

THE
WESTMINSTER
REVIEW.

JANUARY AND APRIL,
1879.

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

SHAKSPERE.

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

NEW SERIES.

VOL. LV.

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

Ballantyne Press
BALLANTYNE AND HANSON, EDINBURGH
CHANDOS STREET, LONDON

THE
WESTMINSTER
AND
FOREIGN QUARTERLY
REVIEW.

JANUARY 1, 1879.



ART I.—DR. JOHNSON: HIS BIOGRAPHERS AND CRITICS.

1. *Routledge's Standard Library. The Life of Samuel Johnson, LL.D.* By JAMES BOSWELL. A New Edition, elucidated by copious Notes. George Routledge & Sons: London and New York.
2. *Life and Conversations of Dr. Samuel Johnson. (Founded chiefly upon Boswell).* By ALEXANDER MAIN. With a Preface by GEORGE HENRY LEWES. London: Chapman & Hall. 1878.
3. *English Men of Letters. Edited by JOHN MORLEY. Samuel Johnson.* By LESLIE STEPHEN. London: Macmillan & Co. 1878.
4. *Dr. Johnson: His Friends and his Critics.* By GEORGE BIRKBECK HILL, D.C.L. Pembroke College, Oxford. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1878.
5. *The Six Chief Lives from "Johnson's Lives of the Poets," with Macaulay's "Life of Johnson."* Edited, with a Preface, by MATTHEW ARNOLD. London: Macmillan & Co. 1878.

THE publication of the various works specified at the head of this paper marks a revival of the interest taken by literary men in Boswell's inimitable work; or perhaps it would be more correct to say, that it marks the extension of that interest among the world at large. This is the result of the love of literature which has of late years spread so widely, and yearly continues to extend. With this love of literature is naturally associated an

[Vol. CXI. No. CCXIX.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LV. No. I.

A

interest in literary history, which Warburton pronounced to be the "most agreeable subject in the world."* Amongst the great works of literary history "Boswell's Johnson" by common consent stands pre-eminant; and therefore its readers increase and multiply, and will continue so to do. Peter Pindar's prophecy as to the future of Boswell's work has received a fulfilment which its writer probably little thought of when he penned these lines :—

"O Boswell, Bozzy, Bruce, whate'er thy name,
Thou mighty shark for anecdote and fame.

* * * * *

Triumphant, thou through Time's vast gulf shalt sail,
The pilot of our literary whale.

Thou, curious scrapmonger, shalt live in song
When death has stilled the rattle of thy tongue.

Even future babes to lisp thy name shalt learn,
And Bozzy join with Wood and Tommy Hearn,
Who drove the spiders from much prose and rhyme
And snatched old stories from the jaws of time.

What tasteless mouth can gape, what eye can close,
What head can nod o'er thy enlivening prose.

* * * * *

Yes! whilst the Rambler shall a comet blaze,
And gild a world of darkness with his rays,
Thee, too, that world with wonderment shall hail,
A lively, bouncing cracker at his tail."†

In fact, it is the cracker which keeps the memory of the comet alive. But the other part of the prophecy is fulfilled; in illustration of which we may mention that the Free Public Libraries of the city of Manchester contain sixteen or seventeen copies of the *Life*, and that it is one of the most popular biographical books in their collections. The Rusholme branch has two four-volume editions; one has been out forty-five times and the other about eighty times in the twelve years since the branch opened. The branch also contains eight one-volume editions. The smaller one (Routledge's, the standard edition) has been out fifty-three times in the last five years, and the two larger ones about seventy times *each* during the same period. No other book of the same class and age we confidently assert has at this time so many readers. Boswell's "Journal of the Tour to the Hebrides" is also read, but by no means so exten-

* Vide his letter to Birch, quoted by Boswell in the introductory chapter to the "Life," p. xv. Our references to the "Life" are to the Standard Library Edition, mentioned at the head of this paper.

† "The Works of Peter Pindar, Esq." Dr. Wolcot. P. 103.

sively as the "Life."* It is not only the increased and increasing love of and interest in literature which distinguish this age. They are accompanied by a disposition to review, to modify, and even to reverse the judgments of former generations on the men of former times. Of this disposition Renan's attempt to whitewash Judas Iscariot is a noteworthy example; and the case of Johnson himself is another. In former days the general, though not universal, opinion of him was, that he was a man of gloomy and savage temper, whose habits in society were coarse, ferocious, and tyrannical. But the literary world is now suffering from an epidemic attack of what Macaulay called the "lues Boswelliana," or the disease of admiration—the object of admiration being no other person than Boswell's idol, Samuel Johnson. The works referred to at the head of this paper furnish illustrations of both these states of the public mind. The editor of the "Standard Library" edition of the "Life" endeavours to "recommend it by its unparalleled cheapness,† and by the more sterling quality of careful and judicious annotation, to many thousands who have not hitherto had an opportunity of becoming familiar with the work." He has also introduced in his edition a great improvement—its division into chapters "for the reader's convenience in the perusal of so great a body of matter." The table of contents of the chapters is well executed, and the index would have satisfied Lord Campbell himself. These excellences, notwithstanding the countervailing defects, inseparable however from the design of the work, of small type and the division of each page into two columns, will, we hope, procure for its publishers the success they deserve.

The second of the works mentioned at the head of this paper was ushered into the world under the sponsorship of the late George Henry Lewes, who in his preface says :—

"'Boswell's Johnson,'" says Mr. Lewes, "is for me a sort of text-book : according to a man's judgment of it I am apt to form my judgment of him. It may not always be a very good test, but it is never a bad one. In spite, however, of its great reputation, the book is less read nowadays than its admirers imagine; and I have often been surprised to find how many cultivated men and women, who would assuredly be able to do it full justice, were satisfied with *second-hand* knowledge of it, simply because they had allowed the idle trash of the hour to come between them and it, preferring to read what every one is reading to-day, and no one will read to-morrow. This neglect of a work which has delighted generations, and will continue to delight

* The writer is indebted for this fact to the kindness of the officials of the Manchester Free Libraries.

† The price of the edition (one vol.) is 3s. 6d.

posterity, is partly due to the mental enervation produced by a constantly increasing solicitation of the attention to new works, mostly of the mushroom type, springing up in a night to disappear in a day, and partly to the fact that 'Boswell's Life,' besides its own defects resulting from the author's deficiencies, has the impersonal defect of belonging to a period of literary culture in many respects unlike, and even opposed to, our own; so that what in his day would pass for literary graces, in our day pass as artificial flowers, and those faded. Many passages which had their interest then are now remorsefully skipped. The size of the work is also an obstacle to its acceptance. Readers so tolerant of trash in the language of to-day yawn over the *langueurs* and *longeurs* tolerated by our fathers. Even the staunchest admirer of 'Boswell's Life' must admit that it is three times as long as it need be."*

Such being his views, Mr. Lewes further tells us that the idea occurred to him

"several years ago (in 1855 or 56) that it would be a feasible scheme to detach from these volumes all that gave them a perennial interest, and compress it into a single volume, without sacrificing anything but the thin soup of Boswellian narrative and comment in which the solid meat of Johnson was dished up. But on reflection this scheme of an abridgment of Boswell appeared less and less attractive. General experience has declared that abridgments are rarely successful."

The scheme of abridgment was therefore abandoned, but

"the original suggestion which prompted it recurred from time to time under various aspects, and at length shaped itself into the scheme of a new 'Life of Johnson' founded on Boswell, but entirely re-written. As a collection of data, Boswell's narrative could be gratefully used; and his inimitable reports of the conversations, stripped of their superfluous garnish, might be preserved. The four volumes of the original might thus be essentially reproduced in one."

The pressure of other pursuits prevented Mr. Lewes even beginning so bold an exploit as re-writing the life of Johnson—an exploit which irresistibly reminds one of a trite quotation referring to angels and another class of beings—he therefore suggested to Mr. Main that he should attempt it. Mr. Main, not having before his eyes the fear lest the quotation we refer to should be found applicable to him, "at once saw it to be feasible, and the work now before us was executed entirely by him," with no more help from Mr. Lewes than "the brief explanation of his notion, conveyed in a single letter." The whole merit of the work, therefore (says Mr. Lewes), must be given to Mr. Main.†

* Preface to Main's "Life of Johnson," pp. viii., ix.

† Main's "Life," preface, pp. ix.—xiii.

The compiling of this book was evidently a labour of love to Mr. Main, but as to its merits we can say little. How it is distinguishable from an abridgment of Boswell we cannot tell. Our opinion of abridgments is that of Mr. Lewes, and, in fact, the readers of this book will only have that second-hand knowledge of Boswell's life which Mr. Lewes deprecates. "The solid meat of Johnson is taken out of the thin soup of Boswellian narrative and comment" to be re-dished up in the far thinner soup of the narrative and comment of Mr. Main. In whatever respects Boswell was deficient as a biographer—in the same respects, and to a far greater degree and extent, Mr. Main is deficient also—we apply to his book what Lord Macaulay said of Croker's edition of Boswell:—

"We love, we own, to read the great productions of the human mind as they were written. We have this feeling even about scientific treatises; though we know that the sciences are always in a state of progression, and that the alterations made by a modern editor in an old book on any branch of natural or political philosophy are likely to be improvements. . . . But in works which owe much of their interest to the character and situation of the writers, the case is infinitely stronger."

After supporting that proposition with his usual wealth of illustration, he continues:—

"With Boswell's book the case is stronger. There is scarcely in the whole compass of literature a book which bears interpolation [we venture to add omission or compression] so ill. We know no production of the human mind which has so much of the race, so much of the peculiar flavour of the soil from which it sprang. The work could never have been written if the writer had not been precisely what he was. His character is displayed in every page; and this display of character gives a delightful interest to many passages which have no other interest."*

Mr. Leslie Stephen, whose short memoir can hardly be called anything but an abridgment of Boswell, if indeed it be not more accurate to call it a dilution, and who, therefore, speaks from experience, agrees with Lord Macaulay:—

"'It is easy enough,' says Mr. Stephen, 'to make a selection of the gems of Boswell's narrative, but it is also inevitable that, taken from their setting, they should lose the greater part of their brilliance. We lose all the quaint, semi-conscious touches of character which make the original so fascinating; and Boswell's absurdities become less amusing when we are able to forget for an instant that the perpetrator is also the narrator.'"[†]

* "Essay on 'Boswell's Johnson,'" pp. 174, 5, edition 1874.

† Leslie Stephens' "Life of Johnson," p. 95.

We dissent from Mr. Lewes' dogma that "even the staunchest admirer of Boswell's life must admit that it is three times as long as need be," and we venture to affirm that the class of readers to whom he refers, whose minds are enervated by the perusal of the trash of the day, supposing they can be interested in Johnson at all, will be more than satisfied with what they can learn of him from Lord Macaulay's brief memoir,* or the rather fuller but far inferior one by Mr. Leslie Stephen. Mr. Main suffers from the "Lues Boswelliana" far more even than Boswell himself. That this is so may be proved by opening the book at random. Thus a letter to Langton of no great interest and showing no remarkable ability is called "magnificent, sunshiny, witty, brilliant even, in the Doctor's very finest style." Johnson is described † "as a strong man, and no sentimentalist; a broad man, and no bigot; a religious man, and no fanatic." Yet this broad man and no bigot could not be induced when in Scotland to enter a Presbyterian place of worship, and maintained the right of the state to put down dissent by force, and apparently would have revived the old penal laws against Unitarians. § Johnson applied to Smollett to use his influence with Wilks, the object of Johnson's special aversion, to obtain the discharge from the navy of Johnson's negro servant Frank, who was discharged accordingly, without any wish of his own." This is called by Mr. Main "one of the most characteristic and beautiful and touching incidents in Johnson's career." ||

Again, Johnson, being asked whether it was reasonable for a man to be angry at another man whom a woman had preferred before him, made this commonplace reply: "I do not see, sir, that it is reasonable for a man to be angry at another whom a woman has preferred to him: but angry he is, no doubt; and he is loath to be angry at himself." "That last clause," says Mr. Main, "is *exquisite*." Johnson is about to visit Paris with the Thrales, whereupon Mr. Main breaks out into this rhapsody: "Nothing puts this man about—he who is master of his own soul finds himself at home in every country, and is not set gaping in wide-mouthed wonder by the sight of every new face." ¶ As to not being put about we will quote one worshipper of Johnson against another. Madame D'Arblay tells us that on one occasion at Streatham some one presumed to dissent from Johnson's opinion on a purely literary question. This so put him about that his

* In his miscellaneous writings, and in Arnold's "Lives."

† Main's "Life of Johnson," p. 80.

‡ Ibid. p. 42.

§ Boswell's "Life," pp. 193-5. Even Boswell admits that his idol's orthodoxy cramped the vigorous powers of his understanding (p. 156.)

|| Main's "Life," p. 253.

¶ Ibid. p.

female adorer notes in her diary that she was really quite grieved to see how unamiable he appeared and how greatly he made himself dreaded by all, and by many abhorred, and, after giving a summary of the dispute, she adds: "the various contemptuous sarcasms intermixed would fill, and very unpleasantly, a quire."* As to the remainder of Mr. Main's bombastic effusion, it is equally true of thousands of men, women, and even children. Writing to Levett, from Paris, Johnson says: "I ran a race in the rain this day, and beat Baretti." "That race," says Mr. Main, "is worth half a dozen Ramblers."† We hope our readers may apprehend the meaning of this dictum; we confess that it passes our understanding. On a journey, Boswell notes that at Leicester they read "in the newspapers that Dr. James was dead," and that Johnson, to Boswell's surprise, only said, "Ah, poor Jamy!" whereupon Mr. Main bursts forth "shall we never come to believe that bitter tears have been shed though no handkerchief was seen at the eyes, that many a heavy hurt has been received though no one heard a cry. There can go much feeling into three little words, 'Ah, poor Jamy!'" Towards the end of this same journey, Boswell remarked: "Sir, you observed one day, at General Oglethorpe's, that a man is never happy for the present, but when he is drunk. Will you not add, 'or when driving in a post-chaise?' Johnson: No, sir, you are drawing rapidly *from* something or *to* something." This Mr. Main calls a "profound deliverance, and a fitting prelude to our traveller's arrival in London—'safe, sound, and happy.'" ‡

Yet on another occasion Johnson said to Boswell, while driving in a post-chaise: "Life has not many things better than this."§ And Mr. Main prints another "deliverance" on the same subject. "If," said Johnson, "I had no duties and no reference to futurity, I would spend my life in driving briskly in a post-chaise with a pretty woman; but she should be one who could understand me and would add something to the conversation."|| The truism which Mr. Main calls a "profound deliverance" was an instance of Johnson's habit of contradicting any opinion expressed by another person, though on some other occasion Johnson might have expressed the same opinion, and even to the same man.

It is well that Johnson cannot be aware that his latest biographer describes him as arriving in London "happy," or he would give him an instance of another of his habits, proof of which may

* "Diary and Letters of Madame D'Arblay," vol. i., pp. 448-9, edition 1876.

† Main's "Life," p. 254.

‡ Ibid. p. 278-9.

§ Boswell, p. 250.

|| Ibid. p. 322.

be found in Boswell *passim*. It is thus tersely described by Peter Pindar :

“Did any one that he was happy cry
Johnson would tell him plumply, 'twas a lie.”*

On one occasion Johnson said to Adam Smith, “You lie.” Smith not unnaturally retorted; “You are a son of a ——.” “On such terms,” says Sir Walter Scott, who has preserved this story, “did these two great moralists meet and part, and such was the classical dialogue between these two great teachers of morality.”† If Johnson had met more men like Smith, he would have learned how to govern his tongue better. On the subject of happiness Mr. Main gives another instance of Johnson’s contradicting himself for the sake of contradicting other people. During a visit to the Pantheon, Boswell said, “I doubt, sir, whether there are many happy people here.” Johnson: “Yes, sir, there are many happy people here. There are many people here who are watching hundreds, and who think hundreds are watching them.”‡

The same page that records Johnson’s theory of life, contains another of Mr. Main’s puerilities. “What had our dear Doctor not observed with those quick, short-sighted eyes of his? ‘Sir, of a thousand shavers, two do not shave so much alike that they cannot be distinguished.’” One of the many quarrels and reconciliations between Johnson and Boswell draws forth this remark from Mr. Main, “We are positively falling in love with these exquisite little encounters. Quarrels are made beautiful by such sweet atonements. One would almost consent to be knocked down twice a week if one were always sure of being picked up so cleverly and so kindly.”§ Johnson borrows sixpence of Boswell, “not to be repaid,” on which Mr. Main remarks, “Johnson’s is one of the *richest* characters on record.”|| Davies’s description of Johnson, that “he laughed like a rhinoceros,” produces this comment from Mr. Main:—“Salvation is always possible to a man who can laugh at all; but a man who could laugh like that hardly *needed* to be saved.”¶ Mr. Main we believe to be a Scotchman—if so, he is very far gone from the “standards” of Scottish theology, but certainly he shows one of the notes of the Christian character in his enthusiastic love for Johnson, who hated and despised Scotland and the Scotch. Mr. Main, indeed, believes that three-fourths of Johnson’s hatred of the Scotch was merely good-humoured, witty banter, and the other fourth honest

* Peter Pindar’s “Works,” p. 106.
; Leslie Stephens’s “Life,” p. 115.
† Main’s “Life,” p. 187.

