e.*, we must investigate their religion, art, literature, science, laws, &c. This we can only do by a prolonged study of living societies.

But the conception of society as a merely physical organism is inadequate and wrong; it is a moral organism also. Consciousness and reason introduce elements which the methods of natural science can never detect—such as morality, science, religion, art. We should like to quote a great many of the passages in which Mr. Montague

expounds and supports his conception of Society. We must, however, content ourselves with the following, which we take almost at random :—

Our civilization is the result not only of appetite but also of asceticism ; not only of self-assertion, but also of self-abnegation ; not only of the instinctive desire to live, but also of the reasoned contempt of life ; not only of the impulse to crush those who stand in our way, clash with us in our pursuits, and hinder us of our profit or pleasure, but also of the longing to lift up those that are fallen, to soothe pain, to assuage grief, to heal remorse, to give light to the blind, health to the sick, and consolation to those that are oppressed and have none to comfort them. . . . These make the true social bond ; and these are not natural. There is nothing like them in the evolution which has produced the infinite variety of animal and vegetable life.

Having examined into the true meaning of social progress, Mr. Montague analyzes the idea implied in individuality, and inquires how is it related to civilization. This analysis and inquiry are necessary before we can say how far and by what means Society ought to limit the freedom of the individual. As to our own age he thinks it does not lack variety of character, but perhaps it lacks development of character. And if so, he suggests that the fact is owing to our unconscious materialism—a characteristic of the age on which Mr. Montague is terribly but justly severe. All the great changes of recent years have tended in the first instance to fix the minds of men solely upon material well-being. But a better time is coming.

Our own age has seen the dissolution of society and the triumph of materialism. It has felt their consequence in the degradation of the individual. But a new social order grows by the very necessity of man's nature. . . . We cannot do without fixity, unity, consistency. Soon or late we shall find them again. . . . A rational education will then become possible. . . . At present it merely sows the seeds of intellectual dyspepsia and spiritual liver-complaint. . . . Now it makes a *dilettante* ; hereafter it will make a man. . . . He will be a great individual, and society, once more abounding in such, will be an exhilarating, a glorious society.

From his analysis of individuality it follows that the activity of the State is not necessarily injurious to the perfection of the individual ; on the contrary, individual perfection can only be approached with the active assistance of Society : "The true function of the State is to make the most of the citizen. This is its only inexhaustible function." Mr. Montague has no blind admiration for freedom of action and of discussion as these are understood in England. He suggests certain limitations to which they ought to be subject, and holds that the publishing of an opinion is not essentially different from any other action, and, therefore, the State is justified in interfering with it on the same principles that justify interference with action in general. The State may employ the engine of criminal justice against "speculative assailants of accepted morality." Mr. Montague anticipates many of the obvious objections to this rather startling announcement, but we cannot admit that he has disposed of them. One of the most interesting chapters is the last, "Bureaucracy and Communism." These, he maintains, are not the necessary consequences of enlarging the func-

tions of the State. Bureaucracy of the continental type, which some English writers are so in dread of, is the result of historical conditions not existing in England. It has been established by dynasties, and its primary object has always been to secure the interest of those dynasties. With us the origin and aim of a bureaucracy would be totally different. Deriving all its authority from the people, existing only to further their interests, it would be held in check by vigorous local institutions. Finally the author defends his views from the charge of Communism, and offers some considerations towards "fixing the limit at which, upon our theory, taxation passes into confiscation." But upon this point he is not able to suggest any definite comprehensive rule; it is a question of degree. He sees no objection to a graduated income-tax and succession duty. But he warns us rather vaguely to "beware how we lose sight of the landmarks of justice in a fog of sophistry, yield up our ears to the jargon of unearned increments, or surrender our understandings to the metaphysic of proscription, of spoliation, and of nationalization."

This very incomplete outline of the views advanced in this most instructive and stimulating essay is all that our narrow limits of time and space allow. Mr. Montague is strongest in criticism. He deals a heavy blow at the moribund theories of a past generation of political philosophers. He is less successful in suggesting principles for practical constructive legislation. We hail his essay as the boldest and most complete "Apologia" we have seen of the new political philosophy. It is expressed in language clear, condensed, incisive, worthy in every way of the sustained dignity and earnestness of tone which pervades the essay from the first page to the last.

Quite in harmony with Mr. Montague's political philosophy is Mr. Cunningham's political economy.² Indeed Oxford and Cambridge, judged by these two representatives, appear to be moving in exactly parallel lines of thought, under the influence of one and the same motive power.

Mr. W. Cunningham's essay on economic principles is a contribution of some value towards the recasting of political economy in a form suited to the altered social and political conditions of the present day; in other words, towards the re-statement of economic doctrines which have ceased to be of practical value, because our conception of national wealth and of the means of attaining it have altered. This, so far as we can understand the drift of Mr. Cunningham's essay, is a fairly accurate account of it. He does not himself attempt any such restatement of particular doctrines; the nearest approach to any such attempt in his essay is the "description" he offers of national wealth (p. 117). But he endeavours to discover some general principles, founded on a wide survey of history in its economic aspect, by the

² "Politics and Economics. An Essay on the Nature of the Principles of Political Economy, together with a Survey of Recent Legislation." By W. Cunningham, B.D., University Lecturer and Chaplain of Trinity College, Cambridge. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., Paternoster Row. 1885.

light of which modern thinkers may remodel the discredited doctrines of the older economists. We could wish that Mr. Cunningham had formulated his views more distinctly; that he had given us something more positive than the merely negative criticism with which our patience is sorely tried and our hopes so often disappointed. One yearns for the support of some positive definite principles to take the place of those which have disappeared under the author's analysis. But this feeling finds scanty satisfaction in Mr. Cunningham's pages. We must bear in mind, however, that he does not pretend to set before us a treatise on political economy, but rather some scattered criticisms and suggestions, the most prominent of which relates to the true subject-matter of economic inquiry. National wealth is, and must necessarily ever be, the subject-matter of political economy. But the definition of national wealth varies, as Mr. Cunningham contends, from one period to another. The current conception of national wealth, as illustrated by national legislation, includes different elements at different times; and, moreover, the legitimate or most desirable methods of gaining national wealth vary with the current morality. Thus, at one period the national wealth means simply the royal treasure; at a later period it is conceived as being the aggregate of the possessions of individuals; while at the present moment Mr. Cunningham appears to think it may be described as "consisting of all physical objects which may be used for sustaining and prolonging the national life," including such elements as situation, climate, and even "the lives and muscles of the citizens." Obviously the political economy which adopts this last view of national wealth will differ essentially in its doctrines from those founded on either of the other views. Mr. Cunningham appears to assume that the political economist must take his definition from the current conception. In his view the economic thinker has only to formulate as accurately as may be the current conception of national wealth, and then show by what means wealth so conceived may be acquired consistently with the current morality. According to Mr. Cunningham, "the doctrines of political economy have changed, not so much because the older economists were mistaken, as because the nation has changed its mind in regard to the kinds of wealth it wished for, and the reasons for which it wished for them." The function of the economist is "to describe the means to an end, and to an end that is a different one in different countries and at different times." But if Mr. Cunningham is right in this view, the older economists were profoundly mistaken indeed in laying down as universal and absolute, principles which "can have no absolute validity, but are only relative to the life of the particular polity with reference to which they are stated." Mr. Cunningham, acting on this view of the function of the economist, addresses himself to "a somewhat lengthy investigation of English economic experience . . . in the hope that from the results of this long national experience of success and of failure, we may be able to lay down principles which shall be true for us in the present day with our present conceptions of national wealth, our present political institutions, and our present ideas of morality." Mr. Cunningham

distinguishes three periods during which the methods of pursuing wealth were determined respectively by Christian morality, national policy, and individual preferences. Passing over Mr. Cunningham's interesting historical sketch, we arrive at last at the promised "economic principles for the present day." It is not an accident of literary style, that Mr. Cunningham uses the word *for* where we might have expected *of*. There are, in fact, hardly any economic principles which can claim to be the recognized principles of the day, and Mr. Cunningham's historical survey of the past economic life of England was undertaken in the hope of supplying this great want by the discovery of some principles which shall be true for the English nation of to-day. It is disappointing to find that his search appears to have been a barren one. He does not tell us so, perhaps he does not think so. But to us, the suggested "principles for the present day" seem vague, illusory and confusing in themselves, while they do not appear to be in any way suggested by or connected with the historical survey of previous economic systems. Two principles we do find, which have some kind of claim to originality of form if not of substance. One of these is that the prevailing conception of "wealth" is inadequate, and errs in identifying increase of national wealth with increase of individual wealth. In proof of which he appeals not to our "English experience," but to the ancient history of Egypt and Rome. The other is that regard to posterity is to be our guide whenever we depart from the principles of "laissez-faire," but that, subject to that test, we shall do well to adopt these principles. The conclusion is disappointing. We had hoped to see some clear guiding principles, serviceable in the present confusion, emerge from Mr. Cunningham's study of English economic experiences. The second part of the book consists of a not very successful attempt to test recent legislation systematically by the principles he has endeavoured to lay down. On the whole we think Mr. Cunningham can do better than he has done in "Politics and Economics." This is no small compliment to his capabilities as an economic writer.

Notwithstanding the disrepute into which many of Adam Smith's doctrines have lately fallen, his great work is hardly less deserving of study than it ever was. Indeed, as its most recent editor points out, there are numerous current misconceptions regarding Smith's treatment of these doctrines. His disciples have, in several instances, developed these doctrines without reference to the limitations and qualifications subject to which they were laid down by their author. Like most founders of great schools, Adam Smith has been discredited by his followers, and those who would appreciate his teaching must seek it direct from himself. Mr. Nicholson is therefore doing a service not only to his great countryman, but also to the study of political economy, in editing a new edition of "The Wealth of Nations,"³ with

³"An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations." By Adam Smith. With an Introductory Essay and Notes, by Joseph Shield Nicholson, M.A., Professor of Commercial and Political Economy and Mercantile Law in

an introductory Essay in which he endeavours to dispel the misconceptions from which his author has suffered. There are some useful notes collected at the end of the volume, indicating the advances made in the subject since Smith's time, and supplying much needed references to the best and most recent authorities. At the present moment it is interesting to note that more than a century ago Adam Smith seriously proposed a scheme of federation of the British empire—the colonies to contribute to the imperial revenue, and to send representatives to Parliament.

Of General Trumbull's little book, "The American Lesson of the Free Trade Struggle in England,"⁴ we can only say that we endorse Mr. Bright's description of it as "useful and very interesting," and his opinion that the Americans will not copy from us.

Thirty years ago, Professor Blackie tells us,⁵ his wanderings among "the breezy Bens of dear old Bræmar" were embittered by what he saw of the crofters' sorrows. He has never ceased to study the causes of the evils and their proper remedies. In pursuing his inquiries, it soon became manifest to him that "the special evils under which the Highlanders groaned were no isolated phenomenon, but were merely the natural result of a general one-sided and unjust body of Land Laws, of which the operation in the remote Highlands, as in Ireland, had been intensified by local peculiarities." This led him to extend his investigations to the agrarian and economic systems of most European countries, and then to study all he could find written on the Land Laws, both from the legal and the economic point of view; crowning his studies with a careful examination of the Report of the Crofters' Commission. It will thus be seen that Prof. Blackie is justified in claiming to be entitled to be heard, although the subject is one which lies outside his professional studies. Perusal of his book shows that he has logically thought out the whole question of land tenures from his own point of view. The historical sketch, to which chap. i. is chiefly devoted, constitutes a deeply interesting and well-written narrative, a valuable contribution to the social and economical history of the Highlands. Having completed a very able and instructive review of the influences, historical and economical, to which the misfortunes of the Highlanders are traceable, he concludes that, although the Land Laws had nothing to do directly with these changes, nevertheless "the high-handed, inhuman, and impolitic proceedings by which that noble peasantry has been ejected from its native seats, never could have taken place but for the absolute power with which the Land Laws had armed the owners in their social relations with

the University of Edinburgh, &c. Author of "Tenant's Gain not Landlord's Loss." London: T. Nelson & Sons, Paternoster Row, Edinburgh, and New York. 1884.

⁴ "The American Lesson of the Free Trade Struggle in England." By General M. M. Trumbull. Chicago: Schumm & Simpson, *Radical Review* Office. 1884.

⁵ "The Scottish Highlanders and the Land Laws. An Historico-Economical Inquiry." By John Stuart Blackie, F.R.S.E., Emeritus Professor of Greek in the University of Edinburgh. London: Chapman & Hall (Limited). 1885.

the occupiers of the soil." Therefore, it is not to the settlement of any petty disputes in a corner of Skye that Highlanders must look for any substantial amelioration of their condition, but to "the great national question of Land Law Reform on a large scale." This alone will be able "to save them from the neglect in which their grievances may be allowed to sleep on the over-burdened tables of the House of Commons; a neglect under which even the rudely enforced claims of the great Irish nation lay smothered for generations, till they were planted on the platform of general recognition by the disinterested patriotism of Mr. Bright, and the fine sense of justice and large statesmanship of Mr. Gladstone." These considerations make it "necessary to enter into a formal exposition of the origin, nature, character, and social operation of the laws that regulate landed property, as the most important factor in that great branch of moral philosophy which it has become of late years customary to call sociology." The author accordingly proceeds to lay down at considerable length a series of propositions constituting "the fundamental heads" of his doctrine. It is impossible to restate these propositions briefly, and it is difficult to gather them up under one description. Some belong purely to moral science, some to political, and some again to social science. Guided by the abstract principles contained in these propositions, he endeavours to formulate the special principles on which the Land Laws of this country ought to be reconstructed. He examines the relation of landlord and tenant as a matter of legal contract, maintaining that there is no freedom of contract between great landlords and small tenants. The consideration of rent leads him to describe the various forms under which that phenomenon presents itself in other European countries, especially in Tuscany, and he arrives at the conclusion that "as a general rule, a fair or just rent should not be left to the discretion of the landowner, as if he were a mere shopkeeper, putting a price on his wares, . . . but it must be fixed either by kindly tradition and equitable usage as it generally has been in England, or by the State, in some such way as is now done in Ireland, by an impartial court composed of lawyers and land valuers." He has no special preference for peasant proprietors as opposed to tenants, provided tenant laws are fair and equitable. To check the evil of excessive accumulation of land he suggests a progressive tax on landed property, a limited right of primogeniture, and a limited right of disposition by will, somewhat of the kind which still exists in the Channel Islands; and in no case should the dead be allowed, by settlements or entails, "to exercise a monstrous lordship over the free economical action of the living possessors in favour of persons yet unborn." In his final chapter, Professor Blackie goes through the recommendations of the Royal Commission on the condition of the crofters. Its general tone he warmly appreciates, but thinks it does not go far enough, and lacks boldness. He advocates the institution of a Land Court, which shall have power to acquire for the State, at a compulsory valuation, such lands as the Court may consider to be required for redistribution among crofters. These lands would be

held by the crofters subject to a permanent rent or tax payable to the State. Apart from its value as a study of Land Laws, Professor Blackie's book has, as we should expect, a high literary value, which will make its perusal an intellectual pleasure to many who may be quite indifferent to his practical aims.

Although the question of disestablishment of the Church of England^a can hardly be described at the present moment as a "burning" one, it may fairly be said to be smouldering, and may at any moment burst forth into full conflagration. The advocates of disestablishment, like those of many other great national changes, are no doubt biding their time, confident that a reformed and truly national democratic Parliament will be more likely to take up their case and do what they want done thoroughly. Disestablishment will, probably, be one of the most prominent subjects on which candidates at the next general election will have to expound their opinions. The republication of Mr. Freeman's papers on this subject, first published ten years ago, is therefore by no means inopportune. They are, both in tone and in substance, as well as by the authority of the author's name, eminently fitted to promote the calm, judicial examination of the conceptions on which the popular arguments for and against are likely to be based, when the question comes to be debated on public platforms throughout the country. Many of these conceptions are very serious *misconceptions*, which it is highly important to have corrected before the great body of impartial citizens, to whom the heated disputants will ultimately appeal, have taken sides and given definite pledges. To correct these misconceptions, "to clear away confusions on both sides, and to enable both sides to discuss more easily the really simple ground of controversy between them," is Mr. Freeman's object. Whether disestablishment and disendowment are desirable, is a question he studiously avoids expressing any opinion upon. Mr. Freeman has acquitted himself admirably of this judicial task, stating, with his usual fulness and clearness, the facts given in evidence and the law applicable to them, leaving it to the public, as to a jury, to find a verdict for or against. It is impossible for any one of ordinary intelligence to read these papers and still remain "confused" about those matters which the author undertakes to make clear. One of the most fundamental points on which Mr. Freeman thinks friends and foes alike go wrong, is the ground on which the lawfulness of disestablishment or disendowment is asserted or denied. It is commonly asserted on the ground that Church property (or, to speak more correctly, the property of the Churches), is "national" property; while it is as commonly denied, on the ground that such property is something too sacred for the State to meddle with. The truth is, that the so-called Church property is

^a"Disestablishment and Disendowment: What Are They?" By Edward A. Freeman, D.O.L., LL.D., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford. Reprinted with additions from the *Pall Mall Gazette*. Second edition. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

neither more nor less "national," neither more nor less "sacred," than any other property, corporate or private; and the State may lawfully do with the one or the other whatever it thinks good. Mr. Freeman tries hard to restore the ugly word "confiscation" to its proper meaning—the taking of property by the State—"a perfectly colourless word." He will hardly succeed. It seems to be beyond the power of any writer, however eminent, to restore the lost character of a fallen word. In the present case we need not regret this, for we want a word to express the taking away of property by the State *without* compensation, whether arbitrarily, or as a just penalty. Other "vulgar errors" combated by Mr. Freeman are, that there was some one particular moment when the State either endowed or established the Church by a deliberate formal act, or that there was any moment when the State took the Church property from one religious body and gave it to another. He makes it very clear in what the "establishment" of the Anglican Church consists at present, and what privileges and liabilities it must necessarily cease to have if disestablished.

The second volume of Mr. Featherman's laborious work, "The Social History of the Races of Mankind," deals with the Nigritians, the first division under Mr. Featherman's classification. The first volume, dealing with his fifth division, was published in 1881. The other volumes are ready for the press, and will be published more or less speedily, according to the patronage each of the separate issues may receive. Mr. Featherman tells us that his work is neither an ethnology nor an anthropology, though it contains material valuable to both sciences. But he claims that it is a history and a geography; to both of which claims we must demur. It is, in fact, hardly anything but an account of the present condition of the inhabitants of Africa, with a very sketchy outline of the principal natural features of the country. It is a very painstaking summary of the observations of the best travellers. So far as we have observed, in the choice of authorities where accounts are conflicting, the author has exercised considerable judgment. It may prove of much value to the student of sociology. There is one feature of the book which is deserving of commendation. The author has collected at the end of each chapter a short but valuable list of the best authorities on the tribes treated of in the preceding pages. The plan of the book is to take each of the principal branches of the Nigritian stock, and after a very brief sketch of the general characteristics of that branch, to consider the special characteristics of the several tribes comprising it. Such a plan leads necessarily to much repetition, but is very convenient for reference by students.

The publication of Mr. Morey's "Outlines of Roman Law"⁸ may

⁷ "Social History of the Races of Mankind. First Division: Nigritians." By A. Featherman. London: Trübner & Co., Ludgate Hill. 1885.

⁸ "Outlines of Roman Law: comprising its Historical Growth and General Principles." By Wm. C. Morey, Ph.D., Professor of History and Political Science in the University of Rochester. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1884.

be considered a satisfactory proof that the study of this subject is spreading in America as well as in England, and its importance as a part of liberal education recognized. The author's description of the scope of his book is really too modest. His "Outlines" will be useful to others besides mere students "who desire an elementary knowledge of the history and principles of Roman Law." We do not hesitate to say that a fairly wide and very accurate acquaintance with Roman Law can be got from this little book, and a more special study of any particular branch will be immensely facilitated by the useful list of references at the end of each chapter, and at the end of the book. It consists of two parts, which treat respectively of the historical growth of Roman Law from the earliest times to the present, and of the general principles of Roman Law. Part I. is an excellent résumé, incidentally introducing a good deal of general constitutional history, while tracing the descent of the law-making power as it passed to ever lower and wider strata of society. The chapters on the influence of the Stoics, and on the functions of the Jurisconsults, are amongst the best in the book. In Part II. Mr. Morey adopts the classification of rights followed by Gaius and Justinian.

It is not often that the veil is lifted from prison life by one who has suffered a long term of penal servitude; still less often by one whose name is known so widely, and, on the whole, so honourably as Michael Davitt's. In his "Leaves from a Prison Diary,"⁹ we have a series of pictures of convicts, and the life they lead in penal servitude, which we feel are faithful as well as graphic. These pictures are reproduced from notes jotted down in the solitude of a cell at Portland, relieved only by the company of a tame blackbird. Mr. Davitt throws a good deal of light on the ways of criminals, their opinions of the rest of the world, their slang, their literature, their codes of honour. His descriptions are clear, pleasantly written, sometimes enlivened by humorous anecdotes, or a little biting sarcasm, which never degenerates into malignant bitterness. He adopts a more serious tone when he speaks of the causes of crime, and points out the remedies which he thinks would be effective. Amongst minor, but immediately operating remedial measures, he lays stress on education, and, we are glad to see, rational recreation. Poverty, which is directly or indirectly responsible for the greater part of crime, must and can be abolished, Mr. Davitt assures us, by the nationalization of the land in the sense which he explains—*i.e.*, in Mr. Henry George's sense. He condemns, on economic grounds, the proposal to lend money to farmers for the purchase of their farms. Dr. Wallace's proposal to compensate landlords by granting them annuities for three lives, he rejects as too merciful; he would only give them a bare subsistence, which might be extended to those dependent on them until the latter were able to earn their own livelihood—*i.e.*, to the age of 15. The

⁹ "Leaves from a Prison Diary; or, Lectures to a 'Solitary' Audience." By Michael Davitt, Founder of the Land League. London: Chapman & Hall, Limited, 1885.

suggested landlord's property tax of 4s. in the £ he considers a step in the right direction. Apart from the extravagance of his revolutionary proposals for dealing with land and landowners, the book is an interesting one, written with a simple earnestness which speaks the sincerity of Mr. Davitt's views. It is quite free from the truculent ranting which disfigures Mr. Hyndman's advocacy of Socialism. Mr. Davitt makes no pretence of supporting his proposals by scientific economic reasoning; but his proposals have the merit at least of being very distinctly stated, so that there can be no ambiguity about his meaning. Most readers will not care to read beyond the first twenty lectures—the lighter and more amusing part of the book, dealing with and classifying Mr. Davitt's prison companions.

We have received the third edition of Captain Abbott's "Journey from Heraut to Khiva, Moscow and St. Petersburg."¹⁰ It comes out at a favourable moment. For, although the political interest in Khiva is for England no longer what it was before Russia had actually absorbed the Khanates, many people will still turn with curiosity to the narrative of a traveller, who, forty years ago, traversed the interminable deserts of the little known, and till recently, almost inaccessible region of Central Asia. Captain Abbott's journey to the Khan of Khiva was undertaken in the year 1840, with a diplomatic purpose in connection with the then recent attempt of Russia against Khiva. Starting from Heraut, Captain Abbott followed the course of the river Murghab northwards, passing through Penj-deh and other places, whose names are now familiar to the public ear, until he arrived at Merv; thence he crossed the desert in a straight line to Khiva. From Khiva, after a stay of about two months, his route lay in a north-easterly direction to Karagan on the Caspian Sea, where the Astrakhan vessels meet the Khlivan caravans. Captain Abbott was disappointed in his hopes of finding a vessel here, and was compelled to undertake a perilous march through a country of robbers and brigands as they proved to be—cannibals as Captain Abbott declares they were—in order to reach the Russian fortified post of Dasht Gullah, otherwise Nuovo Alexandroski on the shores of the Caspian. On this march he was treacherously attacked, robbed, wounded, and all but killed, his small retinue being treated in similar manner, and allotted as slaves amongst their captors. Subsequently his servants and property were restored to him much damaged, and he was conducted to the Russian post, where he was kindly treated and sent on to Orenburg, crossing the Caspian to Gorief at the mouth of the Ural, or "Ourahl," and thence by land along the banks of that river. From Orenburg he travelled comfortably to Moscow and St. Petersburg. It was an adventurous journey; but, with the exception of the one occasion, when he was attacked by the Kuzzauks, his safety does not appear to have been seriously threatened.

¹⁰ "Narrative of a Journey from Heraut to Khiva, Moscow and St. Petersburg, during the late Russian Invasion of Khiva; with some account of the Court of Khiva and the Kingdom of Khaurism." By Captain James Abbott, Bengal Artillery, lately on a Diplomatic Mission to Khiva. Two vols. Third edition. London: W. H. Allen & Co., 13, Waterloo Place, S.W. 1884.

Yet his risks from suspicious or avaricious rulers and ministers were considerable, and were not at all lessened by any fear of England's long arm. The very name of England was unknown until the fame of Pottinger's defence of Herat, a few years before, spread it across the deserts, and caused the Khan of Khiva to inquire who these English were. "No one could satisfy me," said the Khan; "but the most learned were of opinion that the English were a petty tribe of Russians." The chief value of the book lies in the very graphic details it gives of the people Captain Abbott was brought into contact with. He reproduces countless conversations, from which we get an insight into the ideas and characters of these individuals; he describes minutely and forcibly their actions, their dress, their surroundings. For serious readers the book might have been made more valuable by the omission of many anecdotes of very unequal merit, occasional patriotic or pious moralizings, and naïve confidences. The two volumes might well be condensed into one. That one would certainly be less attractive to readers who care chiefly for the personal and adventurous element in records of travel. Readers of this class may be congratulated on the re-issue of this cheery, gossipy story of a remarkable journey, accomplished by a brave and patriotic English soldier, who happily is still with us, although a whole generation has passed away since his famous exploit.

"The King Country,"¹¹ is the name by which a large district comprising some 10,000 square miles in the centre of the middle island of New Zealand is known. It is really, though not formally so recognized, a strict native Maori reserve, within which few white men have ever been allowed to penetrate, and none have settled. When Mr. Kerry-Nicholls undertook to explore, at his own risk, this interesting district, it was "to all intents and purposes an *imperium in imperio*, situated in the heart of a British colony; a *terra incognita* inhabited exclusively by a warlike race of savages, ruled over by an absolute monarch, who defied our laws, ignored our institutions, and in whose territory the rebel, the murderer, and the outcast took refuge with impunity." It was "as strictly tabooed to the European as a Mahomedan mosque, and all who had hitherto attempted to make even short journeys into it had been ruthlessly plundered by natives and sent back across the frontier, stripped even of their clothes." The prospect of difficulty, and the spice of danger in visiting forbidden and unknown ground, together with the probability of doing a service to the colonists, and perhaps to science, were no doubt strong attractions to such a seasoned explorer as Mr. Kerry-Nicholls. Failing to get any satisfactory promise of protection from the king (Tawhiao), our author determined to venture without his authority, and accordingly, early in April, 1883, accompanied only by a Mr. Turner, who acted as interpreter, he entered

¹¹ "The King Country; or, Explorations in New Zealand. A Narrative of 600 Miles of Travel through Maori Land, with a Treatise on the Origin, Physical Characteristics, and Manners and Customs of the Maori Race." By J. H. Kerry-Nicholls. With 52 Illustrations and a Map. Third edition, enlarged. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington, 188, Fleet Street. 1884.

the forbidden territory *viâ* Lake Taupo, directing his course towards the sacred mountains of Tongariro and Ruapehu. Tongariro is an active and Ruapehu an extinct volcano, the latter one of the largest of its kind in the world. Both these were ascended by the travellers, Ruapehu proving a difficult piece of work, but well worth the trouble and discomfort it cost. Here he discovered the sources of two important rivers, the Waikato and the Whangaehu. Leaving Ruapehu, he crossed the Onetapu Desert, which is now covered with scoria; but was formerly a forest, as the existence of remains of huge trees, now reduced to masses of charcoal, proves. Pursuing their course they had to make their way through eighty miles of dense forest and jungle, after which, half-starved, drenched to the skin, torn, and covered with mud, they came upon a party of natives, who, when told they were travelling for pleasure, made the very sensible remark "these *pakehas* have singular ways." The Maoris proved more friendly than might have been expected after the description we have quoted, and the travellers finished their journey without molestation, quitting the King Country on the 18th of May, having ridden 600 miles. Mr. Kerry-Nicholls saw many curious and interesting things besides the wonderful natural scenery and the far-famed hot springs. We have no space to speak of these, nor of the customs and legendary history of the Maoris; but those who are interested in such things, or in the future of that rich and exquisitely lovely island, so marked out by position and climate as the future home of a great English community, will read these pleasant pages with much satisfaction.

In addition to the two records of travel which we have noticed, we have two accounts, by residents of some years, of the very different islands of Madagascar and Japan. "Nine Years in Nipon"¹² might, at one stage of European ignorance, have been warmly welcomed, as enabling us to form a general idea of the externals of Japanese civilization—the sights of the street and the high road. But after the exhaustive work of Professor Rein, and the graphic sketches of Miss Bird, the author of "Nine Years in Nipon" must surely be mistaken in supposing that the public "wish for more" of such inexact information and superficial observations as he too often offers them. For the rest, Dr. Faulds appears to be a very worthy doctor, whose descriptions of life in Japan are truthful so far as they go, and quite harmless if dull.

But "Madagascar: its History and People"¹³ stands on a different level. Its subject is one which we have few books about. Globe-trotters have not yet vulgarized Madagascar, though missionaries have, while doing at the same time much to civilize it. Its inhabitants are particularly interesting to the ethnologist and to the sociologist;

¹² "Nine Years in Nipon: Sketches of Japanese Life and Manners." By Henry Faulds, L.F.P.S., Surgeon of Isukiji Hospital, Tokio, &c. London and Paisley: Alex. Gardner, 12, Paternoster Row. 1885.

¹³ "Madagascar: its History and People." By the Rev. Henry W. Little (some years Missionary in East Madagascar). With a Map. Edinburgh and London: Wm. Blackwood & Sons. 1884.

while to the politician the island is well worth study in view of the recent and still-continuing action of the French. We note with pleasure that Mr. Little, although himself a missionary, is able to write an account of the scene of his labours, and let us hope his triumphs, which is not devoted to the paltry details of missionary achievements. Indeed, but for an occasional chance allusion we should never know what the author's profession was. The scope of his work is much wider. According to his preface the object of his book is twofold: (1.) "To give in a concise form the principal facts of Malagasy history, with a brief description of the habits, customs, and natural features of the country;" (2.) "To direct public interest towards a small and insular but progressive and worthy people, who are at the present time passing through a great national crisis." Mr. Little never loses sight of these two objects all through, and we feel assured that he has substantially attained them. With much tact Mr. Little, unlike his fellow-missionary, Mr. Shaw, has avoided political controversies concerning French action against the Hovas; while at the same time he presents the latter people in such a favourable light, and speaks so highly of their remarkable advance in good government and social order, that we cannot be otherwise than highly indignant at any aggression on their rights, or violent interference with their peaceful development. The author acknowledges his obligations to Mr. Sibree and other writers; but he has added much that is valuable from his own observations, for he knows what is worth describing and how to describe it.

In a thoroughly well got up folio volume containing no less than fifty full-page illustrations, of which thirty-one are excellent artotypes, we have the story of the removal to New York of the Alexandrian Obelisk,¹⁴ the last of the pair known as "Cleopatra's Needles," the companion of the one which now stands on the Thames Embankment. The negotiations which led to the gift of this obelisk to the city of New York, and to its transportation thither, at Mr. Vanderbilt's expense, are told at full length. Lieut. Goringe, by whom this account is compiled, carried out the removal and conveyance and re-erection of the obelisk. Its history and archæology are treated in numerous letters and speeches, as well as in the author's text. The volume also gives some similar information about most of the obelisks which have been taken from Egypt in ancient or modern times to adorn the cities of Europe.

Mr. Innes Shand's "Letters from the West of Ireland"¹⁵ are well worth reprinting. They contain much interesting and some useful information about the condition of the people, the changes which have

¹⁴ "Egyptian Obelisks." By Henry H. Goringe, Lieutenant-Commander, United States Navy. Fifty full-page illustrations—thirty-one artotypes, eighteen engravings, and one chromo-lithograph. London: John C. Nimmo, 14, King William Street, Strand. 1885.

¹⁵ "Letters from the West of Ireland, 1884." By Alexander Innes Shand, Author of "Letters from the Highlands." Reprinted from the *Times*. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons. 1885.

taken place in many districts in recent years, the hopes and fears of the peasants. There are also good descriptions of the scenery and accommodation from the tourist's point of view. The more intelligent the visitor to the West of Ireland the more he will appreciate the assistance to be derived from Mr. Shand's inquiries.

Mr. Hare's name is a guarantee that whatever he has to say about places he has visited will be worth reading. His little volume of "Sketches in Holland and Scandinavia"¹⁶ is nevertheless disappointing. It does not come up to the expectations of readers who know its author through his "Walks in Rome" or "Cities of Italy." The sketches are too "slight." Still, as far as they go, they are in Mr. Hare's peculiarly pleasant style. There are a number of very dainty little engravings.

Mrs. Bryant's admirable lecture on "Overwork"¹⁷ supplies a much needed corrective to the indiscriminating strictures of medical witnesses on that subject. The teacher, as she reminds us, founds her opinions "on a knowledge of children who are well, no less than of children who are ill, whereas the medical man knows only the latter." Mrs. Bryant emphatically asserts that the experience of girls' teachers proves that girls, no less than boys, cannot, as a rule, be overworked, however hard the teacher may try to do it; "their healthy instinct of indolence is more than a sufficient safeguard." There are, of course, some exceptions to the rule in both sexes, and the difference in this respect between boys and girls is that "the unnaturally industrious girl is more industrious, and the unnaturally indolent girl more indolent, than the boys of the same two classes respectively." This is, so far as our experience goes, entirely true, and Mrs. Bryant accounts for the fact in a very obvious way. It would take us too long to follow Mrs. Bryant through her very interesting and suggestive analysis of the varieties of mental characteristics to be found amongst girls. It shows a profound acquaintance with the girl mind, and ought to be studied by every teacher, not of girls only, but of boys too. Parents also may learn from it how much harm they do their children by injudicious treatment. There can be no doubt that Mrs. Bryant calls attention to an important but little heeded truth that the most common cases of overwork spring from psychological rather than physiological conditions, and can never be cured by the purely physiological treatment of medical men. It is for teachers to study these psychological conditions and the best modes of dealing with them. Mrs. Bryant's contribution to this work is more important than the modest form in which it is offered to the public might lead one to expect.

¹⁶ "Sketches in Holland and Scandinavia." By Augustus J. C. Hare, Author of "Cities of Italy," &c. London: Smith, Elder & Co., 15, Waterloo Place. 1885.

¹⁷ "Overwork: from the Teacher's Point of View. With special reference to the Work in Schools for Girls." A Lecture Delivered at the College of Preceptors, November 19, 1884. By Mrs. S. Bryant, D.Sc. London: Francis Hodgson, 89, Farringdon Street, E. C. 1885.

"Kelly's Post Office London Directory" ¹⁸ is fuller and better this year than ever. It is too long established and too well known to need any recommendation from us. Not to know "Kelly's Directory" is indeed to be ignorant of the most complete and encyclopædic work of the kind in existence. We can hardly imagine how Londoners would ever find the people and the things they are for ever wanting if there were no "Post Office Directory." It is a marvellous book of reference, admirably arranged. Nothing but long familiarity with it prevents us from being astonished at the amount of patient labour stored up in this ubiquitous red volume.

We have before us an unusual number of Short Essays, Monographs, and Pamphlets, on a number of economic and social topics. It is quite impossible to offer any detailed criticism on them or even to attempt any adequate notice of their contents. So far as we have been able to examine them we have found nothing particularly calling for notice. Those who are specially interested in the particular questions they treat of may find it worth while to consult them. Two of the most thoughtful of them are Nos. 14 and 15 of the "Economic Tracts" Series—namely: "The Competition Test and the Civil Service of States and Cities." By E. M. Shepard; and, "The Standard Dollar." By H. W. Richardson. (Both published by the Society for Political Education, 4, Morton Street, New York. 1884.)

Of the "Questions of the Day" Series, we have received Nos. 10 and 13, entitled respectively, "The Destructive Influence of the Tariff upon Manufacture and Commerce, and the facts relating thereto." By J. Schoenhof; and "Public Relief and Private Charity." By Josephine Shaw Lowell (both published by G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York and London). From Mr. J. Schoenhof's pen we have also "Wages and Trade in Manufacturing Industries in America and in Europe." With an Introduction by R. R. Bowker. (New York: Published for the New York Free Trade Club by G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1884.)

"The Distribution of Products, or the Mechanism and the Metaphysics of Exchange. Three Essays:—What Makes the Rate of Wages; What is a Bank; The Railway, the Farmer, and the Public." By Edward Atkinson. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Son, 1885), treats the subjects indicated by its lengthy title from the point of view of "one whose life from very early years has been of necessity mainly devoted to active business and to practical affairs." Uniform with the preceding, and published by the same firm, is "The Way Out: Suggestions for Social Reform." By Charles J. Bellamy, author of the "Breton Mills," a novel. 1884.

We have received also the following Pamphlets and Essays:—
"The Community of Property: Nationalization of Land." By James

¹⁸"The Post Office London Directory for 1885. Comprising, amongst other Information, Official, Street, Commercial, Trades, Law, Court, Parliamentary, Postal, City and Clerical, Conveyance and Banking Directories." The Eighty-sixth Publication. London: Kelly and Co., 51, Great Queen Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields, W.C.

Hutchison Sterling, LL.D., Edinburgh. (Edinburgh : Oliver & Boyd, Tweeddale Court; London : Simpkin, Marshall & Co., 1885); "The Homology of Economic Justice." An Essay by an East India Merchant, showing that Political Economy is Sophistry, and Landlordism Usurpation and Illegality. (London : Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1884); "State Measures for the direct Prevention of Poverty, War, and Pestilence." (Containing Three Articles. The two last reprinted from the *National Reformer*.) State Remedies for Poverty; Can War be Suppressed? and, The Extinction of Infectious Diseases. By a Doctor of Medicine, author of the "Elements of Social Science." (London : E. Truelove, 256, High Holborn, 1885); "Address to the Students of the University of Edinburgh." By Sir Alexander Grant, Bart., D.C.L., LL.D., &c., Vice-Chancellor and Principal of the University. Delivered on October 28, 1884. (Edinburgh and London : Wm. Blackwood & Sons, 1884); "An Address to the Board of Electors to the Professorship of Political Economy in the University of Cambridge." By Henry Denning Macleod, M.A., &c. &c., a Candidate for the Professorship. (A. P. Blundell & Co., 26, Garlick Hill, Cannon Street, E.C.); "Beauty for Ashes. An Appeal." (Printed for the Edinburgh University Socialist Society. Glasgow : Wilson & McCormick, St. Vincent Street, 1884); "Fair Representation. An Essay." By Walter E. Smith, B.A., of New College, Oxford. (London : Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1885); "Co-Operative Voting, the Only Means to Secure Proportional Representation; or, Thoughts for the Newly Enfranchised and the Old; containing a Short, Original and Feasible Plan for the Representation of Minorities in the House of Commons." By Geo. Whitelaw, B.A. (London : Hamilton, Adams & Co, 32, Paternoster Row, 1885); "Out West; or, from London to Salt Lake City and Back." By Colin South. (London : Wyman & Sons, 74-76, Great Queen Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields, 1884); "The True Story of the Rebellion in the Soudan." By One who Knows the Mahdi Personally. Translated from the German of Richard Buchta, by Mr. R. W. Felkin. With a Map. (London : Abraham Kingdon & Co., 52, Moorfields, Moorgate, E.C.); "Bechuanaland." By a Member of the Cape Legislature. (London : Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington, 188, Fleet Street, 1885); "Richard Cobden's Volkswirtschaftliche und Politische Ansichten. Auf grund Aelterer und Neuerer Quellen systematisch dargestellt." Von Dr. Carl Walcker, Docentur der Staatswissenschaften an der Universität Leipzig. (Hamburg : F. H. Nestler & Mellis Verlag, 1885); "Laissez-Faire." By Lord Bramwell. (London : Liberty and Property Defence League, 4, Westminster Chambers, S.W., 1884); "Speech delivered in the House of Assembly, South Australia." By Rowland Rees, C.E., M.P., November 12, 1884, on the Second Reading of the Protection of Young Women Bill. (Adelaide : *Advertiser* General Printing Office, off Waymouth Street); "The Transference of the Jewish Sabbath to the National Day of Rest." By Luis Jackson. (Chicago : Gerald Pierce & Co., 122, Dearborn Street, 1885); "Report of the Proceedings of a Public

Meeting of the Native Inhabitants of Bombay, held in the Town Hall on November 29, 1884; and of the Public Reception given to the Marquis of Ripon on his arrival in Bombay." (*Bombay: Bombay Gazette Steam Press, Rampart Row Fort, 1884*); "Report of the Minister of Public Instruction (Victoria) for the Year 1883-4. Presented to both Houses of Parliament. (Melbourne: John Ferres, Government Printer); "Statistics of the Colony of New Zealand for the Year 1883. With Abstracts from the Agricultural Statistics of 1884, and Industrial Statistics from the Census of 1881." (Wellington: By Authority, Geo. Didsbury, Government Printer, 1884); "Statistica dell' Istruzione Secondaria e Superiore. Per l'anno Scolastico, 1882-3. Introduzione." (Roma: Tipographia Elzeviriana, 1885); "Statistica delle Cause di Morte, nei Comuni Capoluoghi di Provincia o di Circondario. Anno 1883. Introduzione." (Roma: Tipographia Metastasio, 1884); "Censimento degli Italiani all'Estero." (Roma: Tipographia Nell' Ospizio di San Michele di C. Verdesi e C., 1884); "Helps to Health: the Habitation, the Nursery, the School Room, and the Person; with a Chapter on Pleasure and Health Resorts." By Henry C. Burdett. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., Paternoster Square, 1885); "Forty-five Years of Registration Statistics, proving Vaccination to be both Useless and Dangerous." By Alfred Russell Wallace, LL.D. (London: E. W. Allen, 4, Ave Maria Lane, 1885); "Second Annual Report of the Metropolitan Public Garden, Boulevard, and Playground Association, 1884." (83, Lancaster Gate, W.); Dickens' "Dictionary of the University of Oxford," and "Dictionary of the University of Cambridge," 1884 (London: Macmillan & Co.); "Blackwood's Educational Series: The Fourth Standard Reader" (London & Edinburgh: Wm. Blackwood & Sons, 1885); "Educational Classics: Rousseau's 'Emile.'" Translated by Eleanor Worthington. (Boston: Ginn, Heath & Co., 1885); "The Compendious Calculator." Twenty-sixth Edition, carefully revised by C. Norris. (London: Crosby, Lockwood & Co., 7, Stationers' Hall Court, Ludgate Hill, 1885); "Report of a Special Committee upon the Prisons of Great Britain." By Charlton T. Lewis, Richard A. McCurdy. (Printed by order of the Executive Committee of Prison Association of New York, 1884); "Jails: A Paper Read at the Convention of the County Agents of the State Board of Corrections and Charities of Michigan, Kalamazoo, December 9 and 10, 1884." By Levi L. Barbour, a member of the Board.

SCIENCE.