§ Ibid. p. 347.
|| Ibid. p. 387.
¶ Ibid. p. 212.

prejudice. We, on the other hand, believe that what Mr. Main calls "the wildest thing Johnson ever said on the subject," expressed his deliberate conviction. "On his return from the Hebrides, a London-bred Scotchman asked him what he thought of his country. 'It is a very vile country, sir.' 'Well, sir, God made it.'" "Yes, sir, *but he made it for Scotchmen.* Comparisons are odious, *but God made hell.*" Mr. Main feels compelled to say of this that he "does not crave a single reader's forbearance."^{*}

A gentleman attempting to defend hard drinking said, "You know, sir, drinking drives away care, and makes us forget whatever is disagreeable. Would you not allow a man to drink for that reason?" Johnson: "Yes, sir, if he sat next *you.*" This piece of insolence and rudeness Mr. Main calls "a magnificent retort."[†] Johnson visits his mother's old servant on her death-bed, kisses her and prays with her; of this Mr. Main says, "It is a scene to say grace over."[‡] Every one remembers Johnson's civil speech to single speech Hamilton:—"I go with my company down the first pair of stairs, in some hopes that they may perhaps return again: *I go with you, sir, as far as the street door.*" At which Mr. Main exclaims, "What delicacy! what feeling! what originality!"[§] To us it seems an ordinary compliment. On one occasion a conversation took place of which we will give Peter Pindar's poetic version, which in no respect exaggerates or misrepresents Boswell's prose version.

" ' Again,' says I, ' one day, I do believe,
A good acquaintance that I have will grieve
To hear her friend hath lost a large estate.'
' Yes,' answered he, ' lament as much her fate
As did your horse (I freely will allow)
To hear of the miscarriage of your cow.' "^{||}

This piece of folly, coarseness, and brutality draws from Mr. Main the approving comment, "A plain spoken man this hero of ours. || The instances are so many that we do not speak confidently; but we think that the lowest depth of slavish adulation of Johnson into which Mr. Main has descended is the remark which we now transcribe. "Boswell brought up the vexed question of Freedom a necessity. Johnson (who, for reasons we shall presently glance at, could not bear to discuss the foundations of his religious belief)" :^{**} "Sir, we *know* our will is free, and there's an end *on't*," on which Mr. Main remarks, "Our readers will have

* Main's "Life," p. 204.

† Ibid. p. 185.

‡ Ibid. p. 154.

§ Ibid. p. 138.

|| Peter Pindar's "Works" p. 108.

¶ Main, p. 133.

** The words in parentheses are ours, not Mr. Main's.

perceived, long ere now, that the Doctor never *thinks*, he always *decides*; he never simply disables an opponent; he always leaves him dead upon the field; and no resurrection is conceivable for one whom he has slain.* We do not think the controversy as to Freewill and Necessity, which, according to Milton, first arose amongst the fallen angels,† was settled by Johnson's *ex cathedra* utterance on 10th Oct., 1769. One of the many instances of Johnson's rudeness quoted by Mr. Main is a case where Johnson snubbed the man at whose table he was dining. This produces the following encomium: "Host or no host, our Doctor will not be worsted. Johnson thought no more of snubbing a man at his own table than at the Mitre Tavern." Turning over Mr. Main's pages we come to a remark intended no doubt to be as "profound" as one of Johnson's own "deliverances," but which, to our limited apprehension, seems simple nonsense. At a dinner at Dilly's (the bookseller's) the conversation turned on toleration, in the course of which Johnson, in reply to Goldsmith, uttered this historical falsehood: "Sir, our first reformers were not burnt for not believing bread and wine to be Christ, but for insulting those who did believe it;" and finished the discussion with a gross insult to Goldsmith. The same evening, at a meeting of the club, the two doctors were reconciled. This fact draws from Mr. Main the remark to which we alluded. "What a beautiful little scene, pathetic almost in its childlike simplicity, and majestic even in its moral grandeur. Truth is often finer than fiction—indeed, there would have been no such thing as fiction known among men had there not lived and moved in our midst real human beings like Oliver Goldsmith and Samuel Johnson."‡ Once only does Mr. Main venture to hint a difference from any of his pope's infallible utterances. At Pembroke College, Oxford, during a discussion between Dr. Adams (the master, who, to quote Mr. Main's own words, "had written an answer—or only a *reply* perhaps—to Hume's 'Essay on Miracles,'"), Johnson, and Boswell, on the controversial treatment due to infidels like Hume, Boswell urged "that personal abuse of the author even might not come amiss in such a case." Adams demurred to this last declaration. Johnson: "When a man voluntarily engages in

* Main's "Life," p. 166.

† "Paradise Lost," book ii. :—

"Others apart sat on a hill retired
In thoughts more elevate, and reasoned high
Of providence, foreknowledge, will, and fate,
Fixed fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute,
And found no end, in wandering mazes lost."

‡ Main's "Life," pp. 209-10.

an important controversy, he is to do all he can to lessen his antagonist, because authority from personal respect has much weight with most people, and often more than reasoning. If my antagonist writes bad language, though that may not be essential to the question, I will attack him for his bad language." Adams : "You would not jostle a chimney sweeper." Johnson : "Yes, sir, if it were necessary to jostle him *down*." That was a capital retort of Johnson's ; but if his chimney sweeper had persisted in constantly getting up again—as black as ever and quite as formidable—would not the Doctor have tired of this jostling process ? But there are people among us (Mr. Main does not venture to say whether or not he is one of them) who honestly believe that David Hume has never been down yet.* We have given our readers sufficient material to enable them to decide whether the "Life of Johnson" derives any improvement from being transferred from the narrative and comment of Boswell to the narrative and comment of Main. We turn to the other volumes mentioned at the head of this article.

We have already said that, in our opinion, Mr. Leslie Stephens' "Life of Johnson" is an abridgment or rather a dilution of Boswell. It fails to bring Johnson before us : of two men who have read nothing more about Johnson than in one case Macaulay's brief memoir, and the other Mr. Leslie Stephens' longer work, the student of Macaulay will have the most vivid and exact idea of Johnson. Mr. Arnold says Macaulay's "Life" is a work which shows him at his best. The subject was one he knew thoroughly, and for which he felt cordial sympathy. Mr. Arnold, therefore, considers himself fortunate in having been successful in his application to the proprietors of the "Encyclopædia Britannica" for permission to prefix Macaulay's memoir to his selection from the "Lives of the Poets."

Mr. Birkbeck Hill's volume is a miscellany of articles on Johnson and subjects concerning him, some of which are now published for the first time ; others have previously appeared, but are so "recast and so enlarged, that, so far as form at least is concerned, they may fairly claim to be original."† The remainder are reprints with additions, of articles which have already appeared in sundry journals. Their author has devoted himself heart and soul to the study of Johnsonian literature—but he has travelled through it "from Dan even to Beersheba to find that all is barren."

"As I continued (says Dr. Hill) to read, and passed from Boswell to the works of Hawkins, Murphy, Madame Piozzi, Madame D'Arblay,

* Main's "Life," p. 268.

† "Dr. Johnson : his Friends and his Critics," p. xi.

and other writers who had themselves known Johnson, I began to feel that in every separate portrait that had been drawn of that great man there were great imperfections. Boswell's, indeed, was worth all the rest taken together; but even Boswell had not seen Johnson in every light. The sketch that Lord Macaulay has given in his celebrated review, which I once accepted without misgiving, now seemed to me singularly unjust and distorted. Even the life of Johnson that he contributed to the 'Encyclopædia Britannica' finely though it is written, I yet found to be greatly wanting in truthfulness. Mr. Carlyle's noble portrait of my hero, while it delighted me, did not fully satisfy me. It was too much like a portrait drawn by Rembrandt, in which the light that the artist lets in on his picture but too often serves to give the spectator a greater impression of gloom."

"If Johnson (Dr. Hill continues) had had but scant justice done to him, the greatest injustice, I felt, had been done to Boswell. Mr. Carlyle had, indeed, defended him, as he had defended Johnson, from the violent attacks of Macaulay, but he had not gone into the whole case. In some points also, even he, I held, had not formed a right estimate of Boswell's character."*

As these convictions grew upon Dr. Hill he began to publish the articles here reprinted, and in the end produced the book work we are now reviewing.

"Was there ever work done on earth," truly said Charles Kingsley, "however noble, which was not, alas! alas! done somewhat ill."† We presume biography is not excepted from this rule. Probably every one of the writers named by Dr. Hill would admit that his or her work on Johnson has some errors or deficiencies. Yet it is a strong thing for any man at this day to set aside such a *catena* of writers as those we refer to, most of whom were personally acquainted with Johnson; and we must say that, after reading Dr. Hill's strong assertion, we are surprised to find that he fails to give us the true portrait of Johnson which we were led to expect from him. Nay, more, as we shall see, he seeks to set aside the authenticity of Boswell's portrait, and to leave us, therefore, in darkness as to what Johnson really was.

The first chapter is the most interesting in the book, the author says that he has

"Done his best to bring before his readers Oxford as it was when the rolls of Pembroke College first received the name of Samuel Johnson, and that he hopes he has thrown some light also on the University as it was in his later years." He adds, "It is but little that has been handed down to us of the incidents of Johnson's under-

* "Dr. Johnson : his Friends and his Critics," preface, pp. ix., x.

† "Lectures in America," p. 100.

graduate days, and to that little I have not been able to add anything. All that was left for me to do was to give a picture of the general life of the student, in his time.”*

We think Dr. Hill has succeeded in bringing before his readers, vividly and exactly, both the College of Johnson's youth and the University of his later years. Dr. Hill also claims to have to set at rest a matter which has been the puzzle of Johnsonian critics for more than forty years.† It was assumed by Johnson's earlier biographers that his residence at Oxford extended over the usual period of three years. Mr. Croker was the first to dispute the fact, and to point out that Johnson's residence there did not exceed fourteen months. Dr. Hill devotes the appendix to his book to a discussion of this question, and, we think, he has shown that the facts are that Johnson was entered at Pembroke on the 31st October, 1728, that his name remained on the books till October, 1731, when it finally disappears, but that his residence came to an end, as the Pembroke battel books show, in December, 1729.‡

Himself a member of Pembroke, Dr. Hill thinks that he is in honour and duty bound to defend against all comers, Johnson, “the great man who is the glory of that society,” and, of course, must indulge “in the bad habit of pecking at Lord Macaulay.” We have already quoted the passage in which he describes the memoir in the “*Encyclopædia Britannica*” as greatly wanting in truthfulness. His second chapter, which is entitled “*Lord Macaulay on Johnson*,” opens with this passage :

“Johnson's character must have had a singular interest for Macaulay, as he has twice described it. The vigorous sketch that he dashed off in the days of his youth for the *Edinburgh Review* is doubtless more widely known than the life that he wrote with such exquisite skill, when he was in the fulness of his powers. In the essay we seem to look upon the picture of a Tory painted by a Whig. In the life we have the portrait of one great man drawn by another great man. Even here there are great blemishes and great exaggerations. But, taken as a whole, it is an admirable piece of workmanship. In it Macaulay silently retracts not a few of the gross statements he had made in his earlier writing.”§

We wonder if Dr. Hill and others like-minded with him ever consider the peculiar means of knowledge of Johnson, his habits and his character, which Macaulay enjoyed. Every reader of Mr. Trevelyan's “*Life of his Uncle*,” knows that much of

* “*Dr. Johnson : his Friends and his Critics*,” p. 96.

† *Ibid.* preface, viii.

‡ *Ibid.* appendix and note, pp. 32—9395.

§ *Ibid.* p. 97.

Macaulay's earlier life was spent with Hannah More ; not only did she know Johnson well, and was one of his worshippers,* she was also the friend of Johnson's pupil and friend, Garrick, and after Garrick's death she lived for some time with his widow. Macaulay, as Dr. Hill tells us, was, at the age of fourteen, master of "Boswell's Life," † and, beyond doubt, he heard from Hannah More, and treasured up much oral tradition as to Johnson, his manners and conversation—hence arose the singular interest which Johnson's character had for him. "You are next to myself," he writes to his sister, "Hannah, the god-daughter of Hannah More—the best read Boswellian I know." ‡ He speaks of the fame of Chatham as not comparable with that of Johnson.§ Within a few years of his death we find from his diary that he was again reading Boswell with great delight. A man whose mind by reading and oral tradition was thus, to use his own word, "soaked" in Johnson, is not likely to write a life of one whom he considered "a good and a great man" which should be justly open to the charge of "being unjust, distorted, and greatly wanting in truthfulness." Why the whole tone of the "Life" is more favourable to Johnson than the tone of the "Review," is easily explained. The "Review" was first published in September, 1831. In 1842 appeared the first edition of "Madame D'Arblay's Diary and Letters." Macaulay reviewed the book in the *Edinburgh* for January, 1843. In his review he says of Johnson, "That with all his coarseness and irritability, he was a man of sterling benevolence, has long been acknowledged. But how gentle and endearing his deportment could be was not known till the 'Recollections of Madame D'Arblay' was published" ||

We doubt the correctness of Dr. Hill's statement, that the "Review" is better known than the "Life." The "Life" and Macaulay's other contributions to the "Encyclopædia Britannica" were first separately published within a year of his death. The volume containing them had a great circulation owing to the desire of the public to read any new publication by the great writer whom they had lost. They are included in the miscellaneous writings first published by Mr. Ellis in 1860, and we suspect that these are as widely read as the earlier published essays. We dissent also from the proposition "that in the essay we seem to look upon the picture of a Tory painted by a Whig. In the 'Life' we have a portrait of one great man drawn by another great man." In order to judge whether this be so or not, let us com-

* "Dr. Johnson : his Friends and his Critics," p. 12.

† *Ibid.* preface, i.

‡ Trevelyan's "Life of Macaulay," vol. i. p. 227.

§ *Ibid.* p. 443.

|| "Macaulay's Essays," p. 710, Edition 1874.

pare the account of Johnson's political opinions given in the essay with that given in the "Life." In the essay, after speaking of Johnson as a "bigoted Tory," which we suppose Dr. Hill will admit he was, Macaulay continues:—

"Nobody spoke more contemptuously of the cant of patriotism.* Nobody saw more clearly the error of those who regarded liberty not as a means but as an end, and who proposed to themselves as the object of their pursuit, the prosperity of the state as distinct from the prosperity of the individuals who compose the state. His calm and settled opinion seems to have been that forms of government have little or no influence on the happiness of society. This opinion, erroneous as it is, ought, at least, to have preserved him from all intemperance on political questions. It did not, however, preserve him from the lowest, fiercest, most absurd extravagances of party spirit; from rants, which in everything but the diction resemble those of Squire Western. He was as a politician half-ice and half-fire. On the side of his intellect he was a mere *poco curante*, far too apathetic about public affairs, far too sceptical as to the good or evil of any form of polity. His passions, on the contrary, were violent, even to slaying, against all who leaned to whiggish principles. If the happiness of individuals is not affected by political abuses, zeal for liberty is doubtless ridiculous, but zeal for monarchy must be equally so. No person could have been more quick-sighted than Johnson to such a contradiction as this in the logic of an antagonist."†

There is nothing "unjust" or "distorted" or even peculiarly "whiggish" in this passage. That it accurately represents the state of Johnson's mind on political questions any one can judge who will look at the passages in Boswell referred to in the note.‡ Macaulay expresses the same judgment more concisely in the "Life":—

"Johnson was in no sense a statesman. He never willingly read or thought or talked about affairs of state. He loved biography, literary history, the history of manners, but political history was positively distasteful to him. The question at issue between the colonies and the mother country was a question on which he had really nothing to say. He failed therefore as the greatest men fail, when they attempt to do that for which they are unfit; as Burke would have failed if Burke had tried to write comedies like those of Sheridan; as Reynolds would

* It has often occurred to us that had the well known sentence, "The man is little to be envied whose patriotism would not gain force upon the plain of Marathon," had been written by any one else than Johnson, and read to him, he would have said, "Clear your mind of cant, sir; why should a man feel more patriotism at Marathon than at Marazion."

† "Essays," p. 184, edition 1874.

‡ Vide Boswell's "Life," pp. 105, 144, 156, 157, 170, 171.

have failed, if Reynolds had tried to paint landscapes like those of Wilson."*

Neither can we assent to Dr. Hill's other statement that in the "Life" Macaulay "silently retracts not a few of the gross statements he had made in his earlier writings. He no longer holds that 'as soon as Johnson took his pen in his hand to write for the public his style became systematically vicious.' He no longer sneers at 'his constant practise of padding out a sentence with useless epithets till it became stiff as the bust of an exquisite.'"† It would be somewhat difficult to define what it is to "silently retract" a statement. Be that as it may, we see no reason to suppose that Macaulay in the "Life" retracts or intended to retract what he said of Johnson's style in the "Review." What he does say in the "Life" is this:—

"'The Lives of the Poets' are on the whole the best of Johnson's works. Savage's Life Johnson reprinted nearly as it had appeared in 1744. Whoever after reading that life will turn to the other lives will be struck by the difference of style. Since Johnson had been at ease in his circumstances, he had written little and talked much; when, therefore, he, after the lapse of years, resumed his pen, the mannerism which he had contracted while he was in the constant habit of composition, was less perceptible than formerly; and his diction frequently had a colloquial ease which it had formerly wanted. The improvement may be discerned by a skilful critic in the 'Journey to the Hebrides,' and in the 'Lives of the Poets,' it is so obvious that it cannot escape the notice of the most careless reader."‡

Macaulay says, therefore, that Johnson's later style had less mannerism than his earlier, but he neither expressly or impliedly retracts his condemnation of Johnson's earlier style pronounced in the "Review," and it is to the earlier writings that the sentences quoted by Dr. Hill more particularly apply. Dr. Hill is here guilty of the sin he lays to Macaulay's charge, exaggeration. Dr. Hill is merciful to Lord Macaulay's reputation. He will not, he says, "point out all the errors into which Macaulay has fallen and all the misstatements which Macaulay has made. He contents himself with some—but only some—of those which are of the most importance.§ The first alleged misstatement is as to Johnson's credulity as to witches, ghosts, and second-sight. The state of Johnson's mind on these subjects is accurately stated by Peter Pindar:—

* "Life of Johnson—Miscellaneous Writings," p. 391, ed. 1871.