ANTHROPOLOGY¹ is one of the new sciences developed in the latter half of the nineteenth century. It is based upon the comparative anatomy and zoology of man, studied with a view to discover the laws under which his physical characteristics have developed in the several parts of the earth, and in successive epochs of time. This subject has already received able exposition from Mr. E. B. Tylor, but the science is essentially of French parentage, and we welcome a general treatise on anthropology from Dr. Paul Topinard as not only meeting a want which the diffusion of information by a multitude of travellers has made very evident, but as reflecting the systematic teaching given upon the subject in French schools, for the volume forms the substance of the author's lectures at the School of Anthropology during the last eight years. So far as we are aware, no equally extended instruction on the physical history of the varieties of man has ever been given in this country. The work exhibits evidences not only of careful research, but of that power of generalization in which French scientific writers so frequently excel; and in the multitudinous references to authorities students will find the means of extending their work beyond the limits of the author's exposition, extended though this is to between eleven and twelve hundred pages. The volume begins with the history of the subject from the days of the Greek writers down to our own time, ending, characteristically, with the foundation of the Anthropological Society of Paris by Paul Broca, in 1859. This discussion is followed by an exposition of general principles and considerations which underlie the studies of the anthropologist. The section discussing race adopts the zoological definition which regards it as the mean of the characters inherited by an assemblage of families, so that the race is not taken as the descendant of one parental type so much as the product of circumstances of existence modifying a type which is capable of some variation. Hence we may reasonably conclude that, just as races have been brought into existence by hereditary conditions of life, or have disappeared, so other races have been produced when the modifying influences of Nature, or civilization, have been varied. After these general discussions, physical characters are set forth, such as are involved in the dimensions of the various parts of the skull and the skeleton, the hair, the nasal development, and the colour of the skin. Then the cephalic index, with all the variations which it presents in relative length and breadth of the brain-case, is well examined. The height of the body as dependent upon the growth of bones of the extremities is the subject of another interesting chapter, in which the influence of social

¹ "Éléments d'Anthropologie générale." Par le Dr. Paul Topinard, Professeur à l'École d'Anthropologie. Avec 229 figures intercollées dans le texte, et cinq planches. Paris: Adrien Delahaye et Émile Lecrossiner, Éditeurs, Place de l'École-de-Médecine. 1885.

conditions and professions is discussed, with many interesting details of relation between height and colour among the peoples of Europe, and with maps showing the relative height of the peoples in the French Departments; from which it appears that tall Frenchmen are found in the East and North-east of France, short Frenchmen in the West and South-west. After summarizing the characters mentioned, so as to produce a classification of races, the author discusses the weight of the brain and the cubic capacity of the cranium; passing to the development of the skull, and those characters in which peoples exhibit irregularities in cranial conformation. Finally, there is an elaborate consideration of zoological characters, and an exposition of the many methods for measuring cranial characters which have been invented of late years. After detailed examination, the characters of the bones, the mouth, eyes, ears, and other parts of the body are instructively explained, leading up to a consideration of the proportions of the body and the relations between its members among different peoples and under different conditions of life. We have no qualification in saying that the traveller will here find all the information which will enable him to make systematic observations calculated to advance science, and that the ordinary observer at home will be stimulated by the work to carry on researches; and we trust that every village doctor and schoolmaster may thus be able to collect information concerning physical characteristics of those who come under their care, with a view to building up a body of facts which will show how far conditions of health and mental development are coincident with those physical modifications of the body which M. Topinard has discussed so well. The woodcuts are interesting and useful, and the tables are well made.

Professor Parker's fame as an original investigator of the embryology of many kinds of animals is so well established that our expectation naturally mounts high on opening a book by him on the descent of mammalia.² No man can know better what mammals are, what they were, and what the evidence is by which the simple reader may appreciate the steps of argument and fact which demonstrate mammalian evolution. This book, having been delivered as lectures to the fellows of the Royal College of Surgeons, presupposes, perhaps, a certain familiarity with matters of embryology, but the Preface states that the subject is to be treated in a more popular method than usual. On reading into the book we find that Professor Parker's idea of popularizing is not so much simplifying language, or explaining technical facts, or demonstrating relations between facts which he has seen, as writing discursively upon a subject in which the only excuse for writing at all is to satisfy our mental hunger to know the evidence which he alone possesses in its fulness concerning mammalian descent. The introductory first lecture tells practically nothing beyond the fact that all mammalian embryos which represent such a stage of

² "On Mammalian Descent." The Hunterian Lectures for 1884. By W. Kitchen Parker, F.R.S., Hunterian Professor, Royal College of Surgeons of England. With Addenda and Illustrations. London: Charles Griffin & Co. 1885.

development as is seen in a gill-bearing vertebrate are very much alike. The second lecture, on the Monotremata, is equally disappointing; the few facts which are faintly indicated are almost entirely the discoveries of palæontologists, and the author, instead of stating evidence that these animals have relations with lower types of life, discusses extinct birds, living fishes, tadpoles, and other matters which have no bearing on the evolution of the group. And when it is suggested that the development and structure of the Australian ornithorhynchus is both reptilian and avian, we feel as though our credulity were being unfairly tested, because the evidence for this and most other statements of similar interests is withheld. In this chapter the most interesting point is a statement of the author's conviction that the elements of the lower jaw which make the jaw composite in a bird disappear into the auditory chamber in the mammal; but this is stated from his old observations on the pig, and not upon the duck-bill. So we pass on through lectures upon Marsupials and Insectivora, and dismiss in the eighth lecture the remaining orders of mammals. The concluding lecture does not sum up the story. Perhaps we have expected too much, and certainly the few facts told, which are all interesting, will be wonderful enough to those readers who do not follow step by step the advance of scientific research. But while we believe that embryology is capable of unfolding the descent of the Mammalia, we do not think the so-called popular method of treatment well adapted for the discussion of research which claims so high a place for itself, and is confessedly important. The volume is pleasantly written, beautifully printed, and includes a number of interesting figures of mammalian embryos.

As long as the religions endure which are founded upon Biblical history, the story of the Deluge is likely to be a favourite subject for scientific exposition. The Duke of Argyll comes forward to explain what geology has to teach in this connection. His essay³ is necessarily a popular one, being addressed as a lecture to a Glasgow audience; and he commences by asking whether there are any geological evidences that there ever was a deluge. His grace's idea of geological evidence is perhaps more catholic than geologists generally would endorse, for he proceeds to reply by appealing to human testimony, and is content to quote the opinion of M. Lenormant that the story of the Deluge is a universal tradition which must arise from reminiscence of a real and terrible event which must have occurred near the first cradle of mankind. Then attention is drawn to the way in which scientific men came to disregard the Deluge, because in the early days of geology it was appealed to in explanation of phenomena with which it could have no possible connection, and this leads to a definition of the Deluge as a sudden submergence where the sea would not have time to leave permanent marks on the land, from which it would pass off with comparative rapidity. And the author is disposed to believe

³ "Geology and the Deluge." By the Duke of Argyll. Glasgow: Wilson & M'Cormick. 1885.

that the submergence of land towards the close of what is called the Glacial period was of a sudden nature, and that the traditional Deluge was closely connected with it. Appealing to the gravels on Moel Tryfan and in positions equally elevated in Scotland, he has no difficulty in establishing the submersion of the British Islands. The effect of such a submergence of thirteen hundred or fourteen hundred feet carried uniformly over the map of Europe is appealed to to realize the deluge which such a depression would cause. The great destruction of land life which the Deluge is reputed to have caused leads the Duke of Argyll to lay an embargo, for the purposes of his argument, on such small fry as the land shells in the Loess of Germany, and such animals as the Irish elk, which curators of museums will be glad to learn is found in thousands in the gravels and brick-earth of England. In fact, we have Buckland's "Reliquæ Diluviana" over again. Rhinoceroses and mammoths and the beasts dredged from the Dogger Bank are all evidences of the Deluge, while the preservation of the same species in ice on the Arctic coast of Siberia supplies evidence of the comparatively recent period at which these animals lived. Finally, the question is asked, Did this great submergence of land take place after, what the author terms, the birth of man? and, in reply, the evidence is stated that man co-existed with the mammoth. In conclusion, it is shown that such a change of level of land is possible. The tone of this lecture, like that of all the other writings of the Duke of Argyll, is an endeavour to reconcile Scripture and science; but, so long as the Scriptural difficulty is got over, the scientific statements seem of secondary importance. And we believe that, although the story of such a submersion as the author pictures might well have been handed down by tradition if it had really occurred, all the circumstances of our gravel deposits and their entombed organisms tell of changes of earth-movement far too slow to have affected the imagination of any generation of observers.

Among popular books on natural history which were current in our youth few were more interesting than the "Edible British Mollusca."⁴ Perhaps we remembered the story of the gentlemen who started with the intention of eating their way through the animal kingdom, and failed; and so found interest in the record of molluscs which are used for food by civilized man. The present edition of the work, revised and improved, does not, however, comprise quite so extensive a list of edible molluscs as might have been anticipated. The Pholas is not much esteemed as food anywhere, though a Newhaven fisherman declares the taste to be much more pleasant than whelks. *Mya truncata* and *Mya arenaria* are both sometimes eaten, though the *Mya arenaria* finds more favour in the United States, where it sells for 35 cents a dozen. It is made into soup, stewed, fried, and served in a variety of dishes. The razor-shell, also, has greater fame out of England than in this country, though commonly eaten at Tenby and

⁴ "The Edible Mollusca of Great Britain and Ireland. With Recipes for Cooking them." By M. S. Lovell. Second Edition. London: Reeve & Co. 1884.

in South Wales; but, among Neapolitans, razor-fish soup, stewed razor-fish, and the fish first boiled and then fried are held to be excellent dishes. Many other shell-fish of small size are eaten by the Spaniards and French, sometimes made into fish sauce, sometimes pounded into a *purée*, but frequently eaten raw with oil and vegetables. The lady-cockle, which is a species of *Macra*, is used in the North of Ireland as food for pigs. The common Tapes of our coast, known in Hampshire as the butterfish, sells locally at about fivepence a quart, and is said to have the merit of never disagreeing with any one. It is a favourite dish both in France and Spain, and the methods of cooking Tapes are numerous, though many enthusiasts eat them in the manner of oysters. The *Venus arenaria* is a favourite article of diet in New York. Cockles are occasionally cultivated on our South-west coast, but although Francatelli devised methods for cooking them, and Soyer did not think them beneath consideration, many people probably go through life without discovering the merits of cockles. The mussel is sufficiently well known and valued. Many other bivalves, like the great *Pinna*, the scallop, and oyster, all receive ample discussion, and the amount of cookery lore which has been brought together concerning the oyster only makes us regret the difficulty of putting it in practice. It is probable that shell-fish are over-valued by the fishermen whose palates have been accustomed to them from youth. Among univalves, the limpet, *Haliotis*, the periwinkle, and whelk are all more or less important for daily food. The snail family has always been valued inland, and once had a great repute in medicine. In all parts of the Continent species of *Helix* are still used as food, being regularly cultivated. One proprietor at Dijon is said to clear about £300 a year by his snails. The cuttle-fish is recommended, when boiled, as having much the flavour of lobster, and as resembling skate when fried in oil. An ample list is given of works consulted, there is a full index, and the book concludes with twelve good plates of the shells of edible molluscs.

We drew attention in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW, No. CXVI., to the merits of Mr. Kingzett's book—"Nature's Hygiene." In the present (second) edition many questions of public interest have been introduced, and the value of the book is increased. It is divided into two parts. The first part consists of nine chapters, which discuss the general questions of oxidation, chemistry of the atmosphere, water supply, and purification of water, sewage and its disposal, contagious diseases, antiseptics, and the disinfection of the sick-room. The second part deals chiefly with the author's special researches on the eucalyptus and the pine as natural disinfectants. Other chapters discuss essential oils as antiseptics and disinfectants, but chiefly with a view to exhibiting the merits of sanitas and similar substances. It is a most in-

* "Nature's Hygiene: a Systematic Manual of Natural Hygiene. Containing also an Account of the Chemistry and Hygiene of the Eucalyptus and the Pine." By O. T. Kingzett, F.I.C., F.C.S. Second Edition. London, Paris, and Madrid: Baillière, Tindall & Cox. 1884.

teresting volume, well stored with facts, and with ideas so put forward as to command consideration.

Mr. Knox⁶ possesses an excellent power of explanation, and many elementary points of some difficulty have been simplified by him, but we are unable to recommend his book, on account of many statements which make us doubt the author's knowledge of his subject. The first need of a teacher is, beyond question, thorough grasp of the matter upon which he speaks or writes; and, when the author has attained to this condition, we have no doubt he may write a book for beginners which will be useful.

Professor Taylor's "Elements of the Differential and Integral Calculus"⁷ is apparently a first course intended for beginners. It commences with an Introduction defining terms and the theory of limits. The idea of a differential as given by the author is not an easy conception for a beginner. It is stated that "the differential of a function or variable at any value is that which would be its increment in any interval of time if at that value its change became uniform," and a page farther on the difficulty is not diminished by the illustration, which takes refuge in the term "evidently" in disposing of matters which to the student can hardly yet be evident. When we turn to see how the author treats the difficulty, which is so carefully met by Todhunter and so carelessly by Williamson, of the indifference of the order of independent differentiations, we again find "it is evident" doing duty for explanation. Blemishes such as these do not encourage us to recommend the work to those who desire to find fundamental principles rigorously and logically established. But there are several points of expression which are useful. The use of the word "slope" for the inclination of the tangent of a curve to an axis is happy, and the notation $\Delta x = 0$ for $\sim \Delta x$ approaches 0 may have something in its favour. If the teaching in the volume were supplemented by sound oral exposition of principles, it would be useful, but it is scarcely suitable for the student who has no other aid. The volume is well printed, and the examples and illustrations are well chosen.

The "Elements of Modern Chemistry,"⁸ by Adolphe Würtz, has long been favourably known as one of the best introductions to chemical science. And the present American translation of the fifth French edition by Professor Greene will contribute to make it more generally useful. It is the most concise treatise on chemistry with which we are acquainted. It devotes nearly fifty pages to introductory considerations, and then the book is nearly equally divided

⁶ "Differential Calculus for Beginners." By Alexander Knox, B.A. Cantab. London: Macmillan & Co. 1884.

⁷ "Elements of the Differential and Integral Calculus. With Examples and Applications." By James M. Taylor, Professor of Mathematics, Madison University. Boston: Ginn, Heath & Co. 1884.

⁸ "Elements of Modern Chemistry." By Adolphe Würtz. Second American Edition. Translated by William H. Greene, M.D., Professor of Chemistry in the Central High School, Philadelphia. With 132 Illustrations. London and Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1884.

between organic and inorganic chemistry. The matter is excellently arranged, the exposition simple, the language clear, and the illustrations and printing leave nothing to be desired.

Mr. Heath issues under the name of "Fern Portfolio"⁹ a series of life-size representations of ferns. This principle aims at making the pictures so true to Nature that identification of specimens from the figures may be rapid and certain; and, though this perfection of the figure, which we believe has never previously been attempted, makes the description much less important, considerable care has been spent in describing the ferns, and in stating their habitats and distribution. There are fifteen plates, which give representations of forty-five species of ferns. It is a sumptuous volume, which would have done credit to any publisher, and its issue by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge is a new indication of the wisdom by which the modern work of that society is directed.

There is no work more valuable in the advancement of geological science than that performed by local field clubs, and it was a happy thought for the members of the Caradoc Naturalists' Club to stimulate the study of Nature among pupils in elementary schools in Shropshire by offering prizes for arranged collections of specimens. In furtherance of this scheme the president of the club has produced "A Handbook of the Geology of Shropshire,"¹⁰ which, from the nature of the case, deals more with the fossils than with Shropshire rocks and sections. The first part gives a brief but useful sketch of the geological formations which exist in the county, drawing attention to the more interesting circumstances of stratification, and localities where they are exposed. The second part, which is also of about the length of a lecture, indicates certain routes by which the strata may be examined and the more interesting geological localities reached; and we have no doubt that these notes, founded on the experience of the club, and other researches, will prove valuable not only to many a beginner, but to scientific men generally and dwellers in the county who have geological tastes. The third chapter is termed "Classification of Fossils," and is a systematic account of the genera which occur in the county, arranged under their several orders, so as to bring under the student's notice the elements of natural-history knowledge, and the distinctive characters which serve him in classifying fossils. The work thus far is comprised in fifty-four pages. Then follow explanations of the 823 figures of fossils, which are represented in twenty-two plates. These descriptions extend to thirty-two pages, give the name of the species and usually a brief statement of its distinctive characters, sometimes with the locality where found, but without the name of the author who formed the species, which is almost indispensable even to

⁹ "The Fern Portfolio." By Francis George Heath. All the Species of British Ferns are included in this Volume. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; New York: E. & J. B. Young & Co. 1885.

¹⁰ "A Handbook of the Geology of Shropshire." By J. D. La Touche, Vicar of Stokesay, President of the Caradoc Field Club. London: Edward Stanford; Shrewsbury: Adnitt & Naunton. 1884.

the beginner who would acquire accurate knowledge. The plates are drawn on lithographic transfer paper, and, as the work of Mr. La Touche and his son, will be of value as showing appreciation of points of scientific interest even when the printing is not uniformly successful. The youth of Shropshire is to be congratulated on having so useful a treatise on fossil collecting, and we trust it may lead at some future date to a demand for the evidence from sections which establishes the succession of the strata.

The eighth "Report on the Meteorology of India"¹¹ opens with the remarkable conclusion that, contrary to experience in Europe, the pressure of the atmosphere in India is, as a rule, unduly high when the temperature is high. Whatever may be the cause of this remarkable circumstance, there can be no doubt that the increased pressure is due to conditions of the more elevated part of the atmosphere such as might be attributed to the attraction of the sun. The Report is divided in the usual way. It shows that the temperature was more or less below the average of past years in 1882, and particularly so in January, March, October, November, and December. The nocturnal radiation was less than the average in January, but in March it was above the average at most stations in the North of India. In the Punjab the nocturnal radiation became excessive in May. The temperature of the ground was above the average at Calcutta, where it was 81.3 degrees at the surface and 82.23 degrees at a depth of three feet. The temperature of the ground is about half a degree above the average in March and April. At Allahabad the temperature of 1882 was below that of Calcutta; and below the temperature of the preceding year by about a degree and a half. The temperature of the air and atmospheric pressure follow; the pressure of 1882 was remarkable for frequent oscillations, and in the latter part of the year these were only felt over portions of the country. The rainfall was on the whole similar to that of the preceding year, but the monsoon winds set in earlier than usual, and were exceptionally strong on the coast of Bombay, but in Bengal the monsoon was later than usual. Being a maximum year of sun spots, the atmospheric observations have more than ordinary interest, and we notice no conspicuous relation between meteorological conditions and spots on the sun. The Report is accompanied by charts which exhibit temperature, pressure, wind, and rainfall, while the bulk of the volume is made up of abstracts of meteorological registers for the year.

The progress in the administration of the Indian Meteorological Survey¹² is so steady from year to year that the minor details scarcely bear chronicling. The reporter returns to the subject of Himalayan snow-fall, and, having obtained fuller information, touches on the connection of the snows with dry westerly land winds to which we re-

¹¹ "Report on the Meteorology of India in 1882." By Henry F. Blanford, F.R.S. Eighth Year. Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing; London: Trübner & Co.

¹² "Report on the Administration of the Meteorological Department of the Government of India in 1883-84." London: Trübner & Co.

ferred last year. And, it being known that the snow in the spring of 1883 fell heavy and late on the outer snowy range of Hazara, Murree, Kangra, Kulu, and Bussahir, the reporter ventured to predict at the beginning of June the long period of dry winds in the plains which, commencing in the latter half of July, lasted till near the end of August. The Punjab felt the dry conditions first; and they speedily extended to the North-West Provinces, Rajputana, Khandesh, Berar, and even to the Konkan and Deccan. As a rule, snow does not fall on the Himalayas before Christmas or the beginning of the New Year, when it is associated with considerable rainfall in the plains of North-west India. Last year, however, snow fell in Cashmere in September, was general over the north-western Himalayas in October, and by the beginning of November it had fallen everywhere north-west of the Sutlej. The author believes that the time is near when it will be possible to forecast the rainfall for North-western India with more certainty than for any other country in the world. The work of the department has been expanded by the introduction in observatories of instruments for the registration of earthquake phenomena. The Report includes many interesting details in relation to the department, and includes Appendices which comprise administrative reports from the offices in the chief districts.

The interest which attaches to cyclones in the popular mind is probably second only to the interest in earthquakes. But they have the advantage over earthquakes that their history can be more easily investigated. In 1882, India experienced seven cyclones, of which the most remarkable originated in the centre of the Bay of Bengal and advanced north across the Gamjam and Orissa coasts, and then continued parallel to the coast of Central Bengal, where it at last disappeared. It was associated, as so many of these storms have been, with widespread and heavy rainfall. The fall of the barometer was small, and the centre of the storm was ill-defined. The author¹³ endeavours to account for the storm, and considers that its energy is derived from the condensation of aqueous vapour in the air. But to us such an explanation only seems to carry the difficulty one stage back, because the condensation of the rain must result from the action of a wind, which at that period of the year puts on unusual conditions owing to the diminished heat of the earth in the autumn season. The story of the storm is told in the most elaborate way, and its history is delineated in a number of charts which represent the pressure, wind direction, and rainfall from the 7th to the 18th of October.

¹³ "Indian Meteorological Memoirs: being Occasional Discussions and Compilations of Meteorological Data relating to India and the Neighbouring Countries." Published by order of his Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General of India in Council, under the direction of Henry F. Blanford, F.R.S. Vol. II., Part III. Account of the South-west Monsoon Storm of the 8th to the 19th of October, 1882, in the Bay of Bengal, by John Eliot, Esq., M.A., Meteorological Reporter to the Government of Bengal. Calcutta: Printed by the Superintendent of Government Printing, India; London: Trübner & Co. 1884.

In the practical applications of science few subjects have greater national importance than the seaworthiness of our ships. And it is a matter for congratulation that one so conversant with the principles of naval architecture as Sir Edward Reed should have placed his knowledge on this subject at the service of the public in a systematic treatise. In this remarkable work¹ the shipbuilder will find a scientific investigation of the conditions which govern the floating powers of vessels under various circumstances of build. As might be expected, the problem is approached first by the examination of general principles, and a history of the principles on which stability has been calculated, and then, after abundant illustrations of special cases, the author examines the stability of certain war-ships, and, by means of diagrams, exhibits the curves of stability of a large number of ships in Her Majesty's Navy, and a few in the navies of other nations. The subject is worked out with an elaborateness that corresponds with its professional importance, and the newest researches of the eminent French writers who have investigated the subject in relation to the necessities of modern shipbuilding are here explained and made generally accessible. It would be difficult, without going into details of a technical character, to do justice to the research which this volume exhibits, and no one could have done greater justice to his predecessors than the author. Referring to the comprehensive grasp of the subject which has distinguished French writers, Sir Edward remarks that the names of Bouguer and Dupin will probably excite greater and more enduring admiration throughout the world in connection with naval architecture than any other names; and he believes that the simple and beautiful manner in which M. Rcech unfolded the system of calculating stability for various draughts of water and angles of inclination by means of the co-ordinates of the successive centres of buoyancy shows an equal mastery of the subject in their successors. The book is divided into nineteen chapters, preceded by an Introduction in which some account is given of the various writers who in comparatively recent years have contributed to the elaboration of those views which the author discusses. The volume is an essential one for the shipbuilding profession. It is well printed, and well illustrated with about 220 woodcuts and many illustrative tables.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

SIR GEORGE COX'S new book¹ will be found a very useful companion to the History of Greece. There are not many biographical particulars of the great men whose lives he writes which

¹ "A Treatise on the Stability of Ships." By Sir Edward J. Reed, K.C.B., F.R.S., M.P. With numerous Diagrams and Tables. London: Charles Griffin & Co. 1885.