† "Dr. Johnson : his Friends, &c.," pp. 97-8.

‡ "Life of Johnson," *ubi supra*, p. 392.

§ "Dr. Johnson . his Friends, &c.," p. 100.

“ At supper, rose a dialogue on witches,
When Crosby said there could not be such bitches ;
But Johnson answered him, ‘ There might be witches,
Nought proved the non-existence of the bitches.’ * ”

Dr. Hill says : “ It was Johnson’s strong desire to add one more prop to his belief that made him willing to believe in the appearance of spirits and second-sight,” and to prove this† he quotes several of Johnson’s sayings, omitting, however, the strongest, which was uttered at Pembroke College, not long before Johnson’s death. Boswell “ mentioned Thomas Lord Lyttleton’s vision, the prediction of the time of his death and its exact fulfilment. Johnson : ‘ It is the most extraordinary thing that has happened in my day. I heard it with my own ears from his uncle, Lord Westcote. I am so glad to have every evidence of the spiritual world, that I am willing to believe it.’ Dr. Adams : ‘ You have evidence enough ; good evidence, which needs not such support.’ Johnson : ‘ I want more.’ ‡ ”

To prove the “ untruthfulness ” of Macaulay’s “ Life,” Dr. Hill quotes this passage from the “ Review ” :—§

“ Johnson (says Macaulay) began to be credulous precisely at the point when the most credulous people begin to be sceptical. He related with a grave face how old Mr. Cave, of St. John’s Gate, saw a ghost, and how this ghost was something of a shadowy being. He went himself on a ghost hunt to Cock Lane, and was angry with John Wesley for not following up another scent of the same kind with proper spirit and perseverance.” ||

This Dr. Hill calls a “ strange perversion,” and he says that Johnson “ was angry with Wesley, not for not following up the scent with proper spirit and perseverance, as Macaulay says, but for believing in a ghost story without proper grounds.” To prove this he quotes from Boswell the following conversation :—

“ BOSWELL : ‘ Pray, sir, what has John Wesley made of his story of a ghost ? ’ ”

“ JOHNSON : ‘ Why, sir, he believes it, but not on sufficient authority. *He did not take time enough to examine the girl.* It was at Newcastle where the ghost was said to have appeared to a young woman several times, mentioning something about the right to an old house, advising application to be made to an attorney, which was done, and at the

* Peter Pindar’s “ Works,” p. 105.

† “ Dr. Johnson : his Friends, &c.,” p. 107.

‡ Boswell’s “ Life,” p. 470.

§ We observe Mr. Hill rarely, if ever, gives the references to the passages he quotes from Macaulay. It would not be consistent with his design.

|| Conf. Hill, p. 103 with “ Essays,” p. 103.

same time saying the attorney would do nothing, which proved to be the fact. "This," says John, "is a proof that a ghost knows our thoughts." Now (laughing) it is not necessary to know our thoughts to tell that an attorney will sometimes do nothing. Charles Wesley, who is a more stationary man, does not believe the story. *I am sorry that John did not take more pains to inquire into the evidence for it.*

"MISS SEWARD (with an incredulous smile): 'What, sir, about a ghost?'

"JOHNSON (with solemn vehemence): 'Yes, madam; this is a question which, after five thousand years, is yet undecided—a question, whether in theology or philosophy, one of the most important that can come before the human understanding.'"^{*}

How does Macaulay misrepresent this conversation? Johnson twice expresses his dissatisfaction with Wesley for not taking more pains to inquire into the evidence for the supposed apparition. Does not that justify Macaulay in saying that Johnson "was angry with Wesley for not following up the scent with proper spirit and perseverance." Dr. Hill continues:—

"The account Macaulay gives of the ghost that Cave was said to have seen, though not so inaccurate, is still not fair. Boswell writes: 'Talking of ghosts, Johnson said he knew one friend who was an honest man and a sensible man, who told him he had seen a ghost, old Mr. Edward Cave, the printer at St. John's Gate. He said Mr. Cave did not like to talk of it, and seemed to be in great horror whenever it was mentioned.

'BOSWELL: "Pray, sir, what did he say was the appearance?"

'JOHNSON: "Why, sir, something of a shadowy being."'

"Macaulay says, 'he related with a grave face how old Mr. Cave saw a ghost.' Of the gravity of his face we are told nothing; but what he related was not what old Mr. Cave saw, but what old Mr. Cave said he saw."

This is hardly, if at all, better than verbal quibbling. "With a grave face" means gravely—Johnson would not talk of ghosts otherwise than gravely—as the "solemn vehemence" of his reply to Miss Seward's incredulous remark shows. If he did not expressly affirm the truth of Cave's story, he was equally far from denying it. Boswell closes his account of this conversation with a passage Dr. Hill finds it convenient to omit:—

"He did not affirm anything positively upon a subject which it is the fashion of the times to laugh at as a matter of absurd credulity. He only seemed willing, as a candid inquirer after truth, however strange and inexplicable, to show that he understood what might be urged for it." †

^{*} "Dr. Johnson: his Friends, &c.," p. 104; Boswell, p. 343.
[†] Conf. "Dr. Johnson: his Friends, &c.," p. 105, with Boswell, p. 343.

Again, Dr. Hill says : "as to the Cock Lane ghost, Johnson scarcely deserves more reproach than did Faraday when he took the trouble to expose the folly of table-turning. He thought indeed that it was possible for a ghost to appear in Cock Lane as anywhere else." Dr. Hill, indeed, owns that "we may indeed wonder that a man of Johnson's vigorous intellect should have refused to accept the general evidence against apparitions which were strong enough even in this day."* "It was this feeling of wonder which led Macaulay to mention that Johnson went on 'a ghost hunt.' The state of the evidence was, we think, the same in Johnson's time as now."

With regard to second-sight, Johnson, Dr. Hill tells us, found that the people of the Hebrides "of all degrees, whether of rank or understanding, universally admitted it, *except the Ministers*"—a notable exception truly ; for it included all the men of the greatest education in the islands. The result of his inquiries into the matter Johnson thus states : "I never could advance my curiosity to conviction, but came away at last only willing to believe." "Is this," asks Dr. Hill, "the habit of mind of a man who begins to be credulous precisely at the point where the most credulous people begin to be sceptical?" With all respect to Dr. Hill we say "Yes it is."†

We resume our quotations from Dr. Hill :

"To pass to another of Johnson's low prejudices. 'It is remarkable,' Macaulay writes, 'that to the last Johnson entertained a fixed contempt for all those modes of life and those studies which tend to emancipate the mind from the prejudices of a particular age or a particular nation. Of foreign travel and of history he spoke with the fierce and boisterous contempt of ignorance.' What does a man learn by travelling? Is Beauclerk the better for travelling? What did Lord Charlemont learn in his travels except that there was a snake in one of the pyramids of Egypt? Any one reading this passage and seeing the inverted commas would at once believe that he was reading Johnson's own words. He is really reading an abridgment of them, in which the sense has been greatly altered. I must give his words as reported by Boswell."‡

Dr. Hill then professes to give, but does not in fact give the whole conversation. We will transcribe the whole passage. The words in italics are omitted by Dr. Hill. The conversation took place in 1778. Johnson was then in his sixty-ninth year, and what he says may therefore be taken as his mature judgment on the question.

* "Dr. Johnson : his Friends, &c.," pp. 100, 101.

† *Ibid.* p. 106.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 108.

“JOHNSON: ‘*The French are a gross, ill-bred, untaught people; a lady there will spit on the floor and rub it with her foot. What I gained by being in France was learning to be better satisfied with my own country.* Time may be employed to more advantage from nineteen to twenty-four almost in any way than in travelling. When you set travelling against mere negation, against doing nothing, it is better, to be sure; but how much more would a young man improve were he to study during those years. Indeed, if a young man is wild, and must run after women and bad company, it is better this should be done abroad, as on his return he can break off such connexions, and begin at home a new man, with a character to form and acquaintances to make. How little does travelling supply to the conversation of any man who has travelled; how little to Beauclerk?’

“BOSWELL: ‘What say you to Lord Charlemont?’

“JOHNSON: ‘I never but once heard him talk of what he had seen, and that was of a large serpent in one of the pyramids of Egypt.’

“BOSWELL: ‘Well, I happened to hear him tell the same thing, which made me mention him.’”*

We may retort on Dr. Hill in his own words that his “is an abridgment which materially alters the sense” of the passage. Than which it is difficult to imagine anything more narrow in spirit or more rash and sweeping in generalisation. Johnson’s universal condemnation of the French was founded on such knowledge as he obtained in a tour not exceeding in duration two months, the greater part of which was passed in Paris. Dr. Hill says: “Johnson does not condemn travelling in general.” We say he condemns it altogether. From his limited experience he deduces the universal, that the only good to be gained from travelling is to learn to be better satisfied with one’s own country. He assumes rightly, or more likely wrongly, that Beauclerk and Charlemont learned nothing by their travels, and thence concludes that no one else could profit by travelling. “Johnson says, and most men would (in Dr. Hill’s opinion) agree with him, that the years between nineteen and twenty-four should not be spent as was in his time too commonly the case, merely in travelling.” † “Travel,” says Lord Bacon, “in the younger sort is a part of education, in the elder a part of experience.” We only regret our want of space prevents our here inserting the whole of the essay “on Travel,” but we must content ourselves with referring our readers to it as the best refutation of the fallacies of Drs. Johnson and Hill. We do not see that Dr. Hill has made out his charge that in this case Macaulay has twisted Johnson’s meaning. “So far,” continues Dr. Hill, “from having a fierce and boisterous contempt of travel, Johnson had very early shown a great eagerness for it, and this lasted to his old age;” and he

* Boswell, p. 359.

† “Dr. Johnson: his Friends, &c.,” p. 108.

supports the statement by reference to Johnson's wish when at Oxford to visit the Universities abroad, to his tour to the Hebrides, to his projected visit to the Baltic, and to his disappointment at the abandonment of his intended journey to Italy with the Thrales. This does not alter the sweeping condemnation of travelling to which Macaulay refers. It only supplies an illustration of Johnson's inconsistency. Inconsistency between his words and his acts, and between his sayings at one time and another, seems to us one of the chief characteristics of his mind. Madame D'Arblay warned George III., when he was reading Boswell, "that little of Johnson's solid opinion was to be gathered from his accidental assertions."* To give one illustration only, nothing could exceed in strength his professions of his hatred and contempt for Whigs, and of his own unreasoning Toryism, yet he notes in his Diary the fall of Lord North's Ministry, adding that he "prayed with Francis and gave thanks;" apparently, though we admit that it is not clear, for the dissolution of the Tory ministry † At another time he in effect said: "There was little or no difference between a wise Tory and a wise Whig. ‡ At another: "I am for the king against Fox, but I am for Fox against Pitt. The king is my master; I do not know Pitt, and Fox is my friend.§ That the Whig was his friend was reason enough for Johnson's supporting him against the Tory leader. As to the relations between Fox and Johnson, Mr. Greville tells us on the authority of Lord Holland, who derived his information through John Kemble, from Garrick, that Johnson liked Fox because he defended his pension, and said he was only to blame in not being large enough. "Fox," he said, "is a liberal man; he would always be *'Aut Cesar aut nullus'*; whenever I have seen him he has been *nullus*." Lord Holland said Fox made it a rule never to talk in Johnson's presence, because he knew all his conversations were recorded for publication, and he did not choose to figure in them.|| Such being Fox's opinion as to Johnson's pension, it is probable that had the coalition of 1783 remained in office, "the pious negotiation," as Boswell calls it, for obtaining an increase of Johnson's pension, to enable him during the winter or two which might still remain to him, to draw his breath more easily in the "soft climate of Italy" would have been successful, and that Fox would have granted what Pitt, then in possession of unbounded power, to his own discredit, refused. As it was,

* "Diary and Letters," vol. iii. p. 337.

† Boswell's "Life," pp. 425-6. The whole passage is obscure. The date given by Boswell is 20th January, 1782; the Ministry were not dissolved till 27th February in that year.

‡ Boswell's "Life," p. 469.

§ Ibid. p. 469.

|| "The Greville Memoirs," vol. ii. p. 316.

"not a farthing was to be obtained, and the author of the "English Dictionary" and the "Lives of the Poets" gasped his last in the river fog and coal-smoke of Fleet-street."*

We now come to another of Macaulay's alleged misrepresentations. "Johnson's manners," says Dr. Hill, "if we are to trust Macaulay, were almost savage." "His active benevolence," he says (still quoting the "Review"), "contrasted with the constant rudeness, and the occasional ferocity of his manners in society made *him, in the opinion of those with whom he had lived during the last twenty years of his life, a complete original.*" The words in italics are omitted by Dr. Hill. Macaulay, after describing the toils and sufferings of Johnson's early life, through all which he had struggled manfully up to eminence and command, continues: "*It was natural that in the exercise of his power he should be 'eo immitior quia toleraverat,' that though his heart was undoubtedly generous and humane, his demeanour in society should be harsh and despotic. For severe distress he had sympathy, and not only sympathy but magnificent relief. But for the suffering which a harsh word inflicts upon a delicate mind he had no pity, for it was a kind of suffering which he could scarcely conceive.*" The passage in italics is omitted by Dr. Hill. Our readers will see the difference it makes in Macaulay's estimate of Johnson, and will find that they are again reading not Macaulay's own words but Dr. Hill's abridgment of them, and an abridgment in which the sense is greatly altered.

Dr. Hill says that Mr. Carlyle has most nobly vindicated Johnson's claim to a "merciful, tenderly, affectionate nature." Macaulay speaks of Johnson's "active benevolence," of his "undoubtedly generous and humane heart," of the "not only sympathy but munificent relief he had for severe distress." It seems to us the difference between Macaulay and Carlyle is one of words only. Dr. Hill says that "It is rather, however, with the greater matters that he [Carlyle] has dealt. I shall attempt to show that in smaller matters also Macaulay has not done Johnson justice." He maintains Johnson's tenderness of heart was always great, but he admits and he quotes from Boswell, Johnson's own admission, "that his manners in the last twenty years of his life were not a little softened."† He says that "the circumstances of Johnson's early life did not tend to sweeten the temper or soften the manners," which is in complete agreement with Macaulay, who says "if we possessed full information concerning those who shared Johnson's early hardships we should find that what

* Vide Boswell, pp. 479, 481, 485, 492. Conf. Macaulay, "Life of Pitt—Miscellaneous Writings," p. 413.

† "Dr. Johnson: his Friends, &c.," p. 112.

we call his singularities of manner were for the most part failings which he shared in common with the class to which he belonged." "Even at this [the earlier] time of his life, however," says Dr. Hill, "he was far from deserving the harsh judgment that Macaulay has passed upon him." Macaulay's judgment is "that Johnson, though a man of active benevolence, was, in society, constantly rude, and occasionally fierce." How far this was the case in his earlier life we have not the means of knowing so well as after the time when Boswell began

"Each joke and tale t'enrol,
Who, like a watchful cat before a hole,
Full twenty years (inflamed with lettered pride)
Didst mousing sit before Sam's mouth so wide,
To catch as many scraps as thou wert able,
A very Lazarus at the rich man's table."*

but we have a description of Johnson at the age of forty, which justifies the belief that in temper and manners he was much the same at that earlier age as in the days when he was worshipped by Boswell and Fanny Burney. "I was," writes Aaron Hill to Mr. Mallet, "at the anomalous Mr. Johnson's benefit, and found the play [Johnson's "Irene"] his proper representative: Strong sense ungraced by sweetness or decorum."† Our belief as to the substantial identity of Johnson's character and manner throughout his life is strengthened by his lifelong friend, Dr. Taylor's description of him, which Boswell has preserved.

"He is a man of very clear head, great power of words, and a very gay imagination; but there is no disputing with him. He will not hear you, and having a louder voice than you, must roar you down."‡ Macaulay referred, of course, to the period about which we all know, not to that time which was to him and is to Dr. Hill necessarily obscure. But in the time which we so well know Johnson, we know there is abundant proof that he was in society constantly rude, and occasionally fierce; Johnson, we know, was under the influence of two delusions: one that he was "a very polite man," the other "that he was a good-natured man." We think his character best described by applying to himself the words he used of two other men. Of Sir Joshua Hawkius, his friend, and afterwards one of his biographers, he said:—

"It must be owned he has a degree of brutality and a tendency to savageness that cannot easily be defended."§

Of Warburton he said:—

* Peter Pindar's "Works," p. 102.

† In note by Boswell to his "Life," p. 44; and see his account of the quarrel between Johnson and Garrick, *ibid.* p. 43.

‡ Boswell, p. 301.

§ "Diary and Letters of Madame D'Arblay," vol. i. p. 24.

“He was a man of vigorous faculties, a mind fervid and vehement, supplied by incessant and unlimited inquiry with wonderful extent and variety of knowledge, which yet had not impressed his imagination nor clouded his perspicacity. To every work he brought a memory full fraught, together with a fancy fertile of original combinations, and at once exerted the powers of the scholar, the reasoner, and the wit. But his knowledge was too multifarious to be always exact, and his pursuits were too eager to be always cautious. His abilities gave him a haughty confidence which he disdained to conceal or mollify : and his impatience of opposition disposed him to treat his adversaries with such contemptuous superiority as made his readers [in Johnson’s case hearers would be more applicable] commonly his enemies, and excited against the advocate the wishes of some of those who favoured the cause. He seems to have adopted the Roman Emperor’s description, *ulerint dum mutuant*, he used no allurments of gentle language, but wished to compel rather than persuade.”*

These two passages combined form a perfect description of Johnson. To refute Macaulay, Dr. Hill quotes from Madame D’Arblay many instances of Johnson’s gentleness and tenderness to her. We have quoted the passage in which Macaulay says that “how gentle and endearing Johnson’s deportment could be was not known till the recollections of Madame D’Arblay were published.” But what has Dr. Hill’s witness to say as to Johnson’s constant rudeness and occasional ferocity? We have already referred to her account of one occasion on which Johnson made himself “dreaded by all, and by many abhorred.” Early in their intercourse she notes “that the freedom with which Johnson condemned whatever he disapproved was astonishing; and the strength of words he uses would be to most people intolerable.”† She records a political discussion between him and Sir Phillip Jennings Clerk, in which Johnson was not only rude and fierce, but also fully showed his bigotry, Tory prejudices, and inconsistency.‡ She tells us that Johnson, during their Welsh tour, rebuked Mrs. Thrale for over-civility to the people, and that Mrs. Thrale thus retorted on him with what Madame D’Arblay calls a “cutter.” “Why, I’ll tell you, when I am with you and Mrs. Thrale and Queenie I am obliged to be civil for four.”§ Madame D’Arblay also gives another instance of what she calls Johnson’s “uncontrolled freedom of speech” when he rudely quoted some lines with direct application to a lady who was dressed in what he was pleased to consider a fashion too young for her age.|| She also records a dispute as to Johnson’s “Life of Lyttleton” which he forced on an unwilling antagonist, and in

* Arnold’s “Six Chief Lives—Pope,” pp. 381-2.

† “Diary and Letters,” vol. i. p. 31.

‡ Ibid. p. 127.

§ Ibid. p. 78.

|| Ibid. p. 86.

which his admirer confesses that "this great but mortal man did, to own the truth, appear unreasonably furious and grossly severe, showed a vehemence and bitterness almost incredible, and had at last to be silenced by Mrs. Thrale, who showed great spirit and dignity."* On another occasion she remarks of Johnson, "were he less furious in his passions he would be semi-divine.† At Brighton, she tells us, Johnson was almost constantly omitted "from the invitations sent to the Thrales and their visitors" either from too much respect or too much fear.‡ We fear from what follows there can be little doubt as to the cause of the omission. On the next page she narrates how Johnson attacked with "unmerciful raillery a young man who had, at Madame D'Arblay's request, seated himself between her and Johnson." She describes the young man as bearing "Johnson's rudeness for about ten minutes, when his face became so hot with the fear of hearing something worse, that he ran from the field and took another chair" Madame D'Arblay's significant comment on this event is that she must "take expedients to avoid Johnson's public notice of her in future." During this same visit to Brighton she also notes in her "Diary"

"That single speech Hamilton§ was gone, and Mr. Metcalf is now the only person out of this house that voluntarily communicates with the Doctor. He has been in a terribly severe humour of late, and has really frightened all the people till they almost run from him. To me only, I think, is he now kind, for Mrs. Thrale fares worse than anybody. 'Tis very strange and melancholy that he will not a little more accommodate his manners and language to those of other people." She adds, "that poor Dr. Delap confessed to us that the reason he now came so seldom was his being too unwell to cope with Dr. Johnson," and also "that Mr. Selwyn refused to meet the Doctor in society," and paying a visit to the Thrales during Johnson's absence, left as the time drew near when he was expected to return, "lest the Doctor should call him to account."

This visit to Brighton occurred within two years of Johnson's death, and therefore within the period when it is admitted his manners were softened and his temper improved—we are content to rest on these recollections of Madame D'Arblay the proof of our proposition that Macaulay's description of Johnson as being "constantly rude and occasionally fierce is neither exaggerated nor unfair."

* "Diary and Letters," vol. i. p. 355, *et sequentes*.

† *Ibid.* p. 383.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 452.

§ Single-speech Hamilton was the man who, by his will, bequeathed his lauded property to a nobleman, and 10,000*l.* to a lady of rank, and then said he was very sorry that both land and money had been entailed by his father, and that he only made the bequest to show his kind disposition to them.—Miss Berry's "Life and Letters," vol. ii. pp. 14, 15.

Dr. Hill says: "if we are to trust Macaulay, 'Johnson's manners were savage.'" Johnson says of Milton that his "contemptuous mention" of a bishop "shows that he had adopted the Puritanical savageness of manners."* As on Johnson's own principles to mention people contemptuously is proof of savage manners, Macaulay is, beyond question, right. We know that Johnson looked on himself as "a very polite man." Mr. Carlyle says, "he had the noble universal politeness of a man that knows the dignity of men and feels his own." Had it been so, would Johnson have replied to the man who asked him "Would you advise me to marry?" "I would advise no man to marry, sir, who is not likely to propagate understanding." On many occasions, to some of which we have alluded, he was guilty of rudenesses quite inconsistent with any sense of the dignity of other men, whatever he might think of his own. Dr. Hill quotes Madame Piozzi, who says, "I saw Mr. Johnson in none but a tranquil uniform state, passing the evening of his life among friends who loved, honoured, and admired him;" but he admits her "words must not be pressed too closely," and certainly they are not consistent with Madame D'Arblay's Streatham and Brighton experiences, and it is difficult to reconcile them with other reminiscences of Johnson by Madame Piozzi herself.

"Veneration (she says elsewhere) for his virtue, reverence for his talents, delight in his conversation, and habitual endurance of a yoke my husband first put upon me, and of which he contentedly bore his share for sixteen or seventeen years, made me go on so long with Mr. Johnson; but the perpetual confinement I will own to have been terrifying in the first years of our friendship, and irksome in the last; nor could I pretend to support it without help when my coadjutor was no more."

Again she says that he was—

"Ever musing till he was called out to converse, and conversing till the fatigue of his friends or the promptitude of his temper to take offence, consigned him back again to silent meditation."†

Boswell draws this vivid picture of Johnson's appearance and manners in society:—

"While talking or even musing as he sat in his chair, he commonly held his head to one side towards his right shoulder, and shook it in a tremulous manner, moving his body backwards and forwards, and rubbing his left knee in the same direction with the palm of his hand.

* Arnold's "Six Principal Lives—Milton" p. 51.

† Conf. "Dr. Johnson: his Friends, &c.," p. 113, with Boswell, p. 482. From the passage we have quoted from Madame D'Arblay it would appear that towards the end of Johnson's life the asperity of his manner towards Mrs. Thrale increased.

In the intervals of articulating he made various sounds with his mouth, sometimes as if ruminating, or what is called chewing the cud, sometimes giving a half-whistle, sometimes making his tongue play backwards from the roof of his mouth, as if clucking like a hen, and sometimes protruding it against his upper gums in front, as if pronouncing quickly under his breath, *too, too, too*. All this, accompanied sometimes by a thoughtful look, but more frequently by a smile. Generally when he had concluded a period in the course of a dispute, by which time he was a good deal exhausted by violence and vociferation, he used to blow out his breath like a whale. This, I suppose, was a relief to his lungs, and seemed in him to be a contemptuous mode of expression, as if he had made the argument of his opponent fly like chaff before the wind.*

This, and Boswell's candid admission that Johnson's "irregular hours and uncouth habits, such as turning the candles with their heads downwards when they did not burn bright enough, and letting the wax drop upon the carpet, could not but be disagreeable to his wife,"† justify, we think, the application of the word "savage" to Johnson's manners as described by Boswell, they are certainly not those of "a very polite man." Macaulay truly says of Boswell, none of Johnson's enemies could have exposed his weaknesses more unsparingly. His remark, "I have no passion for clean linen," is well known, and we agree with Mr. Leslie Stephen "that it is to be feared he must sometimes have offended more senses than one." In Johnson's "Life of Swift," he has given one of those unconscious descriptions of himself of which we have already given instances. He says of Swift:—

"In the intercourse of familiar life he indulged his disposition to petulance and sarcasm. He predominates over his companions with very great ascendancy. . . . On all common occasions he habitually affects a style of arrogance, and dictates rather than persuades. This authoritative and magisterial language he expected to be received as his peculiar mode of jocularly, but he apparently flattered his own arrogance by an assumed imperiousness in which he was ironical only to the resentful, and to the submissive sufficiently serious."

And again:—

"Whatever he did he seemed willing to do in a manner peculiar to himself, without sufficiently considering that singularity, as it implies a contempt of the general practice, is a kind of defiance which justly provokes the hostility of ridicule; he, therefore, who indulges peculiar habits, is worse than others if he be not better."‡

To return to Dr. Hill, nothing, according to him, was further from the truth that Macaulay's statement that "for the suffering

* Boswell, p. 120.

† Ibid. p. 198, note.

‡ Arnold's "Six Chief Lives—Swift," pp. 266-7.

which a harsh word inflicts upon a delicate mind he had no pity ; for it was a kind of suffering which he could scarcely conceive.*

We leave Dr. Hill to reconcile his statement with his idol's repeated declarations. "My dear doctor," said he to Goldsmith, "what harm does it do to a man to call him Holofernes?" "Pooh, ma'am," he exclaimed to Mrs. Carter, "who is the worse for being talked of uncharitably." And within a few months of his death, when conversing with Boswell respecting Langton and the memorable occasion when, as Sir Joshua Reynolds said, the penitent got into a passion and belaboured his confessor, "What harm," said he to Boswell, "does it do to any man to be contradicted?" Boswell: "I suppose he (Langton) meant the *manner* of doing it roughly and harshly." Johnson: "And who is the worse for that?" Boswell: "It hurts people of weaker† nerves." Johnson: "I know no such weak-nerved people." Dr. Hill devotes several pages to prove that "the more familiar we are with Boswell the more we are convinced that Johnson was a far happier man at all events in his latter days than is commonly thought." We are glad for once to agree with Dr. Hill—and this conviction 'is strengthened the more familiar we become with Madame D'Arbly and Hannah More. Johnson's theory of many things was inconsistent with his practice—his opinions contrary to his habits—as, for instance, his advice to Boswell never to publish anxiety or gloominess by complaints, on which Dr. Hill remarks that "it is a pity that his own fits of gloominess were not more successfully hidden."‡

We must not forget that Johnson's constitutional melancholy "gave a dark tinge to all his views of human nature and of human destiny." His theory of life may be expressed in James Mill's words—"it is a poor thing." He professed to hold that belief to the end of his days. In the last year of his life he expressed the opinion that a man who said, "I have lived fifty-one years without ten minutes of uneasiness, was attempting to impose upon human credulity. During his last visit to Oxford, Boswell tells us "we passed to discourse of life whether it was, upon the whole, more happy or miserable. Johnson was decidedly for the balance of misery." Boswell thought himself bound to be of the same mind as Johnson, and aimed to be like Master Stephen in one of Beaumont and Fletcher's plays, "genteel and melancholy," in confirmation of which he continues; "I maintained that no man would choose to lead over

* "Dr. Johnson : his Friends, &c.," p. 117.

† Boswell, p. 466 and note. Mr. Hill, at p. 277 of his Johnson, imperfectly quotes this conversation, not seeing its inconsistency with his contradiction of Macaulay at p. 117.

‡ "Dr. Johnson : his Friends, &c.," p. 131.

again the life which he had experienced, Johnson acceded to that opinion in the strongest terms." We think Burke disposed of this argument in a few words which Boswell quotes:—"Every man," said he, "would lead his life over again; for every man is willing to go on and take an addition to his life which, as he grows older, he has no reason to think will be better or even so good as what has preceded." No better proof of Burke's proposition could be furnished than that of Johnson's own case. In the July of the year we refer to, "when sinking" under a load of infirmities and sorrows he wrote to his physician, "In my present state I am desirous to make a struggle for a little longer life, and hope to obtain some help from a softer climate. Do for me what you can." Even Boswell doubts whether Johnson really believed in the theory of life he professed to hold.

"It was observed to Dr. Johnson," he says, "that it was strange that he who so often delighted his company by his lively and brilliant conversation should say he was miserable."

"JOHNSON: 'Alas it is all outside; I may be cracking my joke and cursing the sun; *Sun how I hate thy beams.*'"

"I knew not well," says Boswell, "what to think of this declaration; whether to hold it as a genuine picture of his mind, or as the effect of his persuading himself, contrary to the fact, that the position he had assumed as to human unhappiness was true," and he applies to him this passage from Greville's "Maxims, Characters, and Reflections":—

"*Aristarchus* is charming; how full of knowledge, of sense, of sentiment. You get him with difficulty to your supper; and after delighting everybody and himself for a few hours he is obliged to return home. He is finishing his treatise to prove that unhappiness is the portion of man."*

Mr. Leslie Stephen truly says, "that superstition and disease stood by Johnson's cradle, and they never quitted him during life."† Dr. Hill devotes a chapter to a comparison of the melancholy of Johnson with that of Cowper,‡ and propounds as "an interesting question how far the gloom, both of Johnson and of Cowper was due to religious belief, and how far religious belief was due to gloom. If the dread of a future state had not constantly hung over each man, would he still have lived so much in a state of morbid melancholy?" Between the superstition of the two men he cynically says "there was not much indeed to choose, of the two, however, he should prefer Johnson's, for on the whole it sat on him more easily."§ With regard to the dread, of a future state causing Johnson's melancholy; had he

* Boswell, pp. 472, 473, 485. † Leslie Stephen's "Johnson," p. 2.

‡ "Dr. Johnson: his Friends, &c." pp. 200-214. § Ibid. pp. 203 6.

not believed in a future life, he would, we think, have been equally, or even more melancholy than he was. He would then have had the apprehension of annihilation which he considered "dreadful." Spite of his theory, of the preponderance of misery in life, he held that existence is so much better than nothing, that one would rather exist "even in pain than not at all."* The relation between Johnson's religion and his melancholy is admirably described by Lord Macaulay :—

"In religion he found but little comfort during his long and frequent fits of dejection, for his religion partook of his own character. The light from heaven shone on him indeed, but not in a direct line, or with its own pure splendour. The rays had to struggle through a disturbing medium. They reached him refracted, dulled, and discoloured by the thick gloom which had settled on his soul; and though they might be sufficiently clear to guide him, were too dim to cheer him." †

What Boswell calls Johnson's "direful apprehensions of futurity," were no doubt the effect of his melancholy temperament, and they were the result of his belief. It is said of Dr. Newman, "that his own faith is an escape from an alternative scepticism, which receives the veto not of his reason but of his will. He has, after all, the critical, not the prophetic, mind. He wants immediateness of religious vision." ‡ This is equally true of Johnson. It is a curious coincidence that both Newman and Johnson were influenced in their religious views by one and the same book, "Law's Serious Call," the deep impression produced by which removed Newman from the influence of the Evangelicalism of "Scott's Commentaries," and converted Johnson from "a habit of talking laxly about religion, though he did not think much against it." § He embraced and held firmly, but blindly and unreasoningly, all the dogmas of the orthodox theology, and his constitutional melancholy, and his orthodox faith, resting not on reason but on his will, disposed him to take the gloomiest views of the future which awaited him beyond the grave. We know nothing more melancholy than his state of mind within a few months of his death, as he described it during that last visit to Oxford, to which we have so often referred.

"Dr. Johnson," narrates Boswell, "surprised not a little Mr. Henderson, a very learned and pious man who supped with us, by acknowledging with a look of horror that he was much oppressed by the fear of death. The amiable Dr. Adams suggested that God was infinitely good."

"JOHNSON : 'That He is infinitely good as far as the perfection of His

* Boswell, p. 343, conf. 490.

† "Life—Miscellaneous Writings," p. 374.

‡ James Martineau's "Essays, Philosophical and Theological," American edition, 1866, p. 346.

§ Conf. Boswell, p. 9, with Newman's "Apologia," p. 62, ed. 1876.

nature will allow, I certainly believe ; but it is necessary for good upon the whole that individuals should be punished. As to an *individual*, therefore, He is not infinitely good ; and as I cannot be *sure* that I have fulfilled the conditions on which salvation is granted, I am afraid that I may be one of those who shall be damned' (looking dismally).

"Dr. ADAMS : 'What do you mean by damned?'

"JOHNSON (passionately and loudly) : 'Sent to hell, sir, and punished everlastingly.'

"Dr. ADAMS : 'I don't believe that doctrine.'

"JOHNSON : 'Hold, sir. Do you believe that some will be punished at all.'

"Dr. ADAMS : 'Being excluded from heaven will be a punishment, yet there may be no great positive suffering.'

"JOHNSON : 'Well, sir, but if you admit any degree of punishment, there is an end of your argument, for infinite goodness simply considered, would inflict no punishment whatever. There is no infinite goodness physically, considered morally there is.'