¹ "Lives of Greek Statesmen." By the Rev. Sir George W. Cox, Bart., M.A. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1885.

will not be found in such histories, but the concentration of the interest round a single figure gives life to the story of events with which every schoolboy is familiar. The author's mythological theories have not much scope for display, except in suggestions such as the connection between the Septemtriones and the Seven Sages, and that the name of the man (Mnesiphilos, one who reminds a friend), who urged Themistocles to oppose the Greek retreat from Salamis, shows "that he is the embodiment of one thought in the mind of Themistocles, and he is nothing more." The *Life of Themistocles* is the best of the series, and great pains are taken to sift the evidence on which the charges of treachery and corruption are brought against the victor of Salamis. The verdict is not proven, or rather not guilty; and the traditional narratives are fairly enough ascribed to the malice of the oligarchical party and the Spartans against the man who had done so much to make Athens free and powerful.

Mr. Philip Smith has brought out a second volume of his "*Ecclesiastical History*,"² which covers the period from the eleventh century to the end of the sixteenth. The book appears to be mainly based on the late Canon Robertson's standard work, but not without reference to original authorities. There is no other book on the subject which gives such a clear and correct view of the facts in such a handy space, and though the author evidently takes pleasure in showing up the corruptions and vices of the clergy, he does not allow his Protestant bias to distort his view of history. The illustrations are not worthy of the text. In a picture of Preaching at Paul's Cross the preacher wears the wig and bands of the eighteenth century, while the costume of the congregation is not later than the beginning of the seventeenth.

The first volume of Mr. Justin McCarthy's "*History of the Four Georges*"³ is as full of interest and instruction as must be expected from the pen of the author of "*A History of our Own Times*," and we look forward to the other three volumes with an interest derived from the knowledge that they are coming from the master-hand of a man who has so thoroughly grasped the meaning of the word history in its true and modern sense. Mr. Justin McCarthy's language, we need scarcely mention, is most fascinating. The period of which this volume treats is from the close of Queen Anne's reign until the accession of George the Second, which embraces the important era during which the line of sovereigns placed upon the throne of England, as an outcome of the Revolution of 1688, were firmly secured in their formerly tottering seats, and the last hope of the House of Stuart disappeared for ever. Vivid pictures of the men and women who played their parts in this scene are given by the author, the effect of which is to open clearly before us the manner in which the great changes which took place in this country during that period were

² "*The Student's Ecclesiastical History*." Part II. By Philip Smith, B.A. London: John Murray. 1885.

³ "*A History of the Four Georges*." By Justin McCarthy, M.P., author of "*A History of Our Own Times*," &c. In four volumes. London: Chatto & Windus, Piccadilly. 1884.

brought about, and especially how the eyes of men were open to the facts that religious toleration in its fullest and purest sense, and the fullest freedom of speech, were the principal means of securing peace at home and abroad both for monarch and subject. Marlborough, Bolingbroke, Shrewsbury, Townshend, and Walpole appear in their places. There is one man in particular whom the author puts very constantly before the reader, whose writings had such an effect upon the political balance of that time, especially as regards Ireland, and that man is Swift. All who have been fortunate enough to become acquainted with the writings of this most remarkable man will find some new and interesting points of his character laid before them in this volume. Bolingbroke's part as regard the Treaty of Utrecht, for which he was impeached in 1715, forms a very interesting feature of this work, and most people will agree with the author that a jury would scarcely convict upon such evidence as appears in the six articles of indictment against him, although it plainly appears to us that he did wickedly intend, "as far as in him lay," to enable the French king, "so exhausted and vanquished as he had been on all occasions, to carry his designs by a peace glorious to him, and to the ruin of the victorious allies."

Mr. Hall's book⁴ on the Customs is a complete repertory of facts relating to the taxation of merchandise in England during the Middle Ages. The mass of rolls through which he waded in the performance of his task must have been enormous. The difficulty of understanding the mediæval system of keeping accounts is very considerable; nor does the use of Roman figures, and the custom of mixing up pounds and marks, make the reckoning more easy to follow. The rolls of the Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer in the Exchequer have scarcely been consulted hitherto by any historian. Mr. Hall's indefatigable industry has made them yield up their secrets, and the result is given in a tabulated form, showing the amount of customs and subsidy on wool and leather in the port of London, abstracts of the prisage and butlerage of wines, and other useful statistics, from the beginning of the fourteenth century. The history of these exactions is deduced from the immemorial royal prerogative of prisage or purveyance; that is, the right to purchase provisions at a lower price than the average buyer would give, which was in time commuted for a fixed money payment, just as rents in specie supplanted rents in kind or tenure by service. The progress of these changes, and the steps by which Parliament acquired control over what had been "the birthright of the Sovereign from time immemorial," are recounted with a laborious accuracy which is not too common in the present day.

At a time like the present, when those who profess the principles of liberty are contented to be bound like slaves to the chariot wheels of one party, or one man, however different the actions of the party or man may be to the principles which they profess, the life and opinions of an

⁴ "A History of the Custom Revenue in England." By Hubert Hall. London: Elliot Stock. 1885.

independent man like Algernon Sidney⁵ are a profitable study. Miss Blackburne considers him as "a typical cultivated man of our own time, who by some mischance found himself put back into the seventeenth century;" but he would probably have found himself as out of place in the political world of to-day. He was a lover of liberty, and aimed at the sovereignty of the whole people, as far as he understood it, but honestly so far. What politician is there now who, when he talks of the will of the people does not obviously think of it as being merely more power to his own elbow, as they say in Ireland? What would the present school of politics say to this?—

The law which would oblige the electors to give particular orders to their knights and burgesses in relation to every vote, would make the decision of the most important affairs to depend upon the judgment of those who know nothing of the matters in question, and by that means cast the nation into the utmost danger of the most inextricable confusion.

Miss Blackburne has not attempted to re-write Sidney's life, but takes her facts from recognized authorities; though, strangely enough, she never mentions Mr. Ewald's book, the latest and completest biography. Her style is animated, and her judgment on men and things terse and epigrammatic. She sums up the Parliament of the Commonwealth as follows:—

They did not enrich themselves; they accomplished some most useful reforms, and they worked as hard as any English Parliament ever did. They had everything to do. Their weak point was that they had no right to do it, and that nobody was particularly anxious to have it done. These defects opened the way for Cromwell's ambition.

Her estimate of Charles II. is that "he had the highest kind of worldly ability—the power of hiding it."

Miss Hays has performed a difficult task with considerable tact and skill. Her "Women of the Day"⁶ consists of brief biographies of about four hundred living ladies of all nations who have earned distinction in public life, in literature or art or on the stage. One fact will strike every one who looks at the book: how few have had a proper training for the work to which they have given their lives. The stage is an exception, but in nearly every other line of life the education received has been such as men would consider quite inadequate to produce such results. One lady, for instance, whose profession is medicine, became governess in the family of a physician so as to secure access to a medical library, and subsequently was refused admission to ten medical schools before she was enabled to obtain her degree. A man would probably have given it up as a bad job, and attempted something easier of access. It would be well for Miss Hays to consider her book merely as a beginning, and to add to her accounts of the more important persons such facts as come before

⁵ "Algernon Sidney: a Review." By Gertrude M. Ireland Blackburne. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1885.

⁶ "Women of the Day." By Frances Hays. London: Chatto & Windus. 1885.

her notice from time to time, with a view to publishing them hereafter in a more extended form.

The history of the struggle between France and England for the Dominion of Canada is well told by Mr. Parkman,⁷ from George Washington's skirmish in the Broad Meadows to the day when the two generals, victor and vanquished, fell at Quebec. The French could hardly have continued to hold Canada for long, even without a war, such was the extravagance and mismanagement of the colony. Three years' command of a fort was considered a good enough prospect for a young man to marry on. The King's officers themselves entered into partnership with merchants who supplied stores to the Canadian Government. Of the presents sent to the Indians, two-thirds were stolen and the rest sold to the Indians for furs. It was a wonder the Indians remained so loyal to the French, but the missionaries, it is said, cultivated a hatred of the English by working upon their converts' superstition. They told them, for instance, that the King of France was the eldest son of Jesus Christ, who was a Frenchman crucified by the English; and some of them—of whom Le Loutre, vicar-general of Acadia and missionary to the Micmacs, was the worst—instigated the savages in their raids upon the English settlers, and even plotted the murder of Captain Howe, which was one of the first incidents of the war. Montcalm and other French officers certainly did what they could to mitigate these cruelties, but the torturing and eating of white prisoners occur far too frequently in the history of the war. Mr. Parkman says nothing about the behaviour of the English Indians, but there is no reason to suppose it was any better. The New England rangers even, men who had chaplains in their camp and were noted for their piety, imitated their savage allies in the matter of scalping, till Wolfe forbade it, except in the case of Indians, or Canadians dressed like Indians. The principal military events are described with much spirit and lucidity, with enough detail to make them interesting, and careful maps are added to explain the text. Besides battles and sieges, there are plenty of romantic adventures, such as those of Robert Rogers the New England ranger, with his band of hunters, who made their reconnaissances in birch-bark canoes in summer and on snow-shoes in winter, and from their perfect knowledge of woodcraft were able to collect information and plunder, and scalps too, in French territory, and had little fear of double their number of enemies. In the commencement of the book Mr. Parkman examines the facts about the expulsion of the Acadians, and states his conviction that it was not put in execution "till every resource of patience and persuasion had been tried in vain. The agents of the French Court, civil, military, and ecclesiastical, had made some act of force a necessity. The Government of Louis XV. began with making the Acadians its tools, and ended with making them its victims."

⁷ "Montcalm and Wolfe." By Francis Parkman. Two vols. London: Macmillan & Co. 1884.

In the Spanish West Indies, *Criollo* meant a half-caste, child of a Spaniard and a native; but in Louisiana the word Creole is used to designate the "French-speaking native portion of the ruling class," the descendants of the original French settlers—a name not to be despised, and which they refuse to grant to the Acadians who came south on being turned out of their own country. Some of the best families trace their descent to the *filles à la cassette*, the French girls who were sent out by Louis XV., each with a trunk containing an outfit of clothes, as wives to the soldiers and planters of the new settlement, then barely thirty years old. Ceded to Spain in 1754, not without an insurrection of the people, ceded back to France while governed by the first Napoleon, and finally bought by the United States for eighty million francs, the colony has had an eventful history, to say nothing of wars, inundations, and pestilences.

The history of the Baratarians pirates is like a chapter out of one of Maryat's novels. They were French privateers, owned and commanded by men living in New Orleans, who received orders as frankly as for the merchandise of Philadelphia or New York, and made no scruple of attacking any officer of New Orleans who interfered with them. During the war between England and the States an English sea-captain tried to bribe them to assist in an attack on Mobile, and for fear of their accepting the proposal, New Orleans was obliged to put them down. The schooner *Carolina*, six gun-vessels, a tender, and a launch were sent against them.

On September 16, 1814, they sighted Grande Terre, formed in line of battle, and stood for the entrance of the bay. Within the harbour, behind the low island, the pirate fleet was soon descried forming in line. Counting all, schooners and feluccas, there were ten vessels. Two miles from shore the *Carolina* was stopped by shoal water, and the two heavier gun-vessels grounded. But armed boats were launched, and the attack entered the pass and moved on into the harbour.

Soon two of the Baratarians' vessels were seen to be on fire; another, attempting to escape, grounded; and the pirates, except a few brave leaders, were flying. One of the fired vessels burned, the other was boarded and saved. The one which grounded got off again and escaped. All the rest were presently captured. At this moment a fine fully armed schooner appeared outside the island, was chased and taken. Scarcely was this done when another showed herself to eastward. The *Carolina* gave chase. The stranger stood for Grande Terre, and ran into water where the *Carolina* could not follow. Four boats were launched; whereupon the chase opened fire on the *Carolina*, and the gun-vessels in turn upon the chase, firing across the island from inside, and in half an hour she surrendered. She proved to be the *General Bolivar*, armed with one eighteen, two twelve, and one six pounder.

The nest was broken up. All their buildings and establishments at Grande Terre and Grand Isle, with their telegraph and stores at Chenière Caminada, were destroyed. On the last day of September the elated squadron with their prizes—seven cruisers of Lafitte, and three armed schooners under Carthaginian colours—arrived in New Orleans harbour amid the peal of guns from the old barracks and Fort St. Charles. But among the prisoners the

^a "The Creoles of Louisiana." By G. W. Cable. London: J. C. Nimmo. 1885.

commanding countenance of John Lafitte and the cross-eyed visage of his brother Pierre were not to be seen. Both men had escaped up Bayou la Fourche to the German coast.

One of the reasons why the Historical Societies in America are so popular and successful is because they constantly deal with events sufficiently recent to create an almost personal interest; whereas we, in the older half of the globe, are inclined to go further off for our subject, and perhaps fare no better. The address at the Seventy-ninth Anniversary of the New York Historical Society consisted of an account, by the late Minister at Vienna, of the negotiations for the peace of 1783,⁹ which were conducted by his grandfather, John Jay, in conjunction with Franklin and Adams. The patience of an American audience must be considerable, for the address cannot have taken less than three hours to deliver, if it really was delivered; and, interesting as it is, it would be hard to find an English society ready to listen to anybody or anything for such a time. Mr. Jay has had the opportunity of consulting in the French archives the confidential correspondence of the Count de Vergennes with his agents in Spain, in America, and in London, as well as the papers concerning the treaties in what he calls "the State Office" in London. France and Spain were attempting to play their own game at the expense of the United States. They helped the States in the war for the purpose of weakening England, but as soon as a separation was certain, did what they could to prevent the new States getting as much territory as they wished to have, and from obtaining the right to the Newfoundland fisheries, which were of the highest importance both commercially and as a school for the navy. American authors (Mr. Jay is too patriotic to give their names) even received money from France to advocate these views; and it was principally due to the firmness of Jay and his colleagues, and not a little to the determination of Lord Shelburne not to act so as to make it impossible to regain the affection of America, to have reunion in some shape, and at least commerce and friendship, that the States were able to start on their national life without having to lean on any European nation for protection and support.

One of the characteristics of Americans is a determination to do nothing by hand that can be done by machinery, and the way this tendency displays itself among professors and teachers at colleges and schools is by a desire to discover the easiest and surest method of producing good results. "The Pedagogical Library"¹⁰ has recently been started to deal with questions of this nature; and Part I. consists of a number of suggestions as to the best methods of teaching history. Most of the writers seem to agree that oral instruction, chiefly biographical in character, is the best beginning, and that for advanced students original historical research is as necessary as it is for

⁹ "The Peace Negotiations of 1782 and 1783." By John Jay, late American Minister to Vienna. New York: Hist. Soc. 1884.

¹⁰ "Pedagogical Library." Edited by G. Stanley Hall. Vol. I.—Methods of Teaching History. Boston: Ginn, Heath & Co.

students of chemistry to learn to do their own experiments. This necessitates the professor of history being also more or less of a historian, but there will probably be no difficulty in securing that at universities. The principle of beginning at home is insisted on, so much so that it is suggested that "some bright boy should write a history of the village bank to read before the class, and afterwards perhaps to publish in the village paper." A further reason for these local studies is given by Dr. Hart, of Harvard, in a statement of fundamental principles of American history: "The growth of our institutions has been from local to central. The general Government can therefore be understood only in the light of the early history of the country." Another of his principles is, "National political parties naturally appeal to the federal principle when in power and to the local principle when out of power."

Two European nations have been going through a process of union and consolidation in our times—Germany and Italy, but with what a difference in the result! In one case the Fatherland groans under the iron heel of militarism—arts and manufactures are stunted, and many of the best citizens go into a voluntary exile to escape from a new tyranny worse than the old. In Italy, on the other hand, though the movement was led by a king, the force came from the people; the individual as well as the country is now free, and freedom and prosperity are daily increasing. It is true that the military and naval expenditure is very heavy for such a country, but a people who have only recently escaped from the rule of despotic princes, supported by foreign arms, may be excused for a little extravagance in insuring their safety; and though gay uniforms are conspicuous in every Italian street, the effect of the army is rather to spread through the country the education which is given to those in the ranks, and so far it has a civilizing and not a cramping influence. Nothing showed the spirit of freedom which actuated the king and his advisers so much as their action towards the Roman See: while France forbade the promulgation of the Encyclical Letter and the Syllabus, Victor Emanuel allowed it to be freely circulated, though his Government expressed their disapprobation of it. The giving up the right to any veto on the appointment of bishops is also a sacrifice which few sovereigns would have made. Mr. Probyn,¹¹ whose history of this period is founded on the principal French and Italian biographies and other books, thoroughly sympathizes with this spirit, and he must have exercised considerable self-restraint to keep his book within such modest limits as one small volume.

Mr. Mozley's new volumes of *Reminiscences*¹² are more delightful if possible than the former ones. The cheerful garrulity and inconsequence which are the writer's chief charms have more scope in

¹¹ "Italy, from the Fall of Napoleon I. in 1815 to the Death of Victor Emanuel in 1878." By John Webb Probyn. London: Cassell & Co. 1884.

¹² "Reminiscences, chiefly of Towns, Villages, and Schools." By Rev. T. Mozley, M.A. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1885.

matters which are almost entirely of a personal and family nature. There is hardly anything in the book which could be turned to a useful purpose, even by the author of "Typical Developments;" so the pleasure it gives is unalloyed, though perhaps not of a very high class. Passages taken at random will be a fair sample:—

Sleeping on board his ship in West India Docks, my uncle was waked by his mate, who asked him to come on deck as quietly as he could. A fruit ship from the Mediterranean had arrived the day before, and for a temporary mooring had passed a hawser to my uncle's ship. "Look at that hawser," the mate whispered. It seemed to move. After a while my uncle made out through the darkness a continuous line of rats passing from his own ship to his neighbour. He and the mate watched till the long procession came to an end. They had been much troubled with rats on the voyage home, but had none going out. It has occurred to me to ask how the rules of Christian charity apply to this case. But I suppose it comes under the head of "ruling ideas."

At Moreton Pinckney "I had a toothache and wanted the tooth extracted. So I had the new doctor called in the first time he was seen in the village. He examined my mouth, and promised to bring his instruments next day. He came, and proceeded to make play with his forceps. "Pray excuse me," he said, "this is the first time I have had to draw a tooth from a living subject. Would you mind lying down on your back on the floor?" This I did immediately, when the operation was performed with complete success.

While Mr. Mozley was at the same parish,

there came from London a circular for some special object, representing that church collections were apt to be scanty, and that they left out many that ought to contribute, and might perhaps if appealed to. So it urged a house-to-house visitation for the purpose. This means from man to man, and that means from field to field. I started early one day and visiting most of the farmhouses in the parish, walked twenty miles and returned with sixpence, which a farmer in pure compassion stopped his plough to extract from his pocket."

Five or six shillings a week was all an unmarried labourer could expect to earn, and they were nearly all in receipt of parish relief, and assigned monthly among the larger ratepayers. And yet in spite of their hopeless condition they were too proud to wear clogs when given to them, though well-to-do Lancashire artisans prefer them to boots.

I remember a churchwarden of great reputed wealth, who kept a good table and several hunters, and who went to the meet in pink, and thought himself quite as good as anybody. A rural dean visited the church, and enumerated what he hoped he would see at his next visit. Among these was an inventory of church property and the Book of Homilies. He came, as he promised, the next year. The churchwarden had not consulted me about the Book of Homilies, and I had misgivings. I was surprised when he addressed the rural dean, with the look and manner of a good boy and said, "I've got a Book of Homilies," taking out of his pocket a sixpenny account-book.

I have sometimes asked myself what might happen if the rural dean directed the churchwardens to provide a terrier, as I believe they once had to do.

Few poets have commenced their trade with such a slender preparation as James Hogg.¹³ By the time he was twenty he had hardly

¹³ "Memorials of James Hogg, the Ettrick Shepherd." Edited by his daughter, Mrs. Garden. Paisley: Alex. Gardner.

read anything except the Bible, "The Gentle Shepherd," and "The Life of Wallace," and he could scarcely write at all, when he began to compose poetry. And yet—which is a very remarkable fact—he could not compose "without the pen in my hand to catch the ideas as they rise." This was his *modus operandi* :—

Having very little spare time from my flock, which was unruly enough, I folded and stitched a few sheets of paper, which I carried in my pocket. I had no inkhorn, but in place of it I borrowed a small phial, which I fixed in a hole in my waistcoat, and having a cork fastened by a piece of twine, it answered the purpose fully as well. I had no method of learning to write, save by following the Italian alphabet; and therefore I always stripped myself of my coat and vest when I began to pen a song, yet my wrist took a cramp, so that I could rarely make above four or six lines at a sitting.

One would have thought that such labour would have required such a concentration of the brain as to stop all flow of ideas. His first published song, "Donald McDonald," was a patriotic effusion at the time when

Napoleon's banners at Boulogne,
Armed in our country every freeman,

and though its popularity was general, no one cared to know who was the author, not even a certain General MacDonald, who thought the song was made in his honour and had it sung constantly at his mess. The publication of the "Queen's Wake," however, at once bore Hogg into the first rank of popularity, and as a countryman of his says (and Englishmen need not quarrel with the dictum), "stamped him as, after Burns (*proximus sed longo intervallo*), the greatest poet that had ever sprung from the bosom of the people." Mrs. Garden does not offer any criticism of her father's works. Her object is rather to give a truer idea of his personal life to those English readers who judge the Ettrick Shepherd from the portrait, kindly but still a caricature, handed down to us in the "Noctes Ambrosianæ." She wishes us to know that he was something more than a vain but genial *bon camarade*, fond of toddy and trout-fishing, who wore his flannel shirts till he had to cut them off his back with shears; and she shows us his patience under misfortune, his love for his family, his affection for his friends, and his unbounded hospitality. The house at Eltrive was, like Abbotsford, "a hotel without the pay," and sometimes had to accommodate strange visitors.

Late of a summer evening a tall emaciated figure was seen turning off the Thirlestane road on the way to Eltrive. As the miserable ill-clad object approached, the keen eye of Mrs. Hogg saw at once that she was in for an additional visitor for one night at least. As he drew near and had crossed the small wooden bridge leading to the house, he went down on his knees and lifted his hands in the attitude of devotion. Some of us went down to see who he could be, but he was in such a state of intoxication that we could not make out his name, nor anything else than this, that he was come to worship at the shrine of the Shepherd. As he could not be admitted into the house, even if there had been room—for, besides the ordinary occupants, Professor Wilson's family, Tom Tod Stoddart, and others of the party were there—there was no redress but to put the drunken admirer of genius to sleep with old Donald in the cowhouse. Next morning being Sunday he was sober, and sent in a message by the girl who carried him his breakfast, that he would like a

book to read. She took him a volume of "Boston," but he returned it, expressing a wish to have something in the languages. I sent him a Gaelic New Testament, but neither did this please him. He wanted Greek or Latin. This aroused curiosity, and Stoddart and John Thomson Gordon went down to examine what unearthly creature they had lighted on. They knew him at once; it was William Mayne, a person of cultivated taste and fine poetical mind who had bid defiance to the efforts of Henry Glassford Bell, and others who appreciated his powers, to keep him right. So far had he fallen that from occupying a position of trust in a writer's office in Glasgow, he had gone into the streets, and was frequently found in the Trongate or Candleriggs selling or singing ballads in broadsheets. They had not heard of him for months, but he had been a kind of butt of Stoddart's, and he addressed him, "Come now, Mayne, let the Shepherd hear you recite your favourite poem." Pleased at being asked, he stretched his miserable frame to its utmost capacity, and recited in a wild chant, with many gesticulations—

"I thought that the grave was a sweeter part
Where one would rest in a sounder sleep," &c.