"BOSWELL : 'But may not a man attain such a degree of hope as not to be uneasy from the fear of death?'

"JOHNSON : 'A man may have such a degree of hope as to keep him quiet. You see I am not quiet from the vehemence with which I talk, but I do not despair.'

"Dr. ADAMS : You seem, sir, to forget the merits of our Redeemer.'

"JOHNSON : 'Sir, I do not forget the merits of my Redeemer ; but my Redeemer has said that He will set some on His right hand and some on His left'

"He was in gloomy agitation and said, 'I'll have no more on't.' " *

This illustrates Johnson's habit of stifling religious doubts and difficulties by the veto, not of his reason, but his will. After reading this conversation, it is consolatory to know that, though through fear of death, Johnson was all his lifetime "subject to bondage," yet, as the end drew near he was freed from his terrors, and felt what he characteristically called the "irradiation of hope." †

Dr. Hill, we think, clearly establishes that Boswell, Murphy, and Hawkins were all alike wrong in supposing that the celebrated passage in Chesterfield's letters describing the "respectable Hottentot" refers to Johnson, ‡ and he is at great, and we think needless pains to prove "that there never could have been any intimacy, still less could there have been any affection" between Chesterfield and Johnson. § He devotes a chapter each to Langton and Beauclerk, in which he gathers together the various scattered references to them by Boswell and other

* Boswell, p. 471.

† "Diary and Letters of Madame D'Arblay," vol. i. p. 582.

‡ "Dr. Johnson : his Friends, &c.," c. vi. pp. 214-230.

§ Ibid. pp. 230-247.

biographers of Johnson, and combines them into admirable sketches of each of these friends of Johnson. Another chapter* is devoted to Goldsmith, but this sketch will not bear comparison with Macaulay's "Life of Goldsmith." We have not left ourselves space to follow Dr. Hill into his laboured vindication of Boswell against the censures of Macaulay; he tries hard to make a hero of Boswell, but that is beyond human power, and Boswell's admirers must be content to let him remain in his true character of *l'âme damnée* of Johnson.

Notwithstanding his admiration of Boswell, Dr. Hill applies to him a process of destructive criticism. After claiming for him "against the authority of one of the greatest writers of our age† — a high place indeed"—he ends by expressing the hope "that he has sufficiently shown that there are strong grounds for thinking that Boswell's merits, as a mere reporter of Johnson's talk, are not quite what they were thought to be.‡ It is doing Boswell small service to claim for him a "high place" amongst biographers, and then to cast a doubt on what forms the charm and value of his book—the authenticity of his reports of Johnson's conversations. "It is not in his writings," says Dr. Hill, "but in his talk, that Johnson lives." But what should we know of his talk but for Boswell; and if Boswell be not accurate, what do we know of Johnson? Boswell records "that Johnson once said, 'The value of every story depends on its being true. A story is a picture of an individual or of human nature in general: if it be false, it is a picture of nothing.'" This is equally true of reports of conversations. Are we, then, adopting Mr. Hayward's classification, to place Boswell's Johnson amongst the "False Pearls of History?"§ It should be borne in mind that Boswell himself says, "I must again and again entreat of my readers not to suppose that my imperfect record of conversations contains the whole of what was said by Johnson or other eminent persons who lived with him. What I have preserved, however, has the value of the most perfect authenticity."|| Boswell, therefore, admits imperfection in his records, because he has not preserved the whole of conversations at which he was present; but he asserts universally that whatever he has preserved is authentic. The grounds on which Dr. Hill bases his depreciation of Boswell are, first, that certain sayings were repeated to Boswell by Langton, and introduced into the Life. "Of these, the authenticity of every article," says Boswell, "is unquestionable." For the expressions I, who wrote them down in his (Langton's) presence;

* "Dr. Johnson: his Friends, &c.," c. viii. p. 248; c. ix. p. 280; c. x. p. 319.

† Macaulay. ‡ "Dr. Johnson: his Friends, &c.," p. 198.

§ Hayward's "Biographical and Critical Essays," vol. i. p. 1, "The Pearls and Mock Pearls of History."
|| Boswell, p. 221.

am partly answerable.* Boswell admits, therefore, that in the case of these particular conversations which are collected together and form one chapter of the edition before us, he is partly responsible for *the expressions*; and Dr. Hill admits that, though Boswell was "utterly incapable of imitating Johnson in the substance of what he said, yet he had a considerable power of taking off his style." As to these sayings, therefore, we do not think the merits of Boswell as Johnson's reporter are much depreciated. The other grounds of Dr. Hill's depreciation are verbal differences, between reports of some of Johnson's sayings, which are to be found in a comparison between the "Life" and a book called "Boswelliana," first printed in 1874 by the Grampian Club. This book consists of "some loose quarto sheets in Boswell's writing inscribed on each page "Boswelliana." They contain "twenty-five anecdotes about Johnson, twenty-one of which are given also in the 'Life.'" Dr. Hill assumes that the stories to be now found in both these books were recorded in the "Boswelliana" at the time they were heard; and from the difference between the versions in the "Boswelliana" and the "Life," assumes that "Boswell, to a certain extent, changed the sayings of Johnson which he had collected."† With the history of these sheets we are not acquainted; but the simple reason for the discrepancy seems to us to be that Boswell has given in the "Life" what he thought to be the most authentic report of these particular sayings of Johnson. We think, therefore, that Dr. Hill is not more successful in depreciating Boswell's merits as a reporter of Johnson's sayings than in proving his assertion that Macaulay's "Life of Johnson" contains "great blemishes and exaggerations," of which throughout Dr. Hill's volume we find no single instance given by way of proof. We see that the current number of the magazine‡ in which Johnson's first published writings appeared, contains "Unpublished Episodes in the "Life of Dr. Johnson." We take occasion of their publication to suggest to Dr. Hill, Mr. Jewitt, and other searchers after unpublished traditions of Johnson, that a very curious and interesting subject for their research is the relations between Johnson and Thurlow, of whom it might be said, varying Gibbon's comparison between Thurlow and Wedderburn—that they were *pares atque similes*. When did their acquaintance begin? To what degree of intimacy did it reach? At first sight, one is inclined to say of them, in the words Dr. Hill uses of Johnson and Chesterfield—"There never could have been any intimacy, still less could there have been any affection between them." Yet they appear to

* Boswell, chap. xlvi. p. 386.

† "Dr. Johnson: his Friends, &c.," p. 190 et seq.

‡ The "Gentleman's Magazine," Dec., 1878. The article is by Mr. Llewellyn Jewitt.

have been at some time intimate, for Johnson compared Wedderburn with Thurlow much to Wedderburn's disadvantage.

"I never," said Johnson to Boswell, "heard anything from him in company that was at all striking; and depend upon it, sir, it is when you come close to a man in conversation that you discover what his real abilities are. To make a speech in a public assembly is a knack. Now I honour Thurlow, sir. Thurlow is a fine fellow, he fairly puts his mind to yours."*

On another occasion,† "I would prepare myself for no man in England but Lord Thurlow; when I am to meet him I would wish to know a day before."‡ Again, when giving advice to Boswell as to his being called to the English bar, he finished by saying: "All this I should have said to any one. I should have said it to Lord Thurlow twenty years ago."‡ From this, one would infer that he had been intimate with Thurlow in Thurlow's earlier days. Again, Thurlow unfortunately, considering the relations between him and Pitt, was chosen to conduct the "pious negotiation;" "because," says Boswell, "I knew that he highly valued Johnson and that Johnson highly valued his Lordship." Thurlow's high value of Johnson was shown by his liberal offer to supply Pitt's want of liberality, nevertheless, Boswell gives no account of any intercourse between the two men. We have spoken of the likeness between them; in many points both of manner and character it was great. The most lifelike of Lord Brougham's sketches of statesmen is that of Thurlow. It is founded no doubt on information received from Lord Holland, whose uncle, Charles James Fox, was, after Thurlow's loss of office, his intimate friend. Lord Holland, it is well known, was celebrated for his stories of Thurlow and for his imitation of him.

"Lord Thurlow," says Lord Brougham, "showed to the suitor a determined, and to the bar a surly, aspect. The measure of his courtesy was too scanty to obstruct the overflow in very audible sounds of the sarcastic and peremptory matter which eyes of the most fixed gloom, beneath eyebrows formed by nature to convey the abstract idea of a perfect frown, showed to be gathering or already collected. He possessed great depth of voice, rolled out of his sentences with unbroken fluency, and displayed a confidence both of tone and assertion which, accompanied by somewhat of Dr. Johnson's balanced sententiousness often silenced when it did not convince, for of reasoning he was pro-

* Boswell, p. 437. Wedderburn (Lord Loughborough, and afterwards E. Rosslyn) is not named, but is evidently the person referred to. See Boswell's own note on the page quoted.

† Ibid. p. 478.

‡ Ibid. p. 474. This was in 1784. Thurlow was called to the bar in 1754.

verbially sparing.* His speeches were mainly positive assertions, personal vituperation, some sarcasms at classes, some sentences pronounced on individuals, as if they were standing before him for judgment."

The points of resemblance were neither few nor small. In other respects the two men were the exact opposites of each other.

"Thurlow's conversation was garnished with expletives rather sonorous than expressive, but more expressive than becoming. His life was passed in so great and habitual a disregard of the decorum usually cast round high station, especially in the legal profession, as makes it extremely doubtful if the grave and solemn demeanour in which he was used to shroud himself were anything more than a manner he had acquired."†

One can hardly imagine how any social intercourse was possible between Johnson and Thurlow. Johnson boasted to Boswell that "obscenity and impiety had always been repressed in his company,"‡ and Boswell gives an instance of the manner in which by emphasised words and frowning looks Johnson reproved one who was guilty of the indecorum of swearing in *his* presence.§ But Thurlow's profane swearing was irrepressible. When Chancellor he received a deputation of what, in the language of the older Dissenters, were called Nonconformist Divines, including such well-known men as Drs. Kippis Palmer (of Hackney) and Rees. Their object was to obtain his support to Beaufoy's motion for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts. Thurlow heard them very civilly, and then said—"Gentlemen, I am against you, by G—d. I am for the Established Church, damme; not that I have any more regard for the Established Church than for any other church, but because it is Established—and if you can get your d—d religion established, I'll be for that, too.¶ A man who could so address a body of grave and venerable men like those then before him is not likely to have been repressed even by Johnson. In this particular case Johnson might have pardoned or even justified Thurlow's oaths, on the ground that they were aimed at Dissenters. It would only have been in conformity with a dictum which, if a story we have read, but our authority for which we have forgotten be true, he once uttered. Johnson reproved an acquaintance for breach of Christian charity in throwing snails from his own garden into his neighbour's, but on learning that the neighbour

* "Historical Sketches of Statesmen of the time of George III.," 2nd (French) edition, p. 50 et seq.

† *Ibid.*

‡ Boswell, p. 470.

§ *Ibid.* p. 312.

¶ H. C. Robinson, "Diary," vol. i. p. 378.

was a dissenter, Johnson rejoined, "Toss away, sir, then, as fast as you like."

We will close this paper by giving our own estimate of Johnson. It differs wholly from those of the writers of the later works we have been reviewing, nor can we without reservation assent to Lord Macaulay's final judgment on Johnson, that "our intimate acquaintance with what he would himself have called the am-fractuosities of his intellect and of his temper serves only to strengthen our conviction that he was both a great and a good man." To our mind, Macaulay's earlier description of Johnson was the better one, viz., "that he was a man of strong but enslaved understanding, the characteristic peculiarity of whose intellect was the union of great powers with low prejudices." That any one can deliberately say, as does Mr. Leslie Stephen, that amongst all the "heroes and statesmen and philanthropists and poets who lie buried in Westminster Abbey, there are very few whom, when all has been said, we can love so heartily as Samuel Johnson." We could respect, regard, possibly reverence, Johnson, but except Boswell and Madame D'Arblay, we cannot imagine that any human being loved Johnson. Johnson said of himself, "that he ought to have been a lawyer," and Boswell relates that "Sir William Scott (Lord Stowell) said to Johnson—'What a pity it is, sir, that you did not follow the profession of the law. You might have been Lord Chancellor and attained to the dignity of the peerage.'*" "There can be no doubt that Johnson was eminently qualified to be a great advocate. At the bar his power of arguing at any moment on any side of any question would have made him *primus inter pares*. Had his application for admission to the bar of Doctors' Commons been successful he would no doubt have taken a high place, and the then leader of that bar, his friend Sir Wm. Scott, would have found in him "a foeman worthy of his steel." Some idea of his forensic ability may be gained from reading the arguments with which, on several occasions, he supplied Boswell for use in court. After hearing one of them read, Burke remarked, "Well, he does his work in a workmanlike manner."† Johnson might even have outstripped Scott in the race for preferment and become Judge of the Consistorial and Admiralty Courts, but we do not think he would have made a good judge. Like his friend Thurlow, he would have been too dogmatic; like him he would have "decided, not reasoned," nor would he have enriched the literature of the law with such judgments as those of Lord Stowell in the cases of *Dalrymple v. Dalrymple*, the *Maria*,

* Boswell, p. 346.

† See these arguments in Boswell, pp. 175, 272, 316.

and the *Gratitude*, which, to quote again Lord Brougham, make "the volume which records Lord Stowell's decisions not like the reports of common law cases, a book only unsealed to the members of the legal profession; it may well be in the hands of the general student, and form part of any classical library of English eloquence or even of national history."* We have said that Johnson could argue at any moment on any side of any question—and this is no exaggeration. This peculiarity had its rise in the sceptical nature of his mind. He had strong political and religious prejudices; but of deep convictions on any subject he had but few. Boswell owns that he loved to

"display his ingenuity in argument, and therefore would sometimes in conversation maintain opinions which he was sensible were wrong, but in supporting which his reasoning and wit would be most conspicuous. He would begin thus: 'Why, sir, as to the good or evil of card-playing.' 'Now,' said Garrick, 'he is thinking which side he will take.' He appeared to have a pleasure in contradiction, especially when any opinion whatever was delivered with an air of confidence, so that there was hardly any topic, if not one of the great truths of religion and morality, that he might not have been incited to argue for or against."†

Even on religious subjects he talked loosely. He led old Mr. Langton to believe that he was a Papist. Johnson at times showed a leaning to Romanism. An authoritative Church would have best suited him, but at other times he expressed himself against it. "In everything," he said, "in which they differ from us they are wrong." "He was," says Boswell, "even against the invocation of saints; in short, he was in the humour of opposition."

At the close of another conversation, when he had spoken favourably of the old religion, Boswell observes: "It is not improbable that if one had taken the other side, he might have reasoned differently."‡ This is a proof that he was an acute and a versatile, rather than a great man. Boswell says of Johnson, "that no man had a more ardent love of literature, a higher respect for it, nor a higher notion of its dignity."§ Yet this is hardly to be reconciled with what Boswell calls his "strange opinion," that "no one but a blockhead ever wrote except for money."|| Lord Macaulay, on the other hand, thought "that the pleasure of writing always pays itself." Here is another instance in which Johnson's opinions and his practice were opposed; for few men wrote more without receiving any remuneration, and for all his

* "Statesmen of George III., p. 260.

† Boswell, p. 263.

‡ Conf. Boswell, pp. 151, 195, 261, 374, and others.

§ Boswell, pp. 10, 346.

|| Ibid. 262.

works he was underpaid. He says of Dryden : "To write *con amore* with fondness for the employment, with perpetual touches and retouches, with unwillingness to take leave of his own idea, and no unvaried pursuit of unattainable perfection was, I think, no part of his character."* What Johnson denies of Dryden, we may without fear of contradiction affirm of Macaulay ; and this description of Dryden is another instance where Johnson, in describing another man, unconsciously describes himself.

Johnson's position in the literary world of his day was well described by Goldsmith. It will be remembered that he censured Boswell "because he was for making a monarchy of what should be a republic."† The same thing might be said of nearly every one of the people amongst whom Johnson lived. For ourselves, we say as did Macaulay, in reference to Niebuhr, "This sort of intellectual despotism always moves us to mutiny, and generates a disposition to pull down the reputation of the dogmatist."‡ Indeed the marks of respect, and even adulation, shewn Johnson, were such as in these days are reserved for persons of royal rank. It appears from Madame Piozzi, as quoted by Dr. Hill, to have been not unusual, "when he entered a room for every one to rise to do him honour."§ The homage paid to him was due in part to his mannerism—the histrionic element in his character. Lord Pembroke, Boswell tells us, once said to him : "Dr. Johnson's sayings would not appear so extraordinary, were it not for his bow wow way."|| Here again the likeness between Johnson and Thurlow is great. In each case "the solemn and imposing aspect, the well-rounded periods, the sonorous voice, appeared to convey things which it would be awful to examine too near, and perilous to question."¶ This would not impose on Burke, Gibbon, Wyndham, Sheridan, or Fox, but on the weaker brethren of the club, and in common society it had no doubt a great effect ; but a stronger reason for the homage paid to Johnson was that writers and readers alike were fewer in those days. In these days when many write, and all read, a literary monarch is as great an anachronism as an infallible pope. The adulation paid to Johnson was a misfortune for him. It developed and strengthened the worst parts of his character, which were also the strongest. We admit his benevolence and generosity, but these were fully balanced, if not outweighed, by his vanity, his coarseness, and his ferocity, which adulation only increased. We cannot

* Boswell, p. 262.