On leaving, the party contributed a small sum of money for his immediate wants. He said he was going to Berwick to ask for a cast in a smack to London, where he was sure of wealth arising from his literary labours; but although we subsequently made enquiry, we heard no more of him that could be depended on as fact.

Are English poets victimized in this way by their admirers? If they were they would be more inclined to order them off the premises than to give them bed and breakfast.

Mr. Hutton has compiled a most interesting book from the correspondence of the late Sir James Bland Burges,¹⁴ who was Under-Secretary of Foreign Affairs at the end of the last century, and was Knight Marshal of the Royal Household till his death in 1824. His father was an officer in the English army, and while quartered in Scotland, after the battle of Culloden, won his wife in a very romantic fashion. The lady was a daughter of Lord Somerville, who looked for a better match than a young aide-de-camp, and this is how "love found out the way":—

Having secured a lodging in the High Street, Edinburgh, my father communicated his business to two of his most intimate friends, Captain Molesworth and Captain Stewart. They agreed to assist him. Availing himself of the opportunity offered by a private dinner with his Lordship, Captain Molesworth informed Miss Somerville that he should return about midnight and escort her to my father's lodging, where the nuptial ceremony was to be performed, Captain Stewart having undertaken to provide a clergyman. On quitting my grandfather's apartments, Captain Molesworth contrived, without being seen by the servants, to put the key of the door into his pocket. Just as the clock struck twelve, he opened the door and let himself into the house. On the first floor, within the dining parlour, lay Lord and Lady Somerville. The first room upstairs was a large drawing-room, within which was a bedchamber occupied by the present Lord Somerville. Within that again was a third, in which my mother slept, in the same bed with Mrs. Nimmo, the housekeeper. In the dark Captain Molesworth mounted the first flight of stairs, passed Lord Somerville's room, ascended the second flight, went through the drawing-room,

¹⁴ "Selections from the Letters and Correspondence of Sir James Bland Burges, Bart. Edited by Jas. Hutton. London: John Murray. 1885.

and opened the door of Captain Somerville's chamber, who was lying in a sound sleep. Passing through this room he opened the door of my mother's bed-chamber. Mrs. Nimmo was asleep. My mother, who was lying awake and in her clothes, hearing the door opened, put aside the curtain, and by the light of a lamp which burnt in the room, recognised Molesworth, who made her a sign to get up and follow him. At this moment her resolution failed. She beckoned him to the bedside, and told him that her courage was gone, and that she could not venture to rise. He whispered in her ear, "Look you, madam, I have come thus far at the peril of my life to serve you and my friend Burges, but I assure you I will not be made a fool of. Either get up this moment and come with me, or I will make a noise that will awaken both your bedfellow and Captain Somerville, and what then will become of your character? As to myself, I am not afraid of the consequences, for I am completely armed. You are safe if you arise and go with me. If you do not, by all that is sacred, your character is gone from this moment." Upon this menacc, which she knew he was quite capable of fulfilling, my mother arose, and with trembling steps followed him through her brother's chamber and downstairs. As they left the house it rained exceedingly hard and was quite dark. Molesworth pulled off his great-coat and put it upon the lady, and placing his own hat slapped upon her head, he took her under his arm. They walked together in this condition to the High Street, where my father awaited them in the company of Captain Stewart and Mr. Jamieson, the clergyman. In a few minutes the ceremony was performed, and the contracting parties executed what in Scotland is termed marriage lines, and what in England we call a certificate of marriage. Shortly after the ceremony was completed my mother returned to the abbey under the protection of her former guide. They entered the house quietly without disturbing any of the inmates, and my mother again lay down beside the unconscious housekeeper.

A few days after, Mr. Burges was ordered to Gibraltar, and it was two years and a half before the marriage was acknowledged. Sir James was the eldest son, and was brought up at Edinburgh University, where he seems to have done nothing but get into rows, such as breaking all Principal Robertson's windows and thrashing his manservant. For the sake of stricter discipline, he was sent to Westminster, and then to Oxford, and began to study law; but a Commissionership in Bankruptcy, and a seat in Parliament given him by Lord Carmarthen, determined him to stick to a political life. During the Gordon riots the Northumberland Militia were quartered on the Inns of Court, and at a dinner given by Sir James to the officers, at which Pitt and Gibbon were present, an amusing *rencontre* took place between them. The historian

had just concluded one of his best foreign anecdotes, in which he had introduced some of the fashionable levities of political doctrine then prevalent, and with his customary tap on the lid of his snuff-box was looking round to receive our tribute of applause, when a deep-toned but clear voice, was heard from the bottom of the table very calmly and civilly impugning the correctness of the narrative, and the propriety of the doctrines of which it had been made the vehicle. The historian, turning a disdainful glance towards the quarter whence the voice proceeded, saw for the first time a tall, thin, rather ungainly looking young man, who now sat quietly and silently eating some fruit. There was nothing prepossessing or very formidable in his exterior, but as the few words he had uttered appeared to have made a considerable impression on the company, Mr. Gibbon, I suppose, thought himself bound to maintain his honour by suppressing such an attempt to dispute his supremacy. He accordingly undertook the defence of the propositions in question, and a very

animated debate took place between him and his youthful antagonist, and for some time was conducted with great talent and brilliancy on both sides. At length the genius of the young man prevailed over that of his senior, who, finding himself driven into a corner from which there was no escape, made some excuse for rising from the table, and walked out of the room. I followed him, and finding that he was looking for his hat, I tried to persuade him to return to his seat. "By no means," said he, "that young gentleman is, I have no doubt, extremely ingenious and agreeable, but I must acknowledge that his style of conversation is not exactly what I am accustomed to. You must positively excuse me;" and away he went in high dudgeon.

It was during the political struggle in 1783 that Sir James first gained a footing in the world of politics by suggesting that the Mutiny Bill, which Fox intended to negative, might, in accordance with established parliamentary precedent, be brought in in either House. In return for this useful hint, Pitt offered him the borough of Seaford, but Sir James, to his dismay, found that the payment of £5,000 in ready money was an indispensable preliminary, and therefore waited till Helston was offered him. The Constitutional Club of 1789 was more thoroughgoing than the new Primrose League. Not contented with a mere flower in the button-hole, they wore a uniform—"a dark blue frock, with a broad orange velvet cape, and large yellow buttons, round each of which was the inscription 'Constitutional Club.' The waistcoat is white kerseymere with yellow buttons, bordered all round with orange-coloured silk. The breeches are white kerseymere with yellow buttons." How such a dress would be stared at in Pall Mall to-day! The editing is well done, the *ipsissima verba* of Sir James being employed wherever possible, and Mr. Hutton having contented himself with writing only enough to connect the letters by a thread of narrative.

A man who can give up a good business and a large income, and be content to live on £400 a year, with "the power of doing what I liked best all day long," is by no means an every-day phenomenon, perhaps because the habits of business usually destroy the power of finding anything else worth doing. Mr. Bray,¹⁵ however, being a man with an active mind and a public spirit, found plenty to do. When a man has the desire to induce other people to think as he does, he can never be idle. He even started on his wedding tour with "Mirabeau's System of Nature and Volney's Ruins of Empires," and other light reading of that sort, to enliven the honeymoon," with the natural result of making his wife exceedingly uncomfortable. There is not much in the autobiography of public interest, and, perhaps we ought to be ashamed to say that we have never seen Mr. Bray's *magnum opus*, "The Philosophy of Necessity," but still the little book will do good. In an unpretending way it inculcates sound maxims, such as that the improvement of the organization of the individual is the road to the amelioration of the condition of the species.

It is useless to expect unselfish feelings, except on quite exceptional occasions, from persons in whom the selfish feelings predominate, and this predominance depends far less on education or circumstances than on organization

¹⁵ "Phases of Opinion and Experience during a Long Life." By Charles Bray. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

. . . No one will place himself second to the interests of the community till his organization fits him for it. . . . I have been accustomed hitherto to consider that the belief in a world to come was beneficial to mankind, but on fuller consideration I am inclined to think that, taken altogether, it has been hurtful. It has weakened real responsibility—that is, if has stood between our actions and their natural consequences. Instead of cultivating the body as the true instrument of our higher mental faculties and of our highest enjoyment here, we have been cultivating a soul for some fanciful fictitious imaginary world elsewhere. I am asked, however, “Has not this soul-cultivation tended to the growth of our best faculties—to their best use and enjoyment here?” Certainly indirectly it has; but the direct cultivation of our higher faculties would have been better.

American theology or philosophy is a very remarkable product of the human mind, or body perhaps, if the dictum of the French physiologist, that the religious emotion is a secretion of the small intestine, be true. The late Mr. Henry James¹⁸ (not the novelist) published, according to his son, “an intensely positive, radical, and fresh conception of God, and an intensely vital view of our connection with him,” and the said son confesses “that this view, this conception, so vigorously thrown down, has not stirred the faintest tremulation on the stagnant waters of our time.” One would have thought this a sufficient reason for not republishing it, but filial reverence thinks otherwise. As a specimen of the confusion of thought, or theological acumen—which you will—which pervades the writing of the late Mr. Henry James, we are told on one page that “no higher obligation is incumbent upon any man, in respect to the demands either of honesty or honour, than to act according to his nature;” and on another page, that no man becomes a man otherwise than by the renunciation of self, because “the greatest conceivable amount of evil is involved in man’s nature:” two dicta which take a good many words to reconcile them. If any one wishes to see how it is done, let them read the book. The reminiscences of Carlyle, reprinted from an American magazine, are amusing and instructive. Mr. James, while admiring his talents, thought that “he felt a helpless dread and distrust of you instantly that he found you had any positive hope in God or practical love to man;” and “as to any sympathy with human nature itself and its inexorable wants, or any belief in a breadth of the Divine mercy commensurate with those wants, I could never discern a flavour of either in him.” As an example of this he tells a story of some gentlemen who had been led by Carlyle’s books to suppose that he had some practical notion, at all events some honest desire, of reform, and therefore called upon him to take counsel.

Carlyle had evidently been well pleased by a visit so deferential from such distinguished swells; but so far was he from feeling the least reflective sympathy with the motive of it, that he regarded the whole affair as ministering properly to the broadest fun. “They asked me,” he said, “with countenances of much interrogation, what it was just that I would have them do. I told them that I had no manner of counsel to bestow upon them; that I did not know how they lived at all up there in their grand houses; nor what manner of tools

¹⁸ “The Literary Remains of the Late Henry James.” Edited, with an Introduction, by William James. Boston: Osgood & Co. 1885.

they had to work with. All I knew was, I told them, that they must be doing something ere long, or they would find themselves on the broad road to the devil." And he laughed as if he would rend the roof.

BELLES LETTRES.

AS the sacred bard of mythical England, Lord Tennyson has no rival in the past or the present. Of late years he has set Shakespeare before him, and turned for inspiration to the pages of English history, but as a writer of historical dramas he has not as yet achieved any remarkable success. Harold and Queen Mary excite our interest and our admiration, and we cannot fail to trace in them the hand of the poet and the genius; but they are only to be read with an effort—indeed, if we may dare say so, they are dull. "Becket"¹ is not dull, and apart from any consideration as to representation on the stage or historical propriety, we cannot but be grateful for a recurrence of the old beauties, the splendid style, the enchanting sentiment of the greater poems. The plot of the drama, if plot there be, turns, in the first instance, on the quarrel between Henry and Becket, their gradual alienation, the wrath of the king, and the murder of the archbishop; and secondly, on the loves of Henry and Fair Rosamond, and the vengeful jealousy of Queen Eleanor. Rosamond is represented as the ideal of wisely innocence, a married maiden, and unsuspecting of guilt or wrong; Eleanor, on the other hand, is the embodiment of female unloveliness, sour and disloyal, a sayer of biting words, a nice critic of language, wily and cruel, Henry's evil angel, who fosters the quarrel with Becket, in order to wreak her vengeance on Rosamond. Of the male actors in the drama Henry stands out much clearer than Becket. He is the typical Plantagenet, passionate, debonair, astute, wrathful, caring neither for God nor man, but capable of deep affection and the gentlest love; Becket, on the other hand, recalls the conventional prelate of the stage. Of the minor characters, Walter Map and the beggars suggest the recent study of high-class historical research. The violation of history in making Rosamond present at Becket's murder, whilst it excites the astonishment of the reader, adds but little to the beauty or the interest of the dénouement. Indeed, so little are we roused to any enthusiasm for Becket, that it is difficult to feel any pity for his fate or horror at the deed. Surely the great Archbishop, who had once been Henry's boon companion, and who stood his antagonist in the internecine quarrel between Church and State, must have been cast in another mould from the tedious and underbred ecclesiastic of the play. That which remains in the memory as a new and delightful possession is the picture of Henry the lover and his Rose of the world. We can never again think of Henry II. and Fair Rosamond other than as Lord Tennyson has willed them henceforth to be. And who but a master could have written the following lyric?

¹ "Becket." By Alfred, Lord Tennyson, Poet Laureate. London: Macmillan & Co. 1884.

Over! the sweet summer closes,
 The reign of the roses is done ;
 Over and gone with the roses,
 And over and gone with the sun.

Over! the sweet summer closes,
 And never a flower at the close ;
 Over and gone with the roses,
 And winter again and the snows.

It is impossible not to take pleasure in Mr. Lang's "Rymes à la Mode."² Here are wit and fancy in new dresses, here is scholarship arrayed in silk attire, learning disguised in motley, and golden-haired harmony to lead the revels. To speak seriously, Mr. Lang has discovered a new mode of giving permanence to the perishable fancies of the poets' mind, and we may not doubt that the moods and humours of these latter days will live enshrined in the ballades of our irreproachable Horace. If it be objected that Mr. Lang's "Rymes" are too much and too often *à la mode*, it should be remembered that he has in a great measure created the mode, and though we do *frét* for more poems like the "Fortunate Islands," "Almae Matres," "Love the Vampire," and more sonnets like the grand one on "Homer's Unity," we may not complain because there is such lavish expenditure of refinement and crudition on what used to be called "comic" poetry. We quote the lines from the "Fortunate Islands," which describe the poet waking from his dream:—

Even so I put the cup away,
 The vision wavered, dimmed, and broke,
 And, nowise sorrowing, I woke.

While, grey among the ruins grey,
 Chill through the dwellings of the dead,
 The dawn crept o'er the Northern Sea,
 Then, in a moment, flushed to red,
 Flushed all the broken minster old,
 And turned the shattered stones to gold,
 And wakened half the world with me!

"Poems,"³ by Miss Betham-Edwards are pleasant reading, by virtue of their gentle melody and wholesome sentiment. Of the minor pieces we were especially charmed with the sonnet "Oh! love, it cannot be so long ago," and "Reconciliation." The Letter of Matthias to Albertus is the confession of a great man in the hour of his success, that he has given to the world what the world would applaud, and not what his genius inspired him to do. The inspiration here comes from Mr. Browning. The ballad of Don José's mule Jacintha is both pathetic and original. Here is Don José's resolve not to part with Jacintha when all his other goods were sold:—

Said Don José, "Not for fountains, nor for halls of gilded stone,
 Was man's soul made, nor for riches, nor for meat and drink alone,
 But for grateful, true affection, and no other man shall own
 Don José's mule Jacintha."

² "Rymes à la Mode." By A. Lang. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1885.

³ "Poems." By Miss Betham-Edwards, author of "Dr. Jacob," "Kitty," &c. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, & Co. 1884.

He continued contemplating, meantime smiling somewhat sadly—
 "Ah! 'tis well my servants left me, scanty fare would suit *them* badly;
 But there's one who bore me up-hill and will bear me down as gladly—
 'Tis Don José's mule, Jacintha."

There is nothing to find fault with, much to praise and to take delight in this volume.

The "Apollo and Marsyas"⁴ of Mr. Lee-Hamilton, is a distinct advance upon the "New Medusa," which he published some time ago. For not only is the overmastering gloom and morbid love of the horrible more under the control of the writer's judgment, but the workmanship is that of an artist and no longer that of an amateur. Mr. Lee-Hamilton has imagination, and he has command of language. We resent his applying the one and the other to the realization of ghastly and terrific conceptions. We do not deny the originality or the verisimilitude of the Legend of the Vampyre in "Sister Mary of the Plague," nor the unspeakable horror of "Ipsissimus;" but in the full meaning of the word it is a shame to speak of these things. We do not mean to imply that these poems are immoral or improper, but that they are horrible and revolting. On the other hand, there is in this volume work of high merit, in which the gloom is of a natural blackness. The "Hunting of the King" may take rank with the great poems on famous rides, and in the "Wonder of the World" there are passages of great beauty and imaginative power. In the old myth it was Apollo who flayed Marsyas, and if, as Mr. Lee-Hamilton allegorizes, it is Marsyas who sounds the note of gloom and horror in the world, we are glad that Apollo won the day.

To judge from his poems,⁵ Mr. Roden Noel is a man of varied and profound emotions, keenly alive to all that is beautiful in art and nature, and full of sympathy for suffering humanity. Indeed, a "Lay of Civilization" is a poetical version of the Bitter Cry of Outcast London. For success as a poet, Mr. Noel writes about too many things, and writes too continuously at white heat. There is, moreover, an exaggeration of style, a plethora of fancy, which wearies and outfaces the reader. The following lines in "Melcha" afford an instance:—

The rhythmic molecule, that only moves,
 Foreknows blithe genius, who sings and loves;
 Crystal snowflower, albumen ocean-floor,
 Are faint foreshadowing of cells and more,
 Hold in their womb alyeon, moss and rose;
 Yea, rosier virgins lovelier than those!

"Diabolus Amans,"⁶ a little volume bound not in half-calf but half-towel, bears testimony to the fact that love and marriage superinduce faith in the unseen, though they may and ought to fail to reproduce orthodoxy. We take it that our devil in love, is a Scottish devil, and that he is an admirer of Mr. Walter Smith and of

⁴ "Apollo and Marsyas, and other Poems." By Eugene Lee-Hamilton, author of the "New Medusa." London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row, E.C. 1884.

⁵ "Songs of the Heights and Deeps." By the Hon. Roden Noel. London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row. 1885.

⁶ "Diabolus Amans," a Dramatic Poem. Glasgow: Wilson & McCormick, St. Vincent Street. 1885.

Arthur Hugh Clough. But for a' that, and a' that, we were favourably impressed with what we suppose to be a maiden effort. The following lines express a natural and wholesome sentiment :—

Christ went into a mountain once to pray ;
 And who was ever on the lonely hills,
 And leapt from crag to crag, and looked adown
 The long green hollows stretching far and fixed
 With mellow light, and dimpling with the soft
 And growing shadows of the afternoon,
 And could refrain from shouting up to Heaven?

“Gathered Leaves,”⁷ by Enis, are for the most part translations and imitations from the French. The selection is excellent, and there is much felicity of expression in the English version. “The Strike,” from the French of “La Grève des Forgerons,” by François Coppée, is a realistic poem of a class with which we are now familiar. The narrator is a working-man, who at first joined a strike, and afterwards, on being taunted for accepting work to save his wife and grandchildren from starvation, kills his accuser. The narrative is at once true to life and pathetic. It deserves to be known and read. “The Unfortunate Woman,” a poem in the style of Béranger, has the merit of genuine pathos. The gratitude of English readers is due to Enis for bringing to their notice these specimens of modern French poetry.

“Love’s Moods,”⁸ by Elian Prince, though manifold, fall naturally into the threefold division of Paradise, Estrangement, and Reconciliation. Mr. Prince has a flow of words and an ample store of allusions, illustrations and images. He writes pleasantly and truthfully of natural objects, as thus :—

Here is no wasted monument,
 With mosses and with ferns besprent ;
 For any fretted masoury
 Splinters of mountain stone you see,
 Most thinly scattered here and there,
 Grey-lichened by the moorland air.

Mr. Prince has not got a sense of humour, or he could not have celebrated the “Glowing Girls of Trent,” as follows :—

I love those pale and elegiac faces,
 From which the large black eyes do beam ;
 The dark tinge of those proud necks—

Nor could he have gone on to say :—

But, I love, far above all,
 That genial port—

“Aldornere”⁹ and two other Pennsylvanian Idylls, by Howard Worcester Gilbert, are not so much caviare as hominy to an English reader. Homely food to be palatable should be the food of our

⁷ “Gathered Leaves.” By Enis. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, & Co., 1, Paternoster Square. 1885.

⁸ “Love’s Moods.” By Elian Prince. London: E. W. Allen, 4, Ave Maria Lane.

⁹ “Aldornere, and two other Pennsylvanian Idylls; together with Minor Poems.” By Howard Worcester Gilbert. Boston: Index Association. 1885. London: Trübner & Co.

own home. The poems on "Flowers," on the other hand, are full of insight and beauty. We regret that we have not space to quote from the "Lines to a Daisy," and "The Trailing Arbutus Flower."

"Moods and Memories,"¹⁰ by William Maccall, are of a subjective character. They display an active and intelligent mind, and no little skill in verse-making. The author is evidently not one of those who believe in the best of all possible worlds, and he is inclined to "gird" at things in general. The sonnet to "Shelley" contains some fine lines, and that to "Algernon Charles Swinburne as the assailant of Louis Napoleon" is happily expressed.

We prefer Mr. Major¹¹ in his simpler vein, when he sings musically enough of "The Spring," "The Evening Star," or "The Sparrows," to Mr. Major when he is shouting "Hail Columbia," or, when in "Some Temperance Lyrics" he bids us "dash aside the dangerous bowl." The following adaptation of Keats' "Not to the sensual ear" is delicious:—

Without the aid of sensual eyes I see,
Without the ear I hear, without the nose
I catch the floating fragrance round that glows.

We thought that it was only Englishmen who were devoid of a sense of humour.