† Ibid. p. 195.

‡ "Life of Macaulay," vol. i. p. 437.

§ "Johnson : his Friends, &c.," p. 117. || Ibid.; Boswell, p. 215, note.

¶ Lord Brougham, *ubi supra*, p. 53.

sympathise with Johnson's worshippers, like Dr. Hill, and Mr. Leslie Stephen, still less with fanatics like Mr. Main. With some reservations and qualifications we can agree in Lord Macaulay's later opinion, but we cannot refrain from expressing our gratitude that our lot is cast in a time when in society such a man as Samuel Johnson is an impossibility.

ART. II.—THE PAPACY: ITS EARLY RELATIONS WITH
ROMAN CATHOLIC STATES.

1. *Resoconto autentico della disputa intorno alla Ventura di San Pietro in Roma.* Roma: 1872.
2. *La Ventura di S. Pietro in Roma. Nella Sala dell' Accademia Tiburina la Sera del 10 Febbraio, 1872.* Per il Professore D. CATALDO CAPRARA, uno de'Sei, che accettarono la disputa. Roma: 1872.
3. *Statutes of the Realm of England*, published by the Record Commission, Nine volumes, London 1810, 1822, enacted during the reigns of the following English Kings—Edward I., Edward II., Edward III., Richard II., Henry IV., and Henry V.
4. *Essays on the Rise and Progress of the Christian Religion in the West of Europe.* By JOHN, EARL RUSSELL. London: 1873.
5. *Nouvelle Histoire des Cardinaux François.* Paris: 1785-88. Dédicée au Roi-Louis XVI.
6. *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury.* Edited by JAMES CRAIGIE ROBERTSON, Canon of Canterbury. Part of the Series, "Rerum Britannicarum Medii Avi Scriptores." London: 1858. 8vo.

THE recent death of Pope Pius IX. and the election of his successor under the title of Leo XIII., are events which seem to require, or at all events to justify, a retrospective view of the origin, policy, and pretensions of the Papacy. The spread in England of what is termed Ritualism, and the extension contemplated at the Vatican of spiritual domination over Scotland, render such an investigation both opportune and desirable. Such an inquiry under the above title must necessarily involve considerations of its acts past and present, its progress, its vicissitudes, and its prospects. "No people," declared Edmund Burke, "will ever look forward to their posterity, who do not

sometimes look back to their ancestors." In dealing with the proposed subject, we shall have to recur to the days of our Norman and Plantagenet sovereigns, and to record the stern resistance by express legislation with which the aggressive inroads of that Church on civil government were met and repelled in the days of our ancestors, by Roman Catholic kings and their parliaments. We must further refer to the efforts made from time to time in monarchical, and still more recently in imperial, France to restrain its audacious pretensions. This branch of the subject must involve the struggle for the supremacy of the German empire over the Church, and lead to a contrast between the imperial laws recently passed for the assertion of that supremacy, and those enacted during early times in our own island. Neither can we avoid alluding to those internal dissensions within the Church itself, during which the hostile rivalries of popes and anti-popes compelled the transfer of its seat from the city, which it had for centuries pretended was eternally linked with its spiritual domination. When describing the fierce and sanguinary retaliations of Roman Catholic monarchs and warriors on Rome as a devoted capital, we may perhaps be pardoned for expressing our congratulations that those perils are passed away for ever, and that united Italy, under a constitutional Government, is again destined to resume its proper rank among the nations of the earth.

Those who have acquired the distinctive appellation of sovereign pontiffs, have in all ages assumed their descent from the head of the Apostles as first bishop of Rome, and the claims which they have asserted are based exclusively on that questionable succession. The Canon Law is accordingly crowded with decretals that emperors and kings must be subject to the Church, and even submit their necks to its dictation. The selection of the Roman capital as its ecclesiastical centre, may be traced to that traditional spirit of aggrandisement by which, after the example of ancient Rome, it aspired to become mistress of the world. While united Italy possesses a population of less than twenty-five millions, the Papacy has established on its soil one hundred and thirty-five distinct bishoprics, but it has deemed a number scarcely exceeding three hundred amply sufficient for the spiritual requirements of all the remaining millions of Roman Catholic Christendom. It has been equally avaricious in its selection of popes, who have numbered two hundred and fifty-three since the days of St. Peter; and his presumed visit to Rome, as will be seen, is more than apocryphal. Of these popes, fifteen were French, thirteen were Greeks, eight were Syrians, six were Germans, five were Spaniards, two were Africans, two Savoyards, two Dalmatians, one Englishman, one

Portuguese, one Hollander, one Switzer, one Candiotte, Italy monopolising all the rest, including the present pope, thus making one hundred and ninety-five in number. The appointment of the cardinals, with whom the election of the pope at present rests, is exclusively vested in the pope, and although their number was fixed by Pius V. at seventy, they have occasionally fallen beneath that limit. Of these, it is believed that the number of foreign cardinals has rarely exceeded twelve, and the natives of other countries on whom that dignity has been conferred, would seem at present to be but thirteen. The non-Italian cardinals, who are also styled princes of the Church, are now electors of a spiritual monarchy, and lately were four French, three Spanish, two Austrian, one German; to these, it would seem, that three others have been recently added, one Irish, one English, and one American. The Sacred College has, in modern times, invariably selected from among themselves, in the great majority of cases, a native Roman, the city naturally prevailing that has contrived to secure and can command a majority so decisive. As the pope for the time being selects the cardinals, that power would seem theoretically, at least, to vest in him the choice of his successor, and it has been authoritatively announced as the special prerogative of this ecclesiastical aristocracy, that every future pope must be an Italian!

The question whether St. Peter had ever been in Rome had been for centuries the subject of grave disquisitions between the papal authorities, who based upon it the spiritual supremacy of the popes, and learned members of the laity. Modern revelations would, however, seem to have finally settled the disputed point, and to have established that the legend was a pure fable. The late Sydney Lady Morgan, in her once celebrated work on Italy, boldly asserted that when the army of the first French Republic occupied Rome, some of their *savans* acquainted with Oriental languages, had carefully examined the curule chair, now the only alleged relic of the saint in that city, and had traced upon its mouldering and dusty surface some carvings which bore the appearance of letters. According to her statement, the inscription was faithfully copied and found to be in Arabic characters, containing the well-known confession of Mohammedan faith, "There is but one God, and Mahomet is his prophet!" Their conclusion was that the chair had been among the spoil brought by the Crusaders from the East, and presented as a votive offering to the pope at a time when the taste for antiquarian lore and the deciphering of inscriptions were not yet in fashion. The fair authoress further added that the story had been hushed up, the chair replaced, and none but the unhal-

lowed remembered the fact, while none but the audacious repeated it.*

The late Cardinal Wiseman was at that period the head of the English Roman Catholic College at Rome, and he expressed his indignation in "Remarks on Lady Morgan's Statements regarding St. Peter's Chair," which he published in an Ultramontane periodical, *The Dublin Review*, but little read in this country. After the Cardinal had been created by the Pope Archbishop of Westminster, he repeated those remarks in the columns of the *London Morning Chronicle*, a journal which has ceased for many years to exist. In these communications he asserted that the chair had been presented to St. Peter by Prudentius, a Roman lawyer, who had become a Christian. He further imputed to her ladyship that she had confounded the chair in the Vatican Basilic with a marble chair in the patriarchal Church of St. Peter at Venice, which was "called by the people the chair of St. Peter." This concession, however, escaped the pious writer, that the sculptures on the Vatican chair represented "the exploits of the monster quelling Hercules," a Pagan god; an admission quite sufficient to dissipate its claim to authenticity as the gift of a pious convert. Lady Morgan replied in a spirited letter, in 1851, addressed to the Cardinal, which ran through several editions, and her assailant prudently retired from the contest. The wily Cardinal probably felt conscious that a questionable theory, resting on the possession of an antiquated piece of furniture such as this chair, depended upon a very slender foundation. The "Remarks" have, however, reappeared in his published essays, preceded by an engraved representation of the chair for the study of the curious, and to silence the doubts of the audacious.† Cardinal Wiseman did not, however, venture to reconcile either the fabled achievements of the heathen deity or the Saracen sentence expressing the Mohammedan Creed with the piety of the Christian lawyer. He perhaps left this blank to be filled up by his successor.

The subject would appear to have slumbered until revived by the late Pope Pius IX. after his infallibility had been proclaimed by the Ecumenical Council. In directing special researches in reference to the question, his Holiness could scarcely have humbled himself so far as to become merely ambitious of refuting the declamation of Alessandro Gavazzi, who, before his ordination as a priest, had been a monk of the Barbanite order. The Pope was probably influenced by higher and purer motives, perhaps by conscientious doubts in respect of his title

* "Italy," by Lady Morgan. London, 1821. Vol. ii. p. 283.

† "Essays by Cardinal Wiseman." London, 1853. Vol. iii. p. 301.

to the novel position he was called upon by the declaration of his infallibility to assume. He committed to a council of learned men, selected by himself, the full investigation of the debated question, whether St. Peter was ever at Rome. The following six canons of the Church and professors were accordingly named—Professor D. Augustus Guidi, Canon Fabiani, Professor Cipolla, Monsignors Ciccolini and Avenitti, with the Surrogate Canon Deggiovanni, as well as Professor Cataldo Caprara.* Their instructions were to search for and produce every description of evidence that could be discovered in order to establish that fact, as the foundation on which alone rested the claim of the Pontiff to be the successor of St. Peter. Two volumes† containing the results of their researches, specified in the title to these pages, were accordingly published at Rome in 1872, by the authority of the Pope, who, according to statements current in print and generally credited at that time, expressed himself deeply dissatisfied at their failure to prove the case committed to them, even to his satisfaction. Being unable to trace any proof that St. Peter had ever set his foot in Rome, they were driven to have recourse to two Pagan authorities, Tacitus and Seneca, the first of whom, in reference to great criminals, used the words, “Crucibus affixi,” while the following passage may be found in the latter author, to which expression may perhaps be traced the legend that the chief of the apostles, in deference to the fate of his Christian master, was crucified with the head down. The words of Seneca accordingly were, “Video istic non unius quidam generis, sed aliter ab aliis fabricatas, alii capite conversus in terram suspendere.” It must have been manifest to those learned referees as it is to the most ordinary understanding, that if St. Peter had never set his foot on Italian soil, he could not possibly have been a victim to that persecution, at least in Rome. Had they been candid and unrestrained by their orthodox attachment to the Church, they might have reported to the Pope that the supernatural had been in all ages closely allied to the fabulous. They might perhaps have gone further within the scope of their instructions, and declared that the martyrdom of St. Peter was as pure a fiction as that of “St. Paolo alle tre Fontane,” which enjoins the credence of the faithful to the legendary tradition that three fountains sprung up within the basilica erected over the spots where the head of Saint Paul, the Apostle of the Gentiles, bounded on his decapitation three times

* It may perhaps be assumed, from their names and additions, that all the nominees selected by the Pope were Italians, and consequently, to some extent at least, interested in establishing the affirmative of the mixed historical and religious question entrusted to them.

The Papacy :

from the earth. We must admonish those who are still disposed to be credulous, that in the topography of ancient Rome these fountains were known to the Romans centuries before Saint Paul arrived in that city as the *Aquæ Salvia*.

The special commissioners of the Pope would seem to have placed their principal reliance on declamation and that most frail and faithless of all foundations, tradition. They also attributed weight to the reveries of the fathers, perhaps wholly unconscious that their ponderous folios, as controversial authorities, have been compared by a Roman Catholic author of orthodox celebrity to wounded elephants in Eastern warfare, which as dangerous auxiliaries, when once set loose, may be at least as formidable to friends as to foes.* Among those dangerous auxiliaries, implicit reliance is placed, on Eusebius, who has been styled "The Father of Ecclesiastic History," but he was not born until the year A.D. 264, at least two centuries after the period assigned for the martyrdom of St. Peter. His testimony must be therefore treated as mere hearsay repetition of the story, as it was told to him. Roman Catholic authors assert that previous to the Apostle's visit to Rome he had fixed his see at Antioch, a once celebrated city of Syria, which was styled "The Queen of the East," but which is now in ruins, without a single Christian Church within its precincts. From his first Epistle it may be inferred that St. Peter was at Babylon at the time it was written; it has been urged by some commentators, and the Papal commissioners would seem to have concurred, that the name of that Eastern city was a mystic designation of the Roman capital, according to a practice alleged not to have been unusual with the Hebrews. By this process of reasoning any event stated in history to have occurred in the East may be transferred to Europe, and the horrid scenes of the Indian Mutiny may be shifted from Hindostan even to England. As the annals of Rome either pagan or apostolic did not disclose any record of St. Peter's episcopate in that city, it became necessary to discover or devise some evidence that he had been there. Accordingly a spot was selected for his prison, and that name was conferred upon a portion of an ancient building, which modern archæologists have proved to have been part of the common jail erected by the early kings, and mentioned by Livy as "*Lautumia*," which it is believed was built by Ancus Martius and added to by Servius Tullius. Chains are also produced, which are represented to pious penitents as having manacled the limbs of the martyr; they are not, however, shown to strangers, but are reserved for the gaze of the faithful on every first of August, in the Church

* Thomas Moore, the Bard of Ireland.

TRÜBNER & CO.'S

MONTHLY LIST.

Vol. III., No. 1.



Jan., 1879.

INDIA AND AFGHANISTAN.

For List of Books of Interest at the present moment relating to India and Neighbouring Countries, see the SUPPLEMENT to the NO. for NOVEMBER, 1878, of this List, 16 pp., post free on application.

"A particularly interesting List."—BOOKSELLER.

NOW READY.

ENGLISH COPYRIGHT EDITION. Crown 8vo, pp. xii-276, cloth, price 6s.

JOHN LOTHROP MOTLEY.

A MEMOIR.

By OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES.

Contents :

Birth and Early Years (1814-1827)—College Life (1827-1831)—Study and Travel in Europe (1832-1833)—Return to America—Study of Law—Marriage—His First Novel, "Morton's Hope" (1834-1839)—First Diplomatic Appointment—Secretary of Legation to the Russian Mission—Brief Residence at St. Petersburg—Letter to his Mother—Return (1841-1842)—Letter to Park Benjamin—Political Views and Feelings (1844)—First Historical and Critical Essays—Peter the Great—Novels of Balzac—Polity of the Puritans (1845-1847)—Joseph Lewis Stackpole, the Friend of Motley—His sudden Death—Motley in the Massachusetts House of Representatives—Second Novel, "Merry Mount, A Romance of the Massachusetts Colony" (1849)—Plan of a History—Letters (1850)—Historical Studies in Europe—Letter from Brussels (1851-1856)—Publication of his First Historical Work, "Rise of the Dutch Republic"—Its Reception—Critical Notices—His Visit to America (1856-1857)—Visit to America—Residence in Boylston Place (1856-1857)—Return to England—Social Relations—Lady Harcourt's Letter (1858-1860)—Letter to Mr. Francis H. Underwood—Plan of Mr. Motley's Historical Works—Second Great Work,

"History of the United Netherlands" (1859)—Publication of the First Two Volumes of the "History of the United Netherlands"—Their Reception (1860)—Residence in England—Outbreak of the Civil War—Letter to the London *Times*—Visit to America—Appointed Minister to Austria—Lady Harcourt's Letter—Miss Motley's Memorandum (1860-1866)—Letters from Vienna (1861-1863)—Resignation of his Office—Causes of his Resignation (1866-1867)—Last Two Volumes of the "History of the United Netherlands"—General Criticisms of Dutch Scholars on Motley's Historical Works (1867-1868)—Visit to America—Residence at No. 2, Park Street, Boston—Address on the coming Presidential Election—Address on the Historic Progress of American Democracy—Appointed Minister to England (1869)—Recall from the English Mission—Its Alleged and its Probable Reasons (1869-1870)—Life of John Barneveld—Criticisms—Groen van Prinsterer (1874)—Death of Mrs. Motley—Last Visit to America—Illness and Death—Lady Harcourt's Communication (1874-1877)—Conclusion—His Character—His Labours—His Reward—Appendix.

"A letter from Herr Lothair Bucher, printed in this volume, contains details about Motley gathered from the Prince at the request of Dr. Holmes. Prince Bismarck says:—'I met Motley at Göttingen, in 1832; I am not sure if at the beginning of Easter term or Michaelmas term. He kept company with German students, though more addicted to study than we members of the fighting clubs (corps). Although not having mastered yet the German language, he exercised a marked attraction by a conversation sparkling with wit, humour, and originality. In autumn of 1833, having both of us migrated from Göttingen to Berlin for the prosecution of our studies, we became fellow-lodgers in the house No. 16, Friedrich Strasse. There we lived in the closest intimacy, sharing meals and outdoor exercise. Motley by that time had arrived at talking German fluently; he occupied himself not only in translating Goethe's poem, 'Faust,' but tried his hand even in composing German verses. Enthusiastic admirer of Shakspeare, Byron, Goethe, he used to spice his conversation abundantly with quotations from these his favourite authors. A pertinacious arguer, so much so that sometimes he watched my awakening in order to continue a discussion on some topic of science, poetry, or practical life, cut short by the chime of the small hours, he never lost his mild and amiable temper.'—*Athenæum*.

London: TRÜBNER & CO., Ludgate Hill.

NOW READY.

Demy 8vo, pp. xvi-270, cloth, price 10s. 6d.

EGYPT, CYPRUS, AND ASIATIC TURKEY.