It is, we admit, both ungracious and unjust to dismiss with a few words a work which must have taken many years to write; but what are we to say concerning Mr. Frederick Swinburne's "Gustavus Adolphus"¹² and its 500 quarto pages? We cannot help being reminded of Poscidon Hicks, his epic "The Megatherium," and what the reviews said about it. The greater part of this long poem appears to be a chapter of history reproduced in a metrical form. Coleridge, when he was at school, began to turn Euclid into verse, and it would be possible to write the money article for the *Times* in couplets. No doubt the composition of this work delighted the author, and if there be any who read it and take pleasure therein, why 'a God's name let them.

Of Mr. Albert Drinkwater's "Plays and Poems,"¹³ the plays are novelettes in verse. They are quite harmless, and may be read with advantage by the young. The poems do not call for any particular criticism.

In his preface to "Child Life,"¹⁴ Mr. Langford tells that he has attempted to reproduce child-life "as he has seen it lived by children."

¹⁰ "Moods and Memories." By William Maccall. London: W. Stewart & Co., Holborn Viaduct Steps, E.C. Edinburgh: J. Menzies & Co.

¹¹ "The Peril of the Republic," and other Poems. By George Macdonald Major. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. The Knickerbocker Press. 1884.

¹² "Gustavus Adolphus: an Historical Poem." By Frederick Pfander Swinburne, with Illustrations. London: Wyman & Sons, 74 and 76, Great Queen Street. 1884.

¹³ "Plays and Poems." By Albert E. Drinkwater. Griffith, Farran, Okeden & Welsh, West Corner, St. Paul's Churchyard.

¹⁴ "Child Life, as learned from Children." By John Alfred Langford, LL.D., F.R.H.S., author of "The Praise of Books." London: Simpkin, Marshall, & Co. 1884.

We cannot congratulate him on his experience of the nursery, or on his rhymes.

We have to acknowledge a fifth volume of Mrs. Horace Dobell's "In the Watches of the Night,"¹⁵ and a second edition of Mr. Michael Field's clever plays, "Callirrhœ,"¹⁶ and "Fair Rosamond."

Lovers and students of Dante will welcome a new translation of the "Divina Commedia"¹⁷ into Terza Rima. Mr. James Minchin tells us in his preface that he began this translation nearly thirty years ago, and that he has bestowed much labour on the completion. For all that there are other translators in the field (we noticed a translation of the "Inferno" into Terza Rima, by Mr. Romanes Sibbald, not long since in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW) we are confident that Mr. Minchin's work will more than hold its own. Difficult as it is to convey the rhythm of the original, this has been accomplished, and the harshness that must ever arise in a translation is mitigated by the singularly melodious ring of the verse. "An Historical Introduction" and "An Excursus on the Obligation of Dante to Virgil" may be read with interest.

In his preface to "The Translation of the *Æneid* of Virgil,"¹⁸ Mr. Mackail wittily observes that a translation of the kind which he has attempted "can only have the value of a copy of some great painting executed in mosaic, if indeed a copy in Berlin wool is not a closer analogy." Perhaps the translation of any poetry into a prose rendering resembles the substitution of an architectural elevation for an artistic study. Mr. Lang and his *confères* did, indeed, succeed in presenting the "Odyssey" and "Iliad" of Homer in the form of a mediæval romance. But Virgil is a different matter. His charm lies in the pregnant idiom of the Latin language, and his own incommunicable style. Whatever may be effected by scholarship, a nice use of archaic words and turns of expression is here accomplished, but the Mantuan still eludes the net of the translator, though, as Mr. Mackail has Englished a well-known passage, "the beaters run up and down, and the lawns are girt with toils."

As the "first instalment towards a collected edition of dramatists who lived about the time of Shakespeare,"¹⁹ Mr. A. H. Bullen has brought out a three-volume edition of the poetical works of Marlowe. In a critical introduction, Mr. Bullen gives a brief account of the Life of "Shakespeare's greatest predecessor in the English drama," discusses the authenticity of the various plays, and touches on the connection of Marlowe with Shakespeare. Mr. Bullen holds that

¹⁵ "In the Watches of the Night." Poems by Mrs. Horace Dobell. Vol. V. London: Remington & Co., 18, Henrietta Street, W.C. 1884.

¹⁶ "Callirrhœ" "Fair Rosamond." By Michael Field. London: George Bell & Sons, York Street, Covent Garden. Clifton: J. Baker & Sons.

¹⁷ "The Divine Comedy of Dante Alighieri." Translated verse for verse from the original into Terza Rima. By James Innes Minchin. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1885.

¹⁸ "The *Æneid* of Virgil." Translated into English. By J. W. Mackail, M.A., Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

¹⁹ "The Works of Christopher Marlowe." Edited by A. H. Bullen, B.A. In three vols. London: John C. Nimmo, 14, King William Street, Strand, W.C. 1885.

Marlowe was the author of "Titus Andronicus," and that he had a share in all three parts of "Henry VI." The third volume includes the translations from Ovid and Lucan, the "Epigrams of J. D.," and a reprint of Mr. R. H. Horne's tragedy of the "Death of Marlowe." This edition, which may be described as a *handy édition de luxe*, is published by Mr. John C. Nimmo. The issue is limited to 400 copies.

The "Poems of Keats,"²⁰ reprinted with scrupulous exactness from the editions of 1817, 1818, 1820, form a welcome addition to the "Golden Treasury Series." In the notes, the editor, Mr. F. T. Palgrave, explains the text, and illustrates the development of Keats' genius by quotations from the Letters. We need not say that Mr. Palgrave's criticisms are valuable and interesting.

We should have noticed "Carols and Poems,"²¹ a Christmas Garland, in our January issue. We cannot do justice in this "roaring moon of crocus and of daffodil," to numming songs of wassail and old world revelry. Here are old carols from MSS. of the fifteenth century, and new carols by such unlikely messmates as Mr. Swinburne and R. H. Hawker. It is a beautiful book, printed on rough paper, with red marginal lines, and bound in white vellum *semé* with sprigs of holly. We think but little of the illustrations. Some dedicatory lines "To my wife" are singularly charming.

A "Tragedie of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark"²² is a reprint of the folio of 1623, with notes by Mr. George Macdonald. Mr. Macdonald regards the first quarto as a surreptitious publication of Shakespeare's private notes and rough draft of his play, the second quarto as an emended edition by Shakespeare himself, and the folio of 1623, which was edited by Shakespeare's friends after his death, as the result of a careful study of the poet's corrections and emendations made between the publication of the second quarto and his death. The text is printed on the left hand, the notes on the right hand page. Of the notes we prefer the exegetical to the critical. To understand what Shakespeare had in his mind when he expressed himself obscurely or unexpectedly is to assist at the birth of ideas beyond the ken of lower mortals—

What man-midwife must he be
For such august delivery!

Mr. A. W. Verrall republishes a series of lectures delivered at Trinity College, Cambridge, under the title of "Studies, Literary and Historical in the Odes of Horace."²³ These studies, which are a series of essays on the character, the chronology, and the morality

²⁰ "The Poetical Works of John Keats." Reprinted from the original editions, with Notes by Francis T. Palgrave. London: Macmillan & Co. 1884.

²¹ "Carols and Poems, from the Fifteenth Century to the Present Time." Edited by A. H. Bullen, with Illustrations by Henry G. Wells. London: John C. Nimmo. 1885.

²² "The Tragedie of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark." A Study, with the text of the folio of 1623. By George Macdonald. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1885.

²³ "Studies Literary and Historical in the Odes of Horace." By A. W. Verrall, M.L., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. London: Macmillan & Co. 1884.

of the Odes, appear to us to possess great critical value, and to throw a new light on difficulties which have baffled and puzzled the student, in spite of the assurances of the commentators that they had grasped the meaning. In an essay on the three books, Mr. Verrall endeavours to show that the arrangement is due to a formal scheme in accordance with the progress of historical events. In "Venus and Myrtale" a theory is upheld that, not only are almost all the allusions to love-making artistic and impersonal, but that much which has been mistaken for the praise of gallantry and wantonness refers to honest courting and married love. Two explanations of difficult passages appear to us especially happy. Mr. Verrall regards the words, "oppositis punicibus," in the 11th Ode of the First Book, as an allusion to the breakwater of the Pontus Julius erected in the winter of 37-36. This does away with a harsh inversion. (2.) In the Excursus, which bears the name of Lamia, Mr. Verrall argues that the Cælius mentioned in the difficult 17th Ode of the Third Book, was not a member of the noble Cælian family, but was a Lamia who was villicus or steward of the poet's farm, and that the high-sounding Gentile name is applied in jest. We have only been able to touch on one or two points, but the whole work demands, and will repay, careful study.

We can only acknowledge the following classical and educational works:—*The Academics of Cicero, with Notes and Introduction,*²⁴ by James S. Reid, M.L.; *"The Annals of Tacitus, i.-iv.,"*²⁵ with Notes and Introductory Excursus by H. Furneaux, M.A.; *"The De Rerum Naturâ of Lucretius, with Introduction and Notes to Books i. iii. v.,"*²⁶ by Francis W. Kelsey, M.A.; and we have received from the Delegates of the Clarendon Press Series, *"The Choephoroi of Æschylus,"*²⁷ with Notes and Introduction by A. Sidgwick, M.A.; *"The Tale of Gamelyn,"*²⁸ with Notes and Glossarial Index, by the Rev. W. Skeat, M.A. Messrs. Macmillan add to their Elementary Series of Classics, *"The Third Book of the Odes of Horace,"*²⁹ with Notes and Vocabulary, by T. E. Page, M.A. We have also to acknowledge a Latin Treatise, *"De Græcis Florum et Arborum Amantissimis,"*³⁰ by Dr. Bruno Arnold.

We have received a little American publication, "Stories for

²⁴ *"M. Tulli Ciceronis Academics."* The Text Revised and Explained by James Reid, M.L. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

²⁵ *"Cornelii Taciti Annalium, Libri i-iv."* Edited with Notes for the Use of Schools. By H. Furneaux, M.A. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1885.

²⁶ *"T. Lucreti Cari de Rerum Naturâ, Libri Sex."* With Introduction and Notes to Books i., iii. and v. By Francis W. Kelsey, M.A. Boston: John Allyn, Publisher. 1884. London: Trübner & Co.

²⁷ *"Æschylus Choephoroi. With Introduction and Notes."* By A. Sidgwick, M.A. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1884.

²⁸ *"The Tale of Gamelyn."* Edited with Notes by Rev. W. W. Skeat, M.A., LL.D. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1884.

²⁹ *"Q. Horatii Flacci Carminum, Liber III."* By F. E. Page, M.A., Assistant Master at the Charterhouse. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

³⁰ *"De Græcis Florum et Arborum Amantissimis."* Scripsit Bruno Arnold, Philosophiæ Doctor. Göttingæ: Apud Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1805. London: Trübner & Co.

Young Children,"³¹ by E. A. Turner; the only comment that suggests itself to us is that they must be for very young children.

We have received Vol. IV. (Part I.) of the excellent "Encyclopædic Dictionary,"³² in course of publication by Messrs. Cassell. We have already expressed at some length, in a former number of THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW, our admiration, both of the work itself and of its material execution. We have only to add that the present volume is in no way inferior to its predecessors.

"Miss Brown"³³ is, to use an expressive French phrase, *mieux étoffé* than most novels. It contains more thought and that of a finer quality. Nevertheless, we hardly think that this first essay of Vernon Lee's as a novelist, is as well suited to her mode of thinking and writing, nor so good in itself as such books as "Euphorion," &c., where pleasant, clever talk was the staple instead of narrative. In "Miss Brown" the actual narrative forms but an insignificant ingredient; the charm of the book lies in the descriptions, the sketches of particular phases of modern artistic and literary society, especially the æsthetic craze, which is admirably portrayed and dissected. Many diverse types of character are well presented and sustained. But the great bulk of the three volumes is occupied with a minute, almost a microscopic, analysis of the inner life of the heroine, Anne Brown; and, though this analysis is skilfully performed, it is so searching, and, above all, so prolonged, as to be tedious. The style, as in all Vernon Lee's writings, is bright and effective, but it is disfigured, on the one hand, by a certain pedantic preciseness, such as the use of "be" for "is" in a potential sense, which nowadays savours of affectation; and, on the other hand, by indulgence in fashionable slip-slop, occasionally amounting to solecisms, as, for instance, the incorrect employment of "very," of which the expression "very alone" may be instanced as the *combe*. We are surprised that Messrs. Blackwood should give in to the detestable American fashion of dividing words—*e.g.*, *sav-iour*, for *sa-viour*, and, worst of all, *mad-ame* for *ma-dame*.

In these days when novels are frequently made the excuse for discussing "burning questions," or ventilating advanced opinions on all subjects, a book like "The Lover's Creed"³⁴ comes as a refreshment. Mrs. Cashel-Hoey's style is excellent, graceful, and tender, while at the same time it is spirited and full of earnestness. She loves her subject and handles it *con amore*, not being ashamed to be romantic, and yet never exceeding the bounds of good taste. What she calls "the great human bond" makes itself felt throughout her pages. Her story is a love story *pur et simple*, and is told with profound belief in her motto, "One and one only is the lover's creed."

³¹ "Stories for Young Children." By E. A. Turner. Boston: Ginn, Heath & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1884.

³² "The Encyclopædic Dictionary." Vol. IV. Part I. Glot. Int. London, Paris and New York: Cassell & Co., Limited. 1884.

³³ "Miss Brown." A Novel. By Vernon Lee. Three vols. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons. 1884.

³⁴ "The Lover's Creed." A Novel. By Mrs. Cashel-Hoey. Three vols. London: Chatto & Windus, Piccadilly. 1884.

"Tarantella"³⁵ does not contrast favourably with the last-mentioned novel. It is a weird and uncomfortable story, all about the bite of a tarantula, which in the South is believed to be fatal, unless the bitten person can be kept dancing until the venom has worn itself out. We have a cataleptic, hysterical heroine, whose state of being would more fitly form the subject of a psychological study than a romance. The author is not very clear that she does not herself believe in the power of music to dispel the fatal virus, hence the name of her book; and in her story she has mixed up the fiddler, his tarantellas, the girl, the spider, and the victim of them all, into a *fatras* of wearisome nonsense.

"Mr. Montenello: a Romance of the Civil Service,"³⁶ by Mr. Baillie Hamilton, though containing a minimum of narrative in a maximum of talk, digressions, and, in short, "padding," of one kind or another, is none the less a very agreeable and readable novel. It is not till the appearance of Mr. Montenello, in the third volume, that the story at all justifies its title of "a Romance." On horseback and at the covert side Mr. Hamilton is almost as much at home as was the gitted author of "Mr. Jorrocks' Jaunts," and his pictures of English country-house life are among the truest, if not the most amusing, we have seen.

"When all was Young,"³⁷ by Cecil Clarke, is a very innocent and tender little love story. A love-lorn damsel, dwelling in the mountains of Saxon Switzerland, encloses in an old tin canister a despairing letter to her lover, entreating him to come back to her. This canister she sends floating down the Elbe, and it is intercepted and fished up by some English children. Their widowed mother, to whom they confide their discovery, determines to trace the writer, and, if possible, bring about a reconciliation between the lovers. In carrying out this charitable purpose, she accidentally falls in with an old friend and admirer, who co-operates with her so ardently and effectually, that, not one, but two happy marriages are brought about by the old tin canister. The very tasteful binding of the book is, in itself, a passport to favour.

"Farnell's Folly"³⁸ is one of the many American novels, depicting the homely life of dwellers in a remote village. It is a very favourable specimen of its class, and shows considerable knowledge of human nature and acute observation of individual character.

"Men, Women, and Progress,"³⁹ by the late Emma Hoskin Woodward, belongs to a class of works which does not find favour in our eyes. The story is a mere vehicle for discussion. It is as though the

³⁵ "Tarantella. A Romance." By Mathilda Blind. Two vols. London: Fisher Unwin, Paternoster Square. 1885.

³⁶ "Mr. Montenello. A Romance of the Civil Service." By W. A. Baillie Hamilton. Three vols. Edinburgh & London: William Blackwood & Sons. 1885.

³⁷ "When all was Young. A Love Story." By Cecil Clark. One vol. London: Elliot Stock, Paternoster Row, E.C. 1885.

³⁸ "Farnell's Folly." Three vols. By J. T. Trowbridge. London: Chatto & Windus, Piccadilly. 1884.

³⁹ "Men, Women, and Progress." By the late Emma Hoskin Woodward. London: Dulau & Co., Soho Square. 1885.

public were enticed by the promise of seeing a play, and when they had paid their money, the entertainment turned out to be a social and political lecture. Mrs. Woodward puts forward the usual stock arguments for women's rights. There is some good sense and a good deal of claptrap, but nothing really new or original.

Mr. James Payn's "Talk of the Town"⁴⁰ is not amusing. Would that it were! It would have been pleasanter both to read and criticize. But, alas! it is dull. The characters are by no means interesting in themselves, and there is nothing in Mr. Payn's treatment to invest them with a borrowed charm. The story is a romance upon the well-known Shakespeare imposture by Samuel William Henry Ireland, and the costumes and outward customs of the period are often mentioned, but the *couleur locale* is but skin deep, laid on by means of details easily gathered from a moderate acquaintance with the literature of the last and beginning of the present century, while the real spirit of the time is never caught.

We cannot say much in praise of Mr. Gibbon's last novel, "By Mead and Stream."⁴¹ The characters are unnatural, and the plot absurdly improbable. It all turns upon the foolish and unjustifiable masquerading of that antiquated stock character, *l'oncle à héritage*, who in this case assumes to himself the rôle of Providence, placing people in false positions, tempting them under the pretext of trying them, and finally, when the lovers of the tale have been estranged and made miserable by the silly *cachotteries* which he has forced upon them, he pops up, like Jack-in-a-box, from behind a convenient sliding panel, to undo the mischief he has caused and make every one happy. Such clumsy machinery and such coarse scene-painting are quite unworthy of the author of "The Golden Shaft."

The second part of "The Little Schoolmaster Mark"⁴² is not less "mystic, wonderful" than the first. Not the least wonderful thing about it is that there should be a second part to a story, of which the hero died in the first part. There are in Part II. some short incidental descriptive passages—especially a description of old Vienna—so vivid and graphic that they stand out like gems, and go far to redeem the haziness and insipidity of their setting.

"The Wearing of the Green"⁴³—bound, by-the-by, in bright *blue* and sprinkled with *brown* shamrocks—is but a sorry performance. It opens well; the first two chapters are very readable and contain some good dialogue, but after that there is really nothing more to praise. The style is tedious and prolix, interspersed with pedantic Latin quotations, and abounding in long, out-of-the-way words. There is no

⁴⁰ "The Talk of the Town." Two vols. By James Payn. London: Smith, Elder & Co., Waterloo Place. 1885.

⁴¹ "By Mead and Stream. A Novel." Three vols. By Charles Gibbon. London: Chatto & Windus, Piccadilly. 1884.

⁴² "The Little Schoolmaster Mark. A Spiritual Romance." Part II. By J. H. Shorthouse. London: Macmillan & Co. 1884.

⁴³ "The Wearing of the Green." Three vols. By Basil. London: Chatto & Windus, Piccadilly. 1884.

want of adventure, but it falls flat through unskillful narration. It is difficult to determine to what particular phase of Irish disaffection the author's sympathy inclines; but his antipathy to England and the English is only to be equalled by his profound ignorance of the manners, morals, and habits of English society, which is betrayed by his foolish and scurrilous picture of English country-house life.

"Gerald,"⁴⁴ a novel in three volumes, by Eleanor C. Price, must rank as one of the cleverest and most agreeable novels of the season. It has the same good qualities which we extolled in "The Foreigners." We know not whether Miss Price has really visited the "Diamond Fields," in South Africa, but her accurate and spirited picture of the life, the country and the people has all the air of an able and conscientious study from Nature.

"Bits from Blinkbonny,"⁴⁵ and its continuation "More Bits from Blinkbonny," may seem at the first glance to be exclusively adapted to those whose literary relaxation takes the form of edifying stories or *lecture pieuse* of some sort. But though piety is undoubtedly the keynote of Mr. Strathesk's writings, they have qualities which must find favour with the most secular reader. They are a sort of folk-lore in the sense that they narrate the short and simple annals of the poor. Their charm lies in their simplicity and in their wonderful truth to nature. Sometimes they remind one of Erckmann-Chatrian's "Contes du Rhin," of Madame Sand's "Mare au Diable," and her "Petite Fadette," or of André Theuriet's "Mademoiselle Guignon;" but their real prototype is to be found in some of Mrs. Beecher Stowe's shorter stories, such as "The Pearl of Orr's Island," and, still more, her "Old Folks at Home," for in these last the same religious note is struck as in "Bits from Blinkbonny,"—the Puritan note—of which, as a matter of course, no trace is to be found in French fiction. The great difference between Mr. Strathesk and Mrs. Beecher Stowe is that whereas the latter often seems to look on the religious fervour she depicts with a half-quizzical smile, Mr. Strathesk enters heart and soul into the emotions of his personages—he evidently has "the root of the matter in him." Perhaps if it were not so, he would be less fit to be the chronicler of "Blinkbonny." Certainly no picture of Scottish peasant life would be faithful from which religion was omitted, or painted by an unsympathetic hand.

We do not advise any one to read Miss Annie Swan's "Aldersyde"⁴⁶ immediately after the "Blinkbonny" series. The similarity of dialect and, in some degree, of tone, naturally induce comparison, which, in the interest of Miss Swan, had better be avoided. In "Aldersyde," as in "Blinkbonny," we have plenty of Scotch dialect, and to our taste, more than enough of religiosity; but there the likeness ends.

⁴⁴ "Gerald." Three vols. By Eleanor C. Price. London: Chatto & Windus, Piccadilly. 1885.

⁴⁵ "Bits from Blinkbonny; or, Bell of the Mansa." By John Strathesk. "More Bits from Blinkbonny." Edinburgh: Oliphant & Co. 1884.

⁴⁶ "Aldersyde: A Border Story of Seventy Years Ago." "Carlowrie; or, among the Lothian Folk." By Annie S. Swan. Edinburgh: Oliphant & Co. 1884.