By J. LEWIS FARLEY, Author of "The Resources of Turkey," &c.

Contents: Wintering in Egypt—Travelling in Syria—Beyrout—Beit-miry—Mount Lebanon—Jerusalem—Damascus—Nazareth—A Day with the Bedawias—Syria—The British Protectorate of Asiatic Turkey—Resources of Asiatic Turkey—Railways in Asiatic Turkey—The Euphrates Valley Railway—Beyrout to

Cyprus—Cyprus: Its Soil, Agriculture, Products, Towns, Roads, Commerce, &c.—Cyprus to Constantinople—Summer on the Bosphorus—The Future of the Ottoman Empire—The Suez Canal—Fuad Pasha's Political Testament, &c., &c.

In Two Volumes, crown 8vo, 348 and 360 pp., price £1 1s.

THE DEVIL'S ADVOCATE.

By PERCY GREG, Author of "Interleaves."

"The series of assaults against modern ideas and institutions in which Cleveland takes either a directing or a controlling part are conducted with great spirit and persistence, and if there are persons who really think the nineteenth century is the beginning of the millennium, they might consult these pages with some profit."—*Saturday Review*.

"Whether we agree or disagree with the interlocutors in these discussions, we recognize in the head that sets them in motion the rare power of thinking for itself, instead of following the lead of believers or doubters."—*Daily News*.

ENGLISH COPYRIGHT EDITION.

In small 4to, pp. xii-171, handsomely bound in white vellum cloth, price 12s.

PRINCE DEUKALION: A Lyrical Drama.

By BAYARD TAYLOR.

"From this argument we learn that the 'central design' or 'germinal cause' of the poem is to picture forth the struggle of humanity to reach 'the highest, justest, happiest, hence most perfect, condition of human life in this planet.' The poem follows the old Greek legend which its title suggests, as far as to make Deukalion and Pyrrha the representatives of creative energy, of the origin of life, in four distinct and widely separated historic eras, all of which are far removed from the mythological period. The first act is dated A.D. 300; the second, A.D. 1300; the third, A.D. 18—, the fixing of the specific year being left to the reader; and in the fourth act the century as well as the year is left conveniently vague. In the first act the reader is asked to behold the passing away of the classic faith, and the emergence of Christianity. In the second, Medusa is the omnipotent representative of a new ecclesiastical system. The third act deals with 'the inflexible, despotic theology' which appertains to any part of the eighteenth century which the reader may choose to fix on. In the fourth and closing act, the poet adventures into some such future era as a 'simply loving and believing creature of God' may discover a forecast of in 'the prophecy within his own nature.'"—*Scotsman*.

"* * * The public will regret to learn that when the first perfect copy of this his last work reached the American Embassy at Berlin, the state of Mr. Bayard Taylor's health had already become so critical that his physicians deemed it advisable that he should not be permitted to see it."

Demy 8vo, pp. xii 232, half morocco, price 7s. 6d.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE BRITISH SETTLEMENT OF ADEN IN ARABIA.

Compiled by Captain F. M. HUNTER, F.R.G.S., F.R.A.S.

Assistant Political Resident, Aden.

This Monograph has been prepared at the request of Dr. W. W. Hunter, Director General of Statistics to the Government of India, and so far as the local circumstances of Aden permitted, upon the general plan drawn up by him in India. It is illustrated by Two Maps - one of Aden itself, the other of the neighbourhood of Aden, showing the Kafilah main and by routes

8vo, pp. 204, cloth, price £1 1s.

A HANDBOOK OF MALAY COLLOQUIAL,

AS SPOKEN IN SINGAPORE.

Being a Series of Introductory Lessons for Domestic and Business Purposes.

By N. B. DENNY, Ph.D., F.R.G.S., M.R.A.S., &c.

Author of "The Folklore of China," "Handbook of Cantonese," &c., &c.

SECOND EDITION, Authorized by H.M. Secretary of State for India in Council.

Vol. I., demy 8vo, xii and 239 pp., cloth, price 12s.

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR TESTING TELEGRAPH LINES
And the Technical Arrangements of Offices.**

Originally Written on behalf of the Government of India, under the Orders of the Director General of Telegraphs in India.

By LOUIS SOHWENDLER.

London: TRÜBNER & CO., Ludgate Hill.

NOW READY.

Second Edition, Enlarged. Crown 8vo, pp. 174, cloth, 2s. 6d.

LECTURES on Popular and Scientific Subjects.

By the EARL of GAITHNESS, F.R.S.

*Delivered at various Times and Places.**Contents:* Coal and Coal Mines—Science applied to Art—A Penny's Worth; or, Take care of the Pence and the Pounds will take care of Themselves—Past and Present Means of Communication—The Steam Engine—On Attraction—The Oil from Linseed—Hodge Podge; or, What's Itailt.Complete in 34 Parts, each part containing 2 Plates with descriptive Text, in large folio size.
Price 2s. 6d. per part.**THE CLASSICS OF PAINTING.**

ITALIAN EARLY AND HIGH RENAISSANCE.

*A Collection of the most Celebrated Masterpieces of the Golden Age of Painting,
Reproduced in Fadeless Phototype.*

With Biographical and descriptive Text by Dr. P. F. KRELL,

Professor of Art-History in the Academy of Industrial Art at Munich.

With the Co-operation of Dr. O. EISENMANN, Director of the Art Gallery at Cassel; and Dr. F. REBER, Director of the Art Gallery at Munich.

Translation from the German by E. D'ESTERRE-KEELING, Edited by J. LEONARD CORNING.

Professor VON LÜBKE says, in speaking of the "Classics of Painting":—"The whole forms a sketch of the History of Painting, illustrated so magnificently as to be an unique treasure in German Literature. That, however, which gives especial value to this most timely undertaking, is the fact that we are here presented with all that is most beautiful in Painting in the most suitable form, and exquisitely got up; at the same time at so reasonable a price that one may obtain a whole Gallery of Masterpieces in beautiful copies for a sum that would often scarcely suffice to purchase a single engraving. The undertaking has my most hearty wishes for its success, because it is eminently adapted to further the highest interests of Art-Education, and because it is presented to us in a form thoroughly worthy of the subject. It begins with the great Masters, who, about the middle of the 15th Century, prepared the way for the freedom and development of Italian Art, and continues its task till it reaches its meridian in the Flemish, Dutch, and Spanish Schools of the 17th Century, at which period Art attains her highest and fullest perfection in the complete realization of the true artistic element. When we consider the difficulties of the undertaking, the obstacles in obtaining access to the materials, the diverse value of the reproductions upon which it is based, consisting mostly of copperplates, sometimes also of lithographs, we must greet this work with unqualified approval, which as a whole has succeeded well, and which, in the best and widest sense, we may most warmly recommend as a popular Home Gallery, likely to prove a welcome means to the further spread of Art-Education."

THE ENGLISH AND FOREIGN PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY.*The following New Editions are Now Ready:—*

Vols. I. III. SECOND EDITION. Vol. I. post 8vo, pp. 350, cloth, price 10s. 6d.

A HISTORY OF MATERIALISM,*And Criticism of its Present Importance.*

By FREDERICK ALBERT LANGE,

Late Professor of Philosophy in the Universities of Zürich and Marburg.

Authorized Translation by ERNEST C. THOMAS, late Scholar of Trinity College, Oxford.

"The book is marked throughout by singular ability, abounds in striking and suggestive reflections, subtle and profound discussions, felicitous and graphic descriptions of mental and social movements, both in themselves and in their mutual relations."—*Scotsman*.Vol. II. *Will be published in February.*Vol. III. *In preparation.*

Vol. IV.] SECOND EDITION. Post 8vo, pp. 366, cloth, price 10s. 6d.

NATURAL LAW: An Essay in Ethics.

By EDITH SIMCOX.

"This thoughtful and able work is in many respects the most important contribution yet made to the ethics of the evolution theory."—*Mind*.

Vols. V. VI.] SIXTH EDITION, Two Volumes, post 8vo, pp. 280 and 200, cloth, price 15s.

THE CREED OF CHRISTENDOM:*Its Foundation Contrasted with its Superstructure.*

By W. R. GREG.

With a New Introduction.

"This work remains a monument of his industry, his high literary power, his clear intellect, and his resolute desire to arrive at the truth. In its present shape, with its new introduction, it will be still more widely read, and more warmly welcomed by those who believe that in a contest between Truth and Error, Truth can never be worsted."—*Scotsman*.

London: TRÜBNER & CO., Ludgate Hill.

THE MOST POPULAR STANDARD WORK OF THE DAY ON THE
DRINK QUESTION.

Crown 8vo, cloth, pp. viii-288, price 10s. 6d.

THE HISTORY OF DRINK.

A Review, Social, Scientific, and Political.

By JAMES SAMUELSON, of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

"Throughout, Mr. Samuelson writes with an entire mastery of all the facts and statistics of a most important, difficult, and complicated subject, and all he has to say is marked by good sense, feeling, and vigour. Fully aware of all the difficulties of the case, he is yet convinced of the necessity that something should be done on behalf of the well-being of the human race. His aim is to aid the cause of temperance reform; thus to raise the standard of morality and to ameliorate the condition of the poor and ignorant. A nobler aim, of course, could not be found, and if statistics ever help to prove the moral worth of any crusade against evil, and men can be roused into action against their deadliest enemy, this 'History of Drink' will be found of real and lasting value to a cause of national importance."—*Standard*.

"Mr. Samuelson has collected much valuable information concerning the use of intoxicating liquors among the Egyptians, the Romans, and the Germans. . . . Although throughout his book he shows a decided leaning towards the political temperance party, we think that he maintains a fairly impartial position on the subject. . . . Mr. Samuelson's interesting volume contains ample proof of the fact that, even when a country appears to be mostly besotted by the sin of intemperance, it is endowed with a power of moral recovery which, if once effectually exercised, will soon enable it to take its place among sober nations."—*Athenæum*.

"Mr. Samuelson's volume abounds in excellent and entertaining material; it is written with much vigour and concentration of words to the point. We could not indicate a better volume with which a thoughtful reader might beguile his time than this careful and succinct history, in which there is no proselytising, no indiscreet partiality. Mr. Samuelson has written a valuable and instructive history of a prominent subject at this moment, and has written it with considerable care, with modesty, and with perfect impartiality; and he will be rewarded, doubtless, by the success his chapters will achieve."—*Lloyd's Weekly News*.

"We have to thank Mr. Samuelson for the pleasure of reading an entertaining and instructive book, on the compilation of which very commendable care and research have been bestowed."—*Globe*.

"Mr. Samuelson's book is worth reading, for it is clear, fair in tone, and almost amusingly simple, though it is far from being scientific."—*Saturday Review*.

"The 'History of Drink' is a pleasantly readable book and recommendable, because it fills a gap that has existed for some time in the literature of this important subject."—*Lancet*.

"The appearance, not inopportunistly, of Mr. Samuelson's work treating of the drinking habits of different nations, ancient and modern, will probably give a further impetus to the consideration of the question, while that part devoted to an examination of the effects of alcohol and wine on the human system is certain to provoke comment."—*Daily Telegraph*.

"This book is based on wide reading and careful collation of authorities, and the complete fairness of spirit which characterises it gives it a claim to general attention which works on the liquor question seldom possess."—*Scotsman*.

"This new work is, however, one of great intrinsic worth. It is full of learning and devoid of bias. We regret that our limits do not allow us to dwell upon Mr. Samuelson's able and acute examination of drink statistics, but we may say that his conclusions are directly opposed to the views often promulgated in the daily press, that drunkenness is on the increase."—*Examiner*.

"The work now before us is by far the best and most exhaustive that has appeared. . . . This book will chiefly commend itself to a large number of readers for the complete and exhaustive descriptions of the drinking customs of all nations in all ages, and as such we advise all interested in the question to read it, and they will be well repaid."—*Brewers' Guardian*.

"It is wonderfully interesting and deeply instructive. There is no dryness from beginning to end."—*Catholic Times*.

"It is not too much to say of this volume, that if it contains the history of drink, it contains at the same time much of the philosophy of a wise temperance."—*Liverpool Mercury*.

"Brimful of interest to all who have the welfare of the community at heart."—*Temperance Crusade*.

"We are pleased to give Mr. Samuelson's book a hearty word of praise. . . . A very chatty and agreeable, whilst useful, treatise upon the general history of the drinks and drinking customs of all times and ages."—*Country Brewers' Gazette*.

NEARLY READY.

In Two Volumes, post 8vo, pp. xx-709, xiii-707, cloth.

AN ACCOUNT OF

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF FRANCIS BACON:

Extracted from the Edition of his Occasional Writings by JAMES SPEDDING.

This work is an endeavour to give to the public such a condensation from Mr. Spedding's larger work as would enable them to read a Biography of Bacon, which should present the result of the most thorough criticism and enquiry, and include so much of Contemporary History as is needed to give the Life its proper setting. Bacon's Letters form a considerable portion of the original work, but in any popular and brief Life the majority of them are not essential to the reader, although necessary to the writer.

The task of condensation was undertaken with Mr. Spedding's permission, and these Two Volumes are published in this country with his consent. When the selections had been made, Mr. Spedding examined them with a view of their being read as a separate Life, inserted what he thought wanting in the way of connection or explanation, and corrected such errors or supplied such deficiencies as he had discovered since the publication of his original work. The book therefore, as it now stands, may be regarded as embodying the Editor's conception of what would be chosen to form a short and popular Life with Mr. Spedding's final literary revision. For the selection, though modified here and there according to Mr. Spedding's suggestions, the Editor is responsible. The text is wholly Mr. Spedding's.

Fifth Edition, with a New Preface and Steel Engraving, crown 8vo, cloth.

SAPPHO:

A Tragedy in Five Acts.

By STELLA,

Author of "Records of the Heart," "The King's Stratagem," &c.

"It presents us with a vivid picture of the violet-crowned Lesbian.—*Daily Telegraph*.

"The play is full of fire and force, and is thoroughly readable."—*Graphic*.

Second Corrected and Enlarged Edition, in One Vol. 4to, with 34 Plates and Map.

ELEMENTS OF SOUTH INDIAN PALÆOGRAPHY.

From the Fourth to the Seventeenth Century, A.D.

By A. O. BURNELL.

"When this book was originally printed in 1874, but little had been done in respect of Indian Inscriptions; since then, Mr. Fleet and others have added much to what was known, and thus, with the help of the exhaustive reviews of the first edition by Professor Weber, in the 'Jenener Literaturzeitung,' and by M. A. Barth, in the 'Revue Critique,' as well as the opportunities afforded to me by a visit to Java in 1876, I am enabled now to bring out a revised and enlarged edition."—AUTHOR'S NOTE.

In One Volume, post 8vo, about 400 pp.

THE LETTERS OF PLINY THE YOUNGER.

Translated by J. D. LEWIS, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.

Whilst Germany can boast of at least four scholar-like translations of Pliny's Letters, England has never had a real translation in our present sense, only the spirited "renderings" of Lords Orrery and Melmoth of more than a century ago.

Second Edition, crown 8vo.

LECTURES ON WELSH PHILOLOGY.

By JOHN RHYS.

Greatly to the surprise and gratification of both author and publishers, the first edition of this work was virtually disposed of in a few months; roughly speaking, it was bought up in Wales, or by men connected with Wales, and that before it had been reviewed by the public press. But such a practical and highly creditable proof of the deep and lasting interest which the Kymry take in their language left but few copies to meet the demand to be expected from philologists here and abroad. Under the circumstances it has been thought fit to prepare another edition, which will be found to be a new one, and not a reprint of the first, as no trouble or expense has been spared in thoroughly revising every page; in the process the work has been so enlarged as to contain about one-fourth as much matter again as it originally did, though its original appearance and volume have been preserved as far as was found practicable. The author has let slip no opportunity of examining for himself the inscriptions that have recently come to light in different parts of Wales, or of profiting by the valuable suggestions of philological friends and the searching criticism of English, French and German reviewers.

London: TRÜBNER & CO., Ludgate Hill.

Official and other Authorised Publications. Just Issued.

PUBLICATIONS OF HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.

UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE WAR OFFICE.

- AIDE-MEMOIRE** for the Use of Officers of Royal Engineers. Compiled by Colonel A. C. COOKE, C.B., R.E., with Contributions and Assistance from other Officers. Vol. I. Formulae, Tables, Military Statistics, and Memoranda for the Field. 16mo, 12s. 6d.
- REVISED ARMY REGULATIONS.** Vol. VI. Regulations for the Medical Department of Her Majesty's Army. War Office, 1st November, 1878. 8vo, pp. 236, price 3s.

UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS IN IRELAND.

- FACSIMILES OF NATIONAL MANUSCRIPTS OF IRELAND.** Selected and edited, under the Direction of the Right Hon. EDWARD SULLIVAN, Master of the Rolls in Ireland, by JOHN T. GILBERT, F.S.A., M.R.I.A., late Secretary of the Public Record Office of Ireland; and Photozincographed, by command of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, by Major General Sir HENRY JAMES, R.E., F.R.S., late Director-General of the Ordnance Survey. Part II. Folio, half-roan, price 42s.

BY ORDER OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA.

- AFGHANISTAN—Correspondence** respecting the Relations between the British Government and that of Afghanistan since the Accession of the Amcer SHERE ALI KHAN. Fcap. folio, pp. vi. and 266, price 2s. 10d.
- AFGHANISTAN, No 2.** Further Papers relating to the Affairs of Afghanistan. Fcap. folio, pp. 22, 3d.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF VICTORIA.