"Aldersyde" wants that "touch of Nature" which is the chief merit of Mr. Strathesk's village pictures. Miss Swan's personages are not so much human beings, with their inconsistencies, foibles and personal traits, as abstract qualities personified. Then, as to the dialect, there are no shades or degrees. In the "Antiquary" we find "Monkbarns," his sister, and his niece all talking Scotch, but each in his or her particular manner and degree. The servants and villagers speak differently again, in a dialect much broader and more marked. But in "Aldersyde," the heroine, a well-born and cultivated woman, talks exactly like her servant. This can never have been so, even "seventy years ago." Of Miss Swan's French it would be cruel to speak: it is entirely her own. Luckily she introduces but a few words of it. "Carlowrie" is of exactly the same texture as its predecessor. In both the staple incidents are bereavements and afflictions of one sort and another. Miss Swan's stories are a sort of moral gymnasia, in which doleful events are used as appliances for the development of the Christian virtues.

"Amyot Brough,"⁴⁷ by E. Vincent Briton, is almost a good novel. The Cumberland dialect, of which there is a great deal in the opening chapters, is all but correct; some of the characters have considerable individuality. The times in which the action is laid are stirring, comprising the rebellion of 1745, our lamentable failure at Rochefort, and the story virtually ends with the storming of Quebec, and the death of the heroic Wolfe in 1759, the "Wonderful Year" alluded to in Garrick's "Hearts of Oak." But—for unhappily there is a *but*—there is something lacking which prevents the book from being altogether a successful effort. There is no want of incident which ought to be exciting and romantic; but somehow from the manner of its narration it becomes tame and flat, and the story has a constant tendency to drag. The female characters are portrayed, as it were, from within, whereas the men are drawn from without. This, in itself, is a sufficient clue to the sex of the writer; but many other indications are scattered over the work, and we cannot help thinking that Miss E. V. Briton might find a more favourable field for her abilities as a novelist than in what purports to be a military romance of the last century.

Mr. Cecil Power's "Philistia"⁴⁸ is an unusually clever novel. It has a very apparent political and social bias. The most prominent characters are Socialists, and all the intellectual and cultivated men in the book are represented as thoroughly convinced of the absolute truth and righteousness of the Socialist doctrines, even though self-interest may restrain them from personally obeying its dictates. In the opening chapter, we find a trio of distinguished Oxford graduates at the Sunday reception of Max Schurz, the great apostle of revolution, cheek by jowl with *dynamitards* and fanatical assassins of every

⁴⁷ "Some Account of Amyot Brough." Two vols. By E. Vincent Briton. London: Seeley & Co., Essex Street, Strand. 1885.

⁴⁸ "Philistia." Three vols. By Cecil Power. London: Chatto & Windus, Piccadilly. 1884.

nation under heaven. Such a *rapprochement* might seem too anomalous to be admissible even in fiction, did not the indignant comments of the Press on the speeches delivered at a recent Socialistic gathering, held at Oxford itself, still ring in our ears, and prove once more that truth is stranger—and in this case, more scandalous—than fiction. For at least Mr. Power's Oxonians do not express their hatred to society in violent and indecent terms. Many of the characters in "Philistia" seem to shadow forth well-known personalities; thus, the prototype of Max Schurz is apparently the notorious Socialist, Karl Marx, whilst Arthur Berkeley (the most charming creation in the whole work, by-the-by), composes operettas entitled "The Primate of Fiji," "The Duke of Bermondsey," and others, which contain an echo of "The Pirates of Penzance," "Pinafore," &c. Besides, the words "Little Miss Butterfly," which recur like a refrain whenever Arthur Berkeley is on the scene, are an evident adaptation of Sir Arthur Sullivan's well-known song from "Pinafore" "Poor Little Buttercup."

The hero of the book, if indeed he may be so named, is Ernest le Breton, an Oxford graduate, son of a distinguished Indian officer, but nevertheless a convinced Socialist and devout disciple of Max Schurz, without whose sanction he fears to undertake the simplest and most evident duties of life, lest perchance they should be "anti-social." He is altruistic to flaccidity, and may be best described in the words of Herr Schurz's daughter, "a quiet, broadfaced South German woman, a little over forty." "A woman," she says, "might as well marry Spinoza's Ethics, or the Ten Commandments. He's a perfect Socialist, and nothing else." It is the spirited and pithy dialogue which gives to "Philistia" its undoubted superiority to the ordinary run of novels; for it must be confessed, the incidents are farcical, and not a few of the personages either exaggerated or unnatural; there is, too, a jumble of classes which is quite bewildering. For instance, "Little Miss Butterfly," the daughter of a small grocer in a petty provincial town, is depicted as the very acme of elegance, cultivation, and refinement; yet with her surroundings, how could she escape being what George Eliot called "spotted with commonness?" And this is no solitary example: few indeed of the characters are the legitimate outcome of their antecedents. But the gravest drawback to Mr. Power's work is its marked Socialistic teaching. It is mischievous to disseminate error in an attractive form, and no error could be more signal than that which attributes to a social scheme of human devising, the power to suspend or materially modify a great natural law like that of the struggle for existence.

"Allan Stuart"⁴⁹ is another neutral-tinted Scotch story in which, as in some we have previously noticed, amusement is made quite secondary to edification. Its motto might be "Sweet are the uses of adversity;" for the hero, Allan Stuart, has calamities of all sorts heaped upon him for the express purpose, as it would seem, of

⁴⁹ "Allan Stuart. A Novel." One vol. By Hope Lees. London: Griffith, Harran & Co., Corner of St. Paul's Churchyard. 1885.

"bringing him into communion with the Unseen." When this end is thoroughly accomplished, the clouds lift, and he at once becomes prosperous and respected. But as both he and his wife are by that time shattered in health, and saddened in spirit, a profane reader might be tempted to ask, "*Est ce que le jeu vaut la chandelle?*"

"Garman and Worse,"⁶⁰ is a Norwegian novel, by A. Kielland, translated by W. W. Kettlewell. It is charming reading. A great variety of characters are introduced, and are admirably treated. The two old brothers Garman—"The Consul" and "the Attaché," remind one occasionally of Mr. Shandy and Uncle Toby, not in themselves, but in their touching relations to each other. Everything in the book is very real, the talk, the physical features of the country, its varying atmospheric conditions, and the way events often fritter off and dwindle away to nothing, just as they do in real life. In fact Mr. Kielland's work is not so much an artistic picture as a striking realistic study.

"Major Frank,"⁶¹ by A. L. G. Bosboom-Toussaint, by Mr. J. Akeroyd, is a delightful story in one volume. There is no tedious analyzing of thoughts and feelings, no discussion of vexed questions, religious, social, or political. The personages act and speak, and in so doing develop their idiosyncracies for the reader, just as people unconsciously reveal their characters in real life. It is a thoroughly agreeable book, and seems to be very well translated.

Herman Schmid's charming story of "The Chancellor of the Tyrol"⁶² has been translated by Miss Dorothea Roberts, and, as far as we can judge, it has been conscientiously done. The two volumes are beautifully got up in a white binding with the Tyrolean crowned eagle in red. We have once before met with an admirable translation of "The Chancellor of the Tyrol," in which the remarkable chapter headed "Il Pastor Fido," was more poetically rendered than it is here. We believe that the length of the story alone prevented its publication. Miss Roberts has judiciously shortened it; but we think it would bear some cur-tailing still.

We have another of Mrs. Marshall's charming books.⁶³ This time the scene is laid in Norwich during the reign of Charles II., and Sir Thomas Browne, the famous physician, who wrote the "Religio Medici," is the central figure. The life and manners of the time are described with the author's usual graphic skill, and the work is illustrated with exquisite drawings of ancient monuments in Norwich and Bury St. Edmunds.

"Great Porter Square,"⁶⁴ by Mr. Farjeon, belongs, as its title

⁶⁰ "Garman and Worse. A Norwegian Novel." One vol. By Alexandre L. Kielland. Translated by W. W. Kettlewell. London: Kegan Paul & Co. 1885.

⁶¹ "Major Frank." By A. L. G. Bosboom-Toussaint. Translated from the Dutch by James Akeroyd. London: Fisher Unwin, Paternoster Square. 1885.

⁶² "The Chancellor of the Tyrol." By Herman Schmid. Two vols. Translated by Dorothea Roberts. London: Fisher Unwin, Paternoster Square. 1885.

⁶³ "In the East Country with Sir Thomas Browne, Knight Physician and Philosopher of the City of Norwich." By Emma Marshall. London: Seeley & Co., Essex Street, Strand. 1885.

⁶⁴ "Great Porter Square. A Mystery." By B. L. Farjeon. London: Ward & Downey, York Street, Covent Garden. 1885.

indicates, to that class of novels in which the interest lies in the solution of a problem. Such books may be decried as sensational, but when written by a master-hand, they never fail to enthrall and captivate the lover of fiction. Who has not been absorbed and delighted by such stories as Gaboriau's "Le Crime d'Orcival," or Wilkie Collins's "Moonstone"? The mystery of "Great Porter Square" is well worthy of comparison with either of these masterpieces. The mystery seems at first unfathomable, its gradual solution is cleverly managed, and the *dénouement* thoroughly satisfactory. It contains, too, some curious studies of character.

Three volumes of capital stories, by Mr. W. E. Norris, bear the title: "A Man of his Word,"⁵⁵ which, strictly speakly, applies only to the first of the series. All the stories, except the first (which is, perhaps, the best), have been previously published in the *Cornhill Magazine*. They are well worth reprinting, for, though, in most respects quite unlike each other, they have one striking resemblance, inasmuch as they are every one amusing and well written.

The new volume of "Parchment Library," entitled "Swift's Prose Writings,"⁵⁶ might with more accuracy have been labelled "Book of Samples from Swift's Prose Writings." Hardly a single work is given whole. We venture to assert that a more adequate estimate of Swift's merits as a prose writer could be formed from "Gulliver's Travels," or "A Tale of a Tub," reprinted word for word without excision, than from the miscellaneous excerpts wrenched from their context of which this edition of Swift's prose writings consists. Under the title of "A Tale of a Tub," we have what? The introduction and the digressions.

Mr. Fleet's laborious "Analysis of Wit and Humour,"⁵⁷ is not a mirth-producing performance, and will probably be most appreciated by those who have no other notion of wit or humour than what they can gather from scientific definitions and classifications. For ourselves we confess that one good joke has more value than pages of dry talk about the nature of jokes in general.

"Queer Quotes and Odd Jokes from 'Frisco,'"⁵⁸ though hardly an average specimen of American humour, contains some amusing tales of the palmy days of Californian gold digging.

"The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn"⁵⁹ are good even for Mark Twain. Huckleberry Finn is a boy about ten years old, and he relates his own adventures in his own words. There is abundance of American humour of the best sort; plenty of incident, sometimes thrilling, at

⁵⁵ "A Man of his Word, and other Stories." By W. E. Norris. Three vols. London: Smith, Elder & Co., Waterloo Place. 1885.

⁵⁶ "Selections from the Prose Writings of Jonathan Swift." With a Preface and Notes by Stanley Lane-Poole. London: Kegan Paul & Co. 1884.

⁵⁷ "An Analysis of Wit and Humour." By F. R. Fleet. London: David Bogue, King William Street, Strand. 1884.

⁵⁸ "Queer Quotes and Odd Jokes from 'Frisco.'" Extracted and Set by Henry L. Williams. London: Griffith, Farran & Co., St. Paul's Churchyard. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co.

⁵⁹ "The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn (Tom Sawyer's Comrade)." By Mark Twain. London: Chatto & Windus, Piccadilly. 1884.

others, extravagantly burlesque; charming descriptions of scenery, and admirable sketches of character. The careful rendering of the different dialects prevailing in the Southern States greatly enhances the interest of the book.

Mr. Ernest George's "Etchings of Old London"⁶⁰ is a very interesting work, both from an artistic and an antiquarian point of view. He has faithfully gathered together these relics of former times. Undreamt of, they stand in our midst, but are one by one fast disappearing, to give place to modern structures. The illustrations are finely executed from drawings on copper, and from their mellowness of colour are more effective than photographs, while in clearness and truthfulness they leave nothing to be desired.

"The World of Proverb and Parable"⁶¹ by Mr. Paxton Hood may be regarded as a contribution of some importance to the growing science of comparative folk-lore. But whatever interest it may possess is not greatly enhanced by the Introductory Essay, which is written from a standpoint too exclusively theological to have much scientific value.

"Mark Rutherford's Deliverance"⁶² purports to be an autobiography edited by his friend Reuben Shapcot. That of course is merely a peg on which to hang this able but loosely constructed narrative. Mark Rutherford is a writer for the Press, who has a hard struggle to keep his head above water, but who, with the help of his friend McKay, endeavours to bring light into the gloom of the hopeless lives of the poor of Outcast London. The motive of the book is to preach a kind of undogmatic Christianity, the religion of love and patience, and of going about doing good. It contains some able sketches of character, and a few shrewd sayings not a little in the style of George Eliot.

No one could be better qualified to write with authority of the intimate family life of "Victor Hugo"⁶³ than M. Alfred Asseline. Himself a poet and a man of letters from his youth, he is a devout worshipper at the shrine of the "Maître;" is bound to the Hugo family both by ties of blood and of life-long affection, and has the command of invaluable documents, comprising copious extracts from the diary and letters of M. Foucher, the father-in-law of the poet, numerous letters from Victor Hugo himself to the author, some charming letters from the late Madame Hugo, and lastly, a series of letters—to us the most intrinsically interesting of all—from François Victor Hugo, to whose genius and industry France is indebted for a translation of Shakespeare, perhaps the most adequate and faithful that has ever been

⁶⁰ "Etchings of Old London." By Ernest George. With Descriptive Letterpress by the Author. London: The Fine Art Society, New Bond Street. 1884.

⁶¹ "The World of Proverb and Parable. With Illustrations from History, Biography, and the Anecdotal Table-talk of all Ages." By Edwin Paxton Hood. London: Hodder & Stoughton, Paternoster Row. 1885.

⁶² "Mark Rutherford's Deliverance." Being the Second Part of his Autobiography. Edited by his friend, Reuben Shapcot. London: Trübner & Co., Ludgate Hill. 1885.

⁶³ "Victor Hugo intime." By Alfred Asseline. Paris: C. Marpon et E. Flammarion. 1885.

accomplished. M. Asseline's work is admirably executed, the extracts are well chosen and well arranged, and M. Asseline's own tone and style are charmingly simple and graceful. By a somewhat curious coincidence, his little work reached us on the very day when, not France alone, but the whole literary world, was engaged in celebrating the eighty-third birthday of the illustrious poet and philosopher in whose honour it was compiled.

Whether he deals with the thorny and complicated problems of Political Economy, or depicts the no less complicated phenomena of modern French society, M. Guyot is equally successful; for into all his work he brings the same clear insight, the same sureness of conviction, and the same telling style, at once vivid and exact, as well adapted to the lifelike presentation of scenes and personages, as to the perspicuous rendering of profound and complex thought. In M. Guyot's latest work, "Un Drôle,"⁶⁴ we have a graphic picture of election manoeuvres in France under the Republic. We see that neither secret voting, nor universal suffrage, has sufficed to check bribery which, though it may not be to any great extent individual, is none the less real and effectual. We are shown a state of things, where party politics reign supreme, subordinating to themselves even the judicature, and dealing wholesale in corrupt monopolies and jobbery of the basest sort. No doubt, under any régime, "L'homme n'est pas parfait," but from the glimpse behind the scenes afforded us by M. Guyot, a Democratic Republic seems to be an especially favourable field—a sort of "happy hunting ground," for the predatory class whom he has typified in "Un Drôle."

"En Désordre"⁶⁵ by Camille Bruno is a volume of short stories such as one meets with only in French literature. The stories are of all sorts, and of every shade of complexion, but the *recueil* is marked by an airy grace, a delicate gaiety and, here and there, by an unaffected pathos such as are possessed by few even among French *conteurs*. Each story has its own peculiar *cachet*: thus the two "Contes Norvégiens" are perfect gems in their tender imaginativeness; "Un Quine à la Loterie" charms by its simplicity, its romance and its truth to the best side of human nature. In "Gounod fecit" we have a criticism on the great composer which is so just, so appreciative, and so *spirituel*, that we cannot resist quoting it: ". . . Gounod y a apporté sa mélodie sans parure, sa psalmodie sans sécheresse, ses redondances sans fatigue, et surtout son entente inouïe de toute chose géniale."

⁶⁴ "Un Drôle." Par Yves Guyot. Paris: Marpon et E. Flammarion.

⁶⁵ "En Désordre." Par Camille Bruno. Paris: Calmann Lévy, Rue Auber. 1885.



INDEX.

* * *All Books must be looked for under the Author's name.*

- ABBOTT, E. A., D.D., and Rushbrooke, W. G., "The Common Tradition of the Synoptic Gospels," 542
- Adams, R. C., "Travels in Faith, from Tradition to Reason," 546
- Africa, South*, 325, 634
- Alcock, R. H., F.L.S., "Botanical Names for English Readers," 575
- Allen, W. F., "History Topics for High Schools and Colleges," 273
- "Ancient and Modern Britons: A Retrospect," 586
- Anderson, D., "Scenes in the Commons," 559
- Ashton, J., newly ordered by, "The Adventures and Discourses of Captain John Smith," 293
- Australasia*, 326, 636
- Axon, W. G. A., F.R.S.L., edited, with an Introduction, by, "English Dialect Words of the 18th Century," 310
- BACKHOUSE, the late E., compiled by, "Early Church History to the Death of Constantine;" edited and enlarged by C. Tylor, 292
- Bain, Dr. A., "Practical Essays," 243
- Bancroft, T. W., "A Method of English Composition," 609
- "Bards and Skalds—Scientific and Poetical Works of the last of the Hereditary," 605
- Baring, T. C., M.A., M.P., "The Scheme of Epicurus;" A Rendering into English Verse of the unfinished Poem of Lucretius, 607
- Barnes, C. L., M.A., "Rock History: A Concise Note-book of Geology, having special reference to the English and Welsh Formations," 574
- Basil, "A Drawn Game," 621
- Bassnett, T., "The True Theory of the Sun: Showing the common origin of the Solar Spots and Corona, and of Atmosphere, Storms, and Cyclones," 255
- Bastian, Prof. Dr. Adoff, "Allgemeine Grundzüge der Ethnologie," 567
- Beatty, Pakenham, "Marcia: a Tragedy," 605
- Benham, Rev. W., edited, with Introduction, by, "Letters of William Cowper," 312
- Bentley, R., F.L.S., "The Student's Guide to Systematic Botany," 267
- Berger, S., "La Bible Française de Moyén-Ago," 220
- Blanford, H. F., F.R.S., "Indian Meteorological Memoirs." vol. ii. pt. ii., 254
- "Meteorological Observations recorded at Six Stations in India in the year 1883," 572
- Bond, Rev. J., M.A., and A. S. Walpole, M.A., "Homer's Iliad," book i., 302
- Bonet-Maury, G., D.D., "Early Sources of English Unitarian Christianity," translated by E. P. Hall; with a Preface by James Martineau, LL.D., D.D., 543
- Bose, Shib Chunder, "The Hindoos as they are," Second Edition, 247
- Bourinot, J. G., "Parliamentary Procedure and Practice," 232
- Boussebard, L., "The Gold-Seekers," 306
- Bouverie, Rt. Hon. E. P., "The Province of Government," 235
- Boyle, F., "On the Borderland betwixt the Realms of Fact and Fancy," 304
- "Breadwinners, The," 307
- "Brent, The Poetical Works of the late John, F.S.A.," Revised Edition, 299
- Brown, J. C., LL.D., compiled by, "Forestry in Norway; with Notices of the Physical Geography of the Country," 576
- "Forests and Forestry of Northern Russia, and Lands beyond," 578
- "Introduction to the Study of Modern Forest Economy," 596
- Browne, G. H., A.M., "Notes on Shakespeare's Versification," 318
- Bryans, C., "Latin Prose Exercises, based upon Cæsar's Gallic War," 608
- Büchner, A., "Léon Dumont," 600
- Buckland, A. W., "The World beyond the Esterelles," 249
- Anna, "Ellen Watson," 289
- "Bulletin de la Société Géologique de France," Troisième Série, 571

- Burgon, J. W., R.D., "The Revision Re-vised," 221
- Burroughs John, "Wake-Robin," "Pe-
pacton," 308
- "Birds and Poets," 309
- "Works," 616
- Burton, R. F., "The Book of the
Sword," 279
- Busch, Moritz, "Our Chancellor;" trans-
lated by W. B. Kingston, 262
- Canadian Dominion, The*, 319, 632
- CARRUTHERS, G. T., M.A., "The Unity
of Matter: being Thoughts on the
Nature, Weight, and Expansion of
Gases," 571
- Chambers, the late Robert, LL.D., "Ves-
tiges of the Natural History of Crea-
tion," Twelfth Edition; with an In-
troduction by Alexander Ireland, 574
- CHILDERS' (MR.) NEW HALF SOVER-
EIGNS, 329-346; distinction between
standard and token coins; profit of
coinage of tokens, 331; the gold cur-
rency, its use and abuse, 332-3; need
of preserving purity of standard coins,
334-5; who is to pay the cost of a re-
issue of standard gold, 336; some
suggestions, 337-8; Mr. Childers'
admirable solution, 339; the coinage
Bill, 340; its opponents, 341-3;
sweaters and coiners baffled, 344;
minor objections to the scheme, 345;
which would rehabilitate and maintain
the sovereign in the best condition, 346.
- CHOLERA, THE NON-CONTAGIOUSNESS,
CAUSATION, AND SCIENTIFIC TREAT-
MENT OF, 472-533.
- CHRISTIAN HAREM, THE, 105-115
- Church, R. W., "English Men of Letters
—Bacon," 273
- Churchill, Mrs. E., "From Convent to
Altar," 306
- Clark, G. T., "Mediæval Military
Architecture in England," 266
- CODIFICATION OF ENGLISH LAW: A
PROSPECT, 1-58; current objections
stated and examined, 1-10; advantages
set forth, 11-16; special objections
considered and answered, 17-30; what
form should codification take? 31; is a
preliminary digest requisite? 32; the
public entitled to a code, or nothing,
35; codification by instalments both
feasible and preferable, 36; no in-
stance of a really "all comprehensive"
code exists, 37; examples of codifica-
tion, 40; advantage to the community
of codification by detail, 42; Bentham's
five essentials to a code, 44; Bentham
standing alone, 45-6; brevity and
perspicuity indispensable, 50; but
Bentham's "plainness" impracticable,
51; methods and costs of codifying
discussed, 52-4; how to maintain and
modify, 55; general summary, 56 *et seq.*
- Colonial Empire, Our*, 319, 629.
- Colson, F. H., M.A., "The Rise of the
Athenian Empire," 302
- CONGO (THE RIVER); AND THE PROPOSED
CONGO TREATY, 116-141; the start
from Loango in October, 1882, 117;
coasting stations, 118; phytography of
S. W. Africa, 119; mouth of the Congo,
120; the "Kruboy" 121; Banana
Point, and Kissangó, 122; Boma, 123-4;
interview with Mr. Stanley at Vivi,
125; the plagues of travellers, grass,
flies, and rain, 126; Isangila, native
markets, 127; Manyanga, 128-9;
Congo scenery, 130; Léopoldville,
Stanley Pool, 131-2; King Ibaka,
Bólóbó station, 133; M. Giraud's ad-
vance from the east, 134; sources of
the Congo, 135; 1,000 miles from
Stanley Pool to Stanley Falls, 136;
the International Association, its trea-
ties with the natives, 137; Lord Gran-
ville's dispatch to M. d'Antas, 138;
the Anglo-Portuguese Treaty, 139;
unreasonable agitation against treaty,
140; desirability of conference to settle
future of the Congo, 141
- Conway, W. M., "The Woodcutters of
the Netherlands in the Fifteenth Cen-
tury," 595
- Cook, A. M., M.A., "C. Sallusti Crispi
Bellum Catilinae," 608
- F. C., M.A., "The Origins of
Religion and Language," 213
- Cooper (Mrs.), "Heart Salvage," 620
- Cope, Rev. Sir W., Bart., compiled and
edited by, "A Glossary of Hampshire
Words and Phrases," 310
- COREA, 74-105; early history, 75-78;
Hamel's account in seventeenth cen-
tury, 79; Roman Catholic Mission-
aries, 81-2; French expedition in 1866,
83; its repulse, 84; Jenkins's attempt
to enter the forbidden land, 85-6-7;
American expedition in 1871, 88-9;
Japanese the first to establish formal
relations with Corea, 90; visit of the
Duke of Genoa and Mr. Spence in
1880, 91; influence of Li Hung-chang
upon Corean Government, 92; hostile
attack on Japanese Embassy in 1882,
93; Chinese intervention, 94; treaty
ratified with United States, 1883, 95;
treaties with England and Germany,
96; description of the people, 97; the
Government, physical aspect, 98;

- mineral wealth, 99; products, 100; population, 101; commerce, 102; treaty ports, 103; development of intercourse, 104
- Cowper, *see* Benham
- Craik, H., M.A., "The State in its Relation to Education," 551
- Crawford, O., "The World we Live In," 622
- Cunningham, W., B.D., "Christian Opinion on Usury, with Special Reference to England," 242
- "Current Discussions in Theology." By the Professors of Chicago Theological Seminary, vol. ii., 545
- DALTON, Rev. H. A., "Select Epodes and Ars Poetica of Horace," 608
- Dantchenko, V. I. N., "Personal Reminiscences of Gen. Scobeloff," 280
- "Darkness and Dawn: the Peaceful Birth of a New Age," 241
- Deming, C., "Byways of Nature and Life," 248
- Devereux, W. Cope, "Fair Italy, the Riviera, and Monte Carlo," 567
- Dillwynn, E. A., "Jill," 622
- Dobell, Mrs. H., "In the Watches of the Night," vol. i., 299
- "In the Watches of the Night," vols. ii. iii., 606
- Dobson, Austin, Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by, "Beaumarchais' 'Le Barbier de Seville,'" 317
- Drummond, James, LL.D., "Introduction to the Study of Theology," 221
- Duncker, Max, "Geschichte des Alterthums," neue folge, erster band, 584
- Duruy, V., "History of Rome," translated and edited by J. P. Mahaffy, vol. ii., 585
- EARP, J., "Strictures on Religious Creeds and Usages," 226
- Eicke, K. M., "First Lessons in Latin," 608
- Elliot, F., "The Red Cardinal," 623
- Elwes, Alfred, "A Dictionary of the Portuguese Language," 318
- Elwes, R. H. M., *see* Spinoza
- "Emerson, R. W.," the Round Table Series, 282
- "Encyclopædic Dictionary (The)," vol. iii. part ii., 611
- "English (New) Dictionary on Historical Principles," edited by James A. H. Murray, LL.D., part i., A—Ant, 611
- Ewing, J. A., B.Sc., "Memoirs of the Science Department, Tôkiô Daigaku," 251
- R. M., "The School and College Handbook of Agriculture," with a Preface by Professor J. Scott, 575
- FASNAOHT, Eugene, "Macmillan's Progressive French Course," II., 317
- Fawcett, Professor H., M.P., "Labour and Wages," 242
- Fleay, F. G., M.A., "The Logical English Grammar," 609
- Flint, Prof. Robert, "Vico," 548
- Forbes, Archibald, "Chinese Gordon," 276
- "Fortunes made in Business," 271
- Francillon, R. E., "A Real Queen," 302
- French, R. V., D.C.L., "Nineteen Centuries of Drink in England," 596
- Fyffe, C. A., "Modern Europe," vol. i., 1792-1814, second edition, 260
- GELDART, Rev. E. M., M.A., edited by, "Folk-Lore of Modern Greece: The Tales of the People," 313
- George, Gertrude M., "The Valley of Sorek," 304
- Gibbon, Charles, "Fancy Free, and other Stories," 304
- Gindeley, Anton, "History of the Thirty Years' War," translated by A. Ten Brook, 581
- Gomme, G. L., edited by, "The Gentleman's Magazine Library," Dialects, Proverbs, and Word-Lore, 310
- "Gone to Texas," edited by Thomas Hughes, 249
- "Gordon (General), Life of," 277
- Grant, J. C., "Prairie Pictures, Lilith, and other Poems," 300
- James, "The Master of Aberfeldie," 618
- Graves, C. E., edited with Notes by, "The Fourth Book of Thucydides," 301
- Green, A. K., "The Leavenworth Case," 305
- Grey, Rowland, "In Sunny Switzerland," 622
- Gustafson, Axel, "The Foundation of Death: A Study of the Drink Question," 561
- Guthrie, Malcolm, "On Mr. Spencer's Data of Ethics," 232
- Guyot, Yves, "Prostitution under the Regulation System, French and English," translated by E. B. Truman, M.D., F.C.S., 243
- , "Un Fou," 314
- HAGUE, Dr. W., "R. W. Emerson," 283
- Hales, J. W., M.A., "Notes and Essays on Shakespeare," 613

- Hall, G. S., edited by, "Methods of Teaching and Studying History," 273
- Hammond, R., "The Electric Light in our Homes," 256
- Hardwicke, H. J., M.D., "The Popular Faith Unveiled," 222
- Harper, T., "The Metaphysics of the School," vol. iii. part i., 232
- Harris, J., "Some Propositions in Geometry," 570
- , J. C., "Mingo, and other Sketches in Black and White," 617
- Harrop, R., "Bolingbroke: A Political Study and Criticism," 283
- Hartmann, E. Von, "Philosophy of the Unconscious," authorized translation by W. C. Coupland, M.A., B.Sc., 3 vols., 546
- "Heine, The Memoirs of Heinrich, and some newly discovered Fragments of his Writings," with an Introductory Essay by T. W. Evans, M.D., 593
- Hellmuth, Rt. Rev. J., D.D., "Biblical Thesaurus," 218
- Hickson, Mary, "Ireland in the Seventeenth Century," with a Preface by J. A. Froude, M.A., 588
- Hillocks, Rev. J. J., "Hard Battles for Life and Usefulness;" an Autobiographic Record, 559
- Hinton, James, "An English Madonna," 296
- "Historical Society: Transactions of the Royal," New Series, vol. ii. part i., 599
- Hodgson, J. E., R.A., "Academy Lectures," 311
- Hoffmann, F. A., "Poetry: Its Origin, Nature, and History," 607
- HOWELLS' (MR.) NOVELS, 347-375
- Hughes, *see* Gone
- Hunt, J. D.D., "Pantheism and Christianity," 222
- IBBETSON, D. C. J., "Report on the Census of the Punjab, taken on the 17th February, 1881," 246
- IMITATIVE ART, 381-401
- "India, Records of the Geological Survey of," vol. xvii. part ii., 571
- India, 624
- Ingram, J. H., Biographical Essay by, "The Tales and Poems of Edgar Allan Poe," 4 vols., 301
- "Italian Parliamentary Papers," 567
- JAMES, M. E., "The Heir of Aylmer's Court," 305
- Janet, Paul, "The Theory of Morals," translated from the French by Mary Chapman, 231
- Jardine, Rev. R., B.D., "The Elements of the Psychology of Cognition," Second Edition, Revised and Improved, 549
- "Jaunt (A) in a Junk: a Ten Days' Cruise in the Indian Seas," 248
- Jeans, G. E., M.A., and A. V. Jones, M.A., "Stories of Roman History from Cicero," 608
- W. T. "Creators of the Age of Steel," 270
- Jefferies, Richard, "Red Deer," 248
- Jones, *see* Jeans, G. E.
- Jukes-Browne, A. J., B.A., "The Student's Handbook of Physical Geology," 253
- "KEATS (John), The Poetical Works of," edited by W. T. Arnold, 606
- Kellogg, E., "Labour and Capital; a New Monetary System," edited by his daughter, Mary Kellogg Putnam, 242
- Kempe, J. A., edited by, "Autobiography of Anna Eliza Bray," 290
- Kettle, R. M., "On Leithay's Banks: A Highland Story," 620
- Keyser, H. A., "On the Borderland," 617
- "Khedives and Pashas," by one who knows them well, 279
- Knapp, W. J., edited by, "Modern French Readings," 316
- with Text, Notes, and Vocabulary, "Modern Spanish Readings," 316
- LANG, A., M.A., edited by, with Notes, "Molière's 'Les Précieuses Ridicules,'" 317
- Lawrence, E., "Principles of the Commonwealth: A Treatise," 233
- Lee, the late Principal, "The University of Edinburgh," 273
- Lefroy, Gen. Sir J. H., C.B., "Diary of a Magnetic Survey of a Portion of the Dominion of Canada, chiefly in the North-Western Territories," 257
- Levy, Amy, "A Minor Poet, and other Verse," 604
- Litchfield, Grace D., "Only an Incident," 308
- LORDS (THE) AND THE FRANCHISE BILL, 448-471; nature and character of the House of Lords, 449; its constitution, 450; Pitt's creation of peers, 451; Lord Rosebery on the peers, 453; Mr. Escott and Prof. Thorold Rogers quoted, 455; "Fifty Years of the House of Lords," 456, 457; the ballot and the Lords, 459; the Lords and religious liberty, 460; and Ireland, 461, 462; Sir G. C. Lewis, 464; Lord Sherbrooke,

- 465; the Duke of Wellington, 466; other opinions on the Lords, 467; the people *not* desirous of abolishing the House of Lords, 468; suggestions on present relations between the two Houses, 459 *et seqq.*
- Loserth, Dr. Johann, "Wiclif and Hus," translated by the Rev. M. J. Evans, 591
- "Lotze's System of Philosophy." Part I., Logic; Part II., Metaphysics. English translation, edited by B. Bosanquet, 226
- Lyall, Sir A. C., K.C.B., "Asiatic Studies, Religious and Social," 244
- Edna, "We Two," 303
- "Lytton, Lord; Life and Letters." By his Son, vols i. ii., 284
- MACCALL, W., "Christian Legends," 617
- Macegeorge, A., a Memoir by, "William Leighton Leitch," 594
- Mackenzie, Lt.-Gen. Colin, C.B., "Storms and Sunshine of a Soldier's Life," 278
- Main, D. M., edited by, "Three Hundred English Sonnets," 606
- Mallock, W. H., "Property and Progress; or a Brief Enquiry into Contemporary Social Agitation in England," 238
- Malabári, Behramji M., "Gujarát and the Gujarátis. Pictures of Men and Manners taken from Life," second edition, 247
- Marryat, Florence (Mrs. Frances Leau), "Under the Lilies and Roses," 623
- "Marth, Frédéric, Poésies de," 316
- Martin, Lady, "Our Maoris," 566
- Marvin, Charles, "The Region of the Eternal Fire: an Account of a Journey to the Petroleum Region of the Caspian in 1883," 564
- Massé, J. F. P., "French Spare Moments in Junior and Senior Classes," 608
- Maupas, M. de, "The Story of the Coup d'Etat," translated by Albert de Vandam, 592
- Maurice, F., "The Life of F. D. Maurice," 288
- Max Müller, F., collected by, "Deutsche Lieder," translated by G. A. M., 307
- Mayor, J. E. B., "Homer's 'Odyssey,' Book ix.," with commentary, 608
- McCarthy, J. H., "England under Gladstone, 1880-1884," 560
- Meiklejohn, Prof., edited by, "Blackwood's Educational Series," 250
- Menger, Dr. Carl, "Die Irrthümer des Historismus in der deutschen Nationalökonomie," 243
- Merz, J. T., "Leibnitz," 230
- Miller, W. G., M.A., "Lectures on the Philosophy of Law," 250
- Mitford, E. L., F.R.G.S., "A Land March from England to Ceylon Forty Years Ago," 565
- Moriarty, Louis M., "Molière's 'Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme,'" 317
- Morris, W., "Art and Socialism," 559
- Muhry, Dr. Adolph, "Kritik und Durze carlegung der Exacten Natur-Philosophie," 550
- Murison, A. F., M.A., edited by, "The Shorter Globe Readers," 250
- Murray, A. H., LL.D., edited by, "A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles," Part i., A—Ant, 611
- C. Grenville, "High Life in France under the Republic," 618
- Musurus Pacha, D.C.L., "Dante's Purgatorio;" translated into Greek Verse, 607
- "My Ducats and My Daughter," 620
- MYTH (THE) OF SIMON MAGUS. 58-73
- NECKER (MADAME) AND MADAME RÉCAMIER, 419-417; two of the last queens of French society, 420; their predecessors, 421-7; frequenters of Mme. Necker's *salon*, 428-9; her qualities and accomplishments, 430; her early friendship with Gibbon, 431-2; M. Necker, 433-4; Mme. de Staël during the Terror, 435-6; Mme. Récamier's *salon*, and its frequenters, 437-9; Napoleon, 440; J. J. Ampère, and Benjamin Constant, 441; the latter's letters, 442-5; Châteaubriand, 446-7
- Needell, Mrs. J. H., "Lucia, Hugh, and Another," 618
- "New (The) Atlantis or Ideals Old and New:" A Dialogue by a Disciple of Buckle, 232
- Newlands, J. A. R., "On the Discovery of the Periodic Law, and on Relations among the Atomic Weights," 257
- Newman, F. W., "Christianity in its Cradle," 539
- "New South Wales (Annual Report of Department of Mines), for the year 1883," 570
- Newton, R. H., "The Book of the Beginnings," 546
- "Noorden (Von) Historische Vorträge von Carl," edited by W. Maurenbrecher, 600
- "ONNALINDA," A Romance, 298
- Oxenham, Rev. H. N., "Short Studies in Ecclesiastical History and Biography," 598
- PAGE, T. E., M.A., Edited, with Notes, by, "Q. Horatii Flacci Carminum, Liber III." 302

- Paltock, Robert, "The Life and Adventures of Peter Wilkins," with a Preface by A. H. Bullen, 313
- Percival, Mrs. E. H., "Life of Sir David Wedderburn," 292
- Perrault, C., "Contes de Fées," with Notes and Vocabulary by G. Eugene Fasnacht, 608
- Peterson, F., M.D., "Poems and Swedish Translations," 297
- Pfeiffer, Emily, "The Rhyme of the Lady of the Rock, and how it Grew," 297
- Piassetsky, P., "Russian Travellers in Mongolia and China," translated by J. Gordon-Cumming, 563
- Piatt, J. J., "Idylls and Lyrics of the Ohio Valley," 692
- Ploetz, Carl, "Epitome of History," translated by W. H. Tillinghurst, 600
- Plumptre, E. H., D.D., "Master and Scholar," second edition, 298
- "Lazarus and other Poems," fourth edition, 298
- "Things New and Old," 298
- Poe, *see* Ingram
- "Primroses," an Elegy in four Cantos, 300
- Pringle, M. A., "Towards the Mountains of the Moon," 562
- Pulling, Serjeant, "The Order of the Coif," 590
- RADFORD, E., "Measured Steps," 604
- Rae, J., M.A., "Contemporary Socialism," 240
- Ranke, L. von, "Universal History," translated and edited by G. W. Prothero, 582
- Ray, P. K., "A Text-book of Deductive Logic for the Use of Students," 231
- Reade, Charles, D.C.L., "Singleheart and Doubleface," 622
- Récamiér (Madame), *see* Necker.
- "Report on the Administration of the Meteorological Department of the Government of India in 1882-3," 254
- Réville, A., D.D., "The Native Religions of Mexico and Peru," 534
- Reynolds, J. W., M.A., "The Mystery of the Universe our Common Faith," 543
- "Richer than Wealth," a novel, 306
- "Rivista Storica Italiana," 293
- Rogers, J. E. T., M.P., "Six Centuries of Work and Wages: the History of English Labour," 235
- Römer, Prof. Dr. F., "The Bone Caves of Ojców in Poland," translated by J. E. Lee, F.G.S., F.S.A., 252
- "Ropes, Poems by Arthur Reed," 603
- Ross, J. M., "Early Scottish History and Literature," 272
- , Lt.-Col. W. A., R.A., "The Blow-pipe in Chemistry, Mineralogy and Geology," 569
- Roundell, Mrs. C., "Cowdray," 269
- "Round Table Series," "George Eliot," "John Ruskin," 599
- Roy, P. C., B.A., "The Rent Question in Bengal," 247
- Rushbrooke, *see* Abbott
- SAVAGE, M. J., "Poems of Modern Thought," 602
- Schuré, E., "La Legende de l'Alsace," 315
- Scotus Novanticus, "Metaphysica Nova et Vetusta," 549
- Scudder, E. H., edited by, "American Commonwealth, Virginia," 589
- Secley, L. B., "Horace Walpole and his World," 283
- "Shakespeare: A New Study of," 615
- Shaler, Prof. N. S., "A First Book in Geology," 572
- Sharman, Julian, "A Cursory History of Swearing," 291
- Sharp, W., "Earth Voices, and other Poems," 294
- Sibbald, J. R., "The Inferno: A Translation, with Notes and an Introductory Essay," 301
- Sibree, J., M.A., "Poems," 298
- Sime, W., "To and Fro; or, Views from Sea and Land," 248
- Simplicius, "The Use of what is called Evil," a Discourse, 232
- Sinclair, T., "Goddess Fortune," 621
- Sladen, D. B. W., "A Poetry of Exile, and other Poems," 605
- Smith, W. C., "Kildrostan, a Dramatic Poem," 601
- "Socialist (The) Revolution of 1888," 312
- Soley, Rev. H., "Re-housing of the Industrial Classes; or, Village Communities v. Town Rookeries," 558
- Solly, H., "Charles Dayrell: A Modern Bacchanal," 303
- Spencer, Herbert, "The Man *versus* the State," 553
- "Spinoza, the Chief Works of Benedict de," translated from the Latin, with an Introduction, by R. H. M. Elwes, 229
- Statham, F. R., "Free Thoughts and True Thoughts," 544
- Sterndall, R. A., F.R.G.S., F.L.S., "Natural History of the Mammalia of India and Ceylon," 258
- Stevens, A. De Grasse, "Old Boston," a Romance, 305

- Stokes, G. J., "The Objectivity of Truth," 232
- Stormonth, Rev. J., "A Dictionary of the English Language," parts vii., viii., 318
- Parts ix., x., xi., 610
- Stoughton, J., D.D., "Howard the Philanthropist and his Friends," 597
- Streatfield, G. S., "Lincolnshire and the Danes," 269
- Stubbs, C. W., M.A., "The Conscience, and other Poems," 604
- Sully, J., "Outlines of Psychology," 229
- TAIT, Rev. J., "Mind in Matter : A Short Argument on Theism," 550
- P. G., M.A., "Light," 256
- Taylor, J. E., "The Sagacity and Morality of Plants," 576
- Temple, G., "Lancelot Ward, M.P.," 621
- Tetlow, J., M.A., "A Progressive Series of Inductive Lessons in Latin," 608
- Thoreau, H. D., "Walden," 308
- Thucydides, *see* Graves
- Tilden, W. A., D.Sc., "Introduction to the Study of Chemical Philosophy," 569
- Tillinghurst, *see* Ploetz
- Tollens, Hendrick, translated from the Dutch of, "The Hollanders in Nova Zembla : an Arctic Poem," 606
- Tomlinson, J. T., "The Legal Study of Canon Stubbs," 274
- Toynbee, the late Arnold, "Lectures on the Industrial Revolution in England," 556
- Traill, H. D. "The New Lucian," 291
- Travis, J., LL.B., "A Law Treatise on the Constitutional Powers of Parliament, and of the Local Legislatures, under the British North America Act, 1867," 560
- Trollope, Anthony, "An Old Man's Love," 305
- Troun, C. E., B.A., Cobden Prize Essay, "The Future Work of Free Trade in English Legislation," 234
- Tulloch, J. "Modern Theories in Philosophy and Religion," 230
- Tuttle, H., "History of Prussia to the Accession of Frederick the Great," 579
- "Two Fair Women, A Tale of," 300
- VERNON-LEE, "Euphorion: being Studies of the Antique and the Mediæval in the Renaissance," 612
- Vosmaer, Carl, "The Amazon," translated by E. J. Irving, 619
- WALPOLE, A. S., "Select Fables of Phædrus," with Notes and Vocabulary, 302
- Ware, Mrs. Hibbert, "Friend Ellwood : A Tale of Real Life in the Seventeenth Century," 620
- Watson, R. G., "Spanish and Portuguese South America," 266
- Webb, W. T., "Indian Lyrics," 295
- WEIGHTS (BRITISH) AND MEASURES, 402-419
- West Indies*, 321, 633
- Wharton, Francis, LL.D., "Commentaries on Law," 250
- Whelpton, E., "Meadow Sweet, or The Wooing of Iphis : A Pastoral," 306
- White, R. G., "The Fate of Mansfield Humphreys, with the Episode of Mr. Washington Adams in England," 615
- Wilkinson, W. C., "College Greek Course in English," 607
- WILLIAM IV., 142-184
- Wilson, H. S., "Studies in History, Legend, and Literature," 275
- Witt, C., "The Trojan War," translated from the German by Francis Young-husband, with a preface by Rev. W. G. Rutherford, 314
- WOMAN QUESTION (THE) IN EUROPE, 185-212
- WOMEN RATEPAYERS' RIGHT TO VOTE, 375-381
- Wood, Rev. J. G., M.A., "Petland Revisited," 617
- , W. M., "Things of India made Plain," 248
- YBARRA, General A., "A Practical Method for Learning Spanish," 610
- "Year Book of the Scientific and Learned Societies of Great Britain and Ireland," 568

END OF VOL. LXVI.