Just Published, in Two Vols., pp. lxii-488 and vi-456, Maps, Plates, and Woodcuts, cloth. Price £3 3s.

- THE ABORIGINES OF VICTORIA.** With Notes relating to the Habits of the Natives of other Parts of Australia and Tasmania. Compiled from various sources for the Government of Victoria, by R. BROUGH SMYTH, F.L.S., F.G.S., &c. &c.

The author, when he was appointed, sixteen years ago, Secretary of the Board for the Protection of the Aborigines, commenced collecting information respecting the customs of the people who had formerly owned the soil of Australia, and to make accurate drawings of their weapons and ornaments. Having no idea in the beginning that the work would be an extensive one, it has yet grown into the two large volumes now published. Although principally confined to the habits of the aboriginal natives of Victoria, there is much in it that treats of the customs observed in other parts of Australia, and some information also respecting the race that formerly inhabited Tasmania. The work is divided into the following sections:—Physical Character—Mental Character—Numbers and Distribution—Birth and Education—Marriage—Death and Burial of the Dead—Daily Life—Food—Diseases—Dress and Personal Ornaments—Weapons—Implements and Manufactures—Stone Implements—Nets and Fish Hooks—Methods of Producing Fire—Canoes—Myths—Language—Appendices—The Aborigines of Tasmania, &c. The Two Volumes contain upwards of 200 illustrations, with a large Map of Victoria.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE NEW SHAKSPERE SOCIETY.

- Series I.** No. 5. TRANSACTIONS, 1877-79. Part I.
- Series VI.** SHAKSPERE'S ENGLAND. No. 2. Harrison's Description of England in Shakspeare's Youth. The Second and Third Books. Edited from the first two editions of Holinshed's Chronicle, A.D. 1577, 1587, by FREDERICK J. FURNIVALL, M.A. Part 2. *The Third Book.*
- Series VIII.** MISCELLANIES. No. 2. ROBERT CHESTER'S Love's Martyr; or, Rosalin's Complaint. 1601. Edited by the Rev. ALEXANDER B. GROSART, LL.D.
Subscription £1 1s. per annum.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE ENGLISH DIALECT SOCIETY.

- Series C.** No. 22. ORIGINAL GLOSSARIES, and Glossaries with fresh Additions. IX. A Dictionary of English Plant-Names. By JAMES BRITTEN, F.L.S. (Department of Botany, British Museum), and ROBERT HOLLAND. Part I. Price 8s. 6d.
Subscription £1 per annum.

London: TRÜBNER & CO., Agents by Appointment.

NEW AMERICAN BOOKS.

In Two Vols., imperial 4to. Vol. I. AUTHORS AND TITLES. Vol. II. SUBJECTS.

THE AMERICAN CATALOGUE OF BOOKS

In Print and for Sale, July 1, 1878. Vol. I., Part 1, A. to Edwards.

Sold by Subscription only. Price, Complete in Two Vols., £7 10s. Vol. I. will be published in Four Parts. Vol. II. complete.

*^s As but a limited Edition will be printed and no plates will be kept, to prevent disappointment Subscribers are requested to send their names as early as possible.

In Twenty-five Parts, folio, each Part containing Two fine Illustrations in Chromo-Lithography, with descriptive letterpress in French and English. Price £10.

TREASURES OF ART, INDUSTRY, AND MANUFACTURES,

As represented at the Centennial Exhibition of 1876.

Edited by General O. B. NORTON.

The Illustrations of Foreign Exhibits comprise the CERAMICS of China, England, France, and Sweden, STATUARY of Italy and of the United States, BRONZES of Japan and Germany, CURIOUS POTTERY of South America, EMBROIDERY of Switzerland and the East Indies, DAMASCENE WORK of Spain, ARMOUR and ARMS of Turkey and Tunis, together with the best Manufactures of America.

*^s The Edition is necessarily limited, and it is desirable that Orders should be sent as early as possible.

ORATORY AND ORATORS. The Power and Influence of the Orator—Is Oratory a Lost Art?—Qualifications, Trials, and Helps—Tests of Eloquence—Personalities—Political Orators: English, Irish, American—Forensic and Pulpit Orators, &c. By W. MATHEWS, LL.D. Crown 8vo, cloth, pp. viii-456. Chicago. 10s.

GEORGIA: A Guide to its Cities, Towns, Scenery, and Resources. With Tables containing valuable Information for persons desiring to Settle or to make Investments within the limits of the State. By J. T. DERRY. Illustrated. 12mo, cloth, pp. 200. Philadelphia. 5s.

FIRST ANNUAL REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES ENTOMOLOGICAL COMMISSION for the Year 1877. Relating to the Rocky Mountain Locust, and the Best Methods of Preventing its Injuries and of Guarding against its Invasions, in pursuance of an Appropriation made by Congress for this purpose. With Maps and Illustrations. 8vo, cloth, pp. xvi-477 and 294. Washington. £1 1s.

REPORTS UPON THE ASTRONOMICAL DETERMINATIONS at Main Stations occupied in the Years 1872, 1873, and 1874, and Results of Barometric Observations of the Years 1871, 1872, 1873, 1874, and 1875. In Two Parts. Illustrated by 22 Plates and Three Woodcuts. Part I. REPORTS UPON THE ASTRONOMICAL DETERMINATIONS at Main Stations in Nevada, Utah, Montana, Wyoming, Nebraska, Colorado, and New Mexico, occupied in the Years 1872, 1873, and 1874. By Dr. F. KAMPE, JOHN H. CLARK, W. W. MARYATT, and Professor T. H. SAFFORD. With list of Geographical Positions, &c. Part II. RESULTS IN BAROMETRIC HYPSONETRY, obtained during the years 1871, 1872, 1873, 1874, and 1875. Reported by First-Lieutenant Wm. L. MARSHALL, Corps of Engineers, U.S.A. With Tables of Barometrically Determined Altitudes. 4to, cloth, pp. xiii. and 571. Washington, 1877. £5 5s.

A GUIDE TO THE PRACTICAL EXAMINATION OF URINE, for the Use of Physicians and Students. By JAMES TYSON, M.D. Second Edition, revised and improved. Crown 8vo, cloth, pp. 172. With Illustrations. Philadelphia. 6s. 6d.

WRINKLES AND RECIPES, compiled from the "Scientific American." A Collection of Practical Suggestions, Processes, and Directions for the Mechanic, the Engineer, the Farmer, and the Housekeeper. Edited by PARK BENJAMIN, Ph.D. Revised by R. H. THURSTON, P. H. VANDER WEYDE, R. H. BUEL, and JOSHUA ROSE. Thirteenth Edition, 12mo, cloth, with Coloured Frontispiece and numerous Illustrations, pp. 300. New York. 10s.

GOLD AND DEBT: An American Handbook of Finance. With over 80 Tables and Diagrams illustrative of Financial Subjects. Also a Digest of the Monetary Laws of the United States. By W. L. FAWCETT. Second Edition. 12mo, cloth, pp. 270. Chicago. 9s.

REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES, &c., NOW READY.

THE GEOGRAPHICAL MAGAZINE.

This Magazine has ceased to appear. Its place will be occupied by the New Series of the "PROCEEDINGS OF THE ROYAL GEOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY AND MONTHLY RECORD OF GEOGRAPHY." The price will be the same, 2s. 6d. per Number, but it will be published by Mr. E. STANFORD, Charing Cross, from whom any information can be obtained.

THE GEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE;

Or, MONTHLY JOURNAL OF GEOLOGY. *January, 1879, price 1s. 6d.*

On the Tripartite Classification of the Lower Palæozoic Rocks. By C. LAIWOHL, F.G.S.
 On the Volcanos of the Bay of Bengal. By Y. BALL, M.A., F.G.S. (Plate I.)
 Historical Geology of Cornwall. By W. A. E. USSHER, F.G.S. (Part I.)
 Notices of Memoirs.
 Reviews.
 Reports and Proceedings.
 Correspondence.

Annual Subscription, including postage, 18s.

THE ATLANTIC MONTHLY.

Devoted to LITERATURE, SCIENCE, ART, AND POLITICS. *January, 1879, price 1s.*

Aspects of American Life. By C. D. WARNER.
 Ancestors. By J. T. TROWBRIDGE.
 The Latest Songs of Chivalry. By H. W. PARSON.
 The Lady of the Aroostook. XI.—XIV. By W. D. HOWELLS.
 Round the World at the Paris Exhibition.
 The Pines of Eden. By G. P. LATHROP.
 A Birthday. By H. P. SPOFFORD.
 Working Men's Wives.
 Is Universal Suffrage a Failure? By GOLDWIN SMITH.
 The Dead Feast of the Kol-Folk. By J. G. WHITTIER.
 Our New Neighbours at Ponkapog. By T. B. ALDRICH.
 Americans. VI. By R. G. WHITE.
 An Artist's Model. By K. P. OGDON.
 A Student's Sea Story. By H. B. STOWE.
 The Contributors' Club. Recent Literature.

Annual Subscription, including postage, 14s.

THE "ATLANTIC" PORTRAIT FOR 1879.—An admirable Life-size Portrait of JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, executed by Mr. J. E. BAKER, and uniform in size and style with Portraits of LONGFELLOW, BRYANT, and WHITTIER, has been prepared for Subscribers to the Atlantic Monthly, for 1879. Size 24 × 30. Price 4s.

THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

January, 1879, price 6s.

Dr. Johnson: His Biographers and Critics.
 The Papacy: Its Early Relations with Roman Catholic States.
 The Russians in Turkey.
 The Caroli Family.
 Afghanistan.
 Machiavelli.
 India and our Colonial Empire.
 Contemporary Literature.—Theology—Philosophy—Politics, &c.—Science
 History and Biography—Belles Lettres—Miscellanea.

Annual Subscription, including postage, 22s.

THE PRINCETON REVIEW.

Devoted to THEOLOGY, PHILOSOPHY, POLITICS, SCIENCE, LITERATURE AND ART.

Published Bi-monthly. Annual Subscription, 9s.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND ARTS.

Edited by JAS. D. and E. S. DANA and B. SILLIMAN.

Published Monthly, price 2s. 6d. Annual Subscription, £1 10s.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THE MEDICAL SCIENCES.

Edited by ISAAC and J. M. HAYES, A.M., M.D.

Published Quarterly, price 7s. 6d. Annual Subscription, £1 10s.

It is respectfully requested that New Subscribers will send in their names as early in January as possible, in order to avoid disappointment.

of S. Petro in Vinculi, to commemorate the festival of St. Peter in *Vinculis*. If they had been forged for the express purpose of exhibition, and are really antique, it is far more probable that they had been once worn by some barbarian captive. The special commissioners of the Pope supplied the absence of evidence by dogmatic denunciations of those who were so audacious as to express doubts either as to the facts, or the proofs.

It may, perhaps, be inferred, that any traditional resemblance of the Apostle was not deemed by his early successors trustworthy. They accordingly felt themselves justified in transmuting the ancient bronze statue of Jupiter Capitolanus, from the Capitol of Pagan Rome, into the modern personification of St. Peter. Having been exorcised and purified by Papal consecration, with a key substituted in its hand for a thunderbolt, it may be seen placed near the altar, under the glorious dome dedicated to his memory. The feet present evident marks of being worn away from the many fervid kisses impressed upon them by the lips of pilgrims, who were, we may feel assured, never made acquainted by its jealous guardians with its heathen origin. The saint has not himself bequeathed to posterity any trace of his having selected Rome as his spiritual domicile, and there is no allusion to him in the five epistles which St. Paul unquestionably addressed from that city. In the numerous vestiges of early Christian art which modern research has brought to light from the Roman Catacombs, there are figures apparently representing St. Paul, but no resemblance can be traced amongst them to the general conception entertained with respect to the founder of the Church. The pretended relic of the chair was not, however, passed over by the Papal delegates, but they forgot to mention an unlucky discovery once made when cleaning it, which led to its withdrawal, in 1662, by Pope Alexander VII. from public view. We have, however, been recently assured by a high ecclesiastical authority, the Rev. J. Spencer Northcote, D.D., President of St. Mary's College at Ascot, that after a seclusion of over two centuries, it is one of the merits of Pope Pius IX. that by his orders it has been, as the reverend author informs us, again "exposed to the veneration of the faithful."* We are in doubt as to the motives which induced this suppression, but we may perhaps assume that Pope Alexander, more scrupulous than Pius IX., might have deemed the pretended relic a gross imposture even upon those whom the pious president designates as "the faithful." Mr. Northcote has described the ivory engraved ornaments of the chair which cover the panel, as interlaid with thin laminæ of gold let into the lines of the engraving. St. Peter

* "Roma Sotterranea." London, 1869. Appendix, pp. 389-902.

had been selected as chief of the apostles principally for his humility, but the chair is furnished with iron rings in order to enable it to be borne with its living burden on the shoulders of slaves. It would seem, therefore, highly improbable that the poor fisherman of Galilee, with the earthly example of his Master in his memory, would have indulged in the ostentatious pride of being triumphantly exhibited in such a seat to the gaping crowds of a populous city, at a period during which the spirit of persecution was driving the Christians, who had not as yet become Roman Catholics, to seek the shelter and seclusion of the Catacombs.

During the abeyance of the supposititious chair which a Papal injunction had thus shielded from detection by mortal eyes, the popes flinging away even the pretence of humility, aspired to a far more gorgeous throne of state. The pretended relic of St. Peter having been thus abandoned as a link in the chain of proof, that which has been substituted for the curule chair is better adapted for pontifical displays, their object being to dazzle and delude. The most frequent, and perhaps the most prominent of these exhibitions at St. Peter's, had been thus described by an English Roman Catholic clergyman before the days in which Ultramontanism became so rampant.

“When the Pope celebrates divine service, the great or middle doors of the church are thrown open; the procession enters, and advances slowly in two lines, between two ranks of soldiers, up the nave. This majestic procession is closed by the Pontiff himself seated in a chair of state, supported by twenty valets half-concealed in the drapery that falls in loose folds from the throne; he is crowned with his tiara, and bestows his benediction on the crowds who kneel at both sides as he is borne along.”*

Then follows “the adoration of the people,” a scene at which the pious and reverend author cannot suppress his astonishment. “Why should the altar be converted into the footstool of a monarch?† The tiara worn on these occasions may perhaps be deemed a type of temporal power; it is composed of the iron crown of the Lombard kings, whose dynasty was terminated in the eighth century by the invasion of Charlemagne, and as now represented is bound by a fillet of iron, which the popes pretend had been hammered from one of the nails of the true cross, an assertion indignantly denied by the church of Milan, which had been the capital of the Lombard kingdom. The three circlets which confer upon it the title of the triple crown were subse-

* “Classical Tour in Italy,” by the Rev. John Chetwode Eustace, vol. ii. pp. 167-8.

† *Ibid.* vol. iv. p. 333.

quently added at distinct periods and for different mystic reasons. It may be therefore seen that the Papal Church has dogmatically decreed as acknowledged facts mere speculations involved in the gravest doubts. We cannot, however, pass from the inquiry whether St. Peter was ever at Rome without recording the deliberate conclusion of our highest historical authority, the late Earl Russell, a conclusion most probably formed after a careful study of the works published in 1872 by the authority of the late Pope in Rome, which contain the researches and arguments of the six learned commissioners to whom the proof was confided. "The rumoured journey of St. Peter to Rome, and his establishment there as the first bishop, rests on no authentic document, and is probably one of the many fictions which were invented in other times to adorn and elevate the Roman Pontiff."*

The Bishops of Rome had been originally elected by the people, combined with the inferior clergy of that city, and being invested with a sacred character, had acquired in the early ages of the Church the affection as well as the reverence of those to whom they owed their elevation. The possessions of those bishops were but limited, and were held by them merely as trustees for the public. The apostolic constitutions and ancient canons of the Church are express in their directions that the elections should be open and free, while they condemned any attempt to force a prelate on a reluctant community. By the corruptions which time and ambition engender, the promotion of bishops to the popedom was summarily transferred by papal usurpation to the college or consistory composed exclusively of cardinals. The term cardinal would seem to have been borrowed from the Imperial Court, at which the principal officers of state had that appellation added as a distinction to their dignities. The derivation of the term has been traced to the Latin word "*cardo*," a hinge, and as applied to courtiers, it imputes to them that they are flexible and easily turned. When adopted by the Church, the popes forbade the Holy Roman Empire to use the phrase, and they have since arbitrarily applied it exclusively to its own nominees. At its first selection as an ecclesiastical term it had a far different meaning from that which it at present bears, having been merely applicable to those parochial clergy who were attached by residence to the cathedral church at Rome; there were accordingly cardinal deans and cardinal deacons. The *Pontifex Maximus* had been the high priest of pagan Rome, to whom the especial supervision of all heathen

* "Essays on the History of the Christian Church," by John, Earl Russell, London, 1873. P. 81.

sacrifices had been confided. The name was adopted by the early Bishops of Rome, and now forms in the title of the sovereign pontiff the highest spiritual designation of the pope. It is vain to deny that some of the early popes might as patriots claim historical distinction, having during the long struggles between foreign domination and Italian independence frequently preserved the freedom of the city and of its inhabitants from the inroads of the turbulent barons, and the absentee oppression of the Germanic hordes. We can, however, scarcely expect that future popes or cardinals, having for ages assumed and exercised a cosmopolitan ascendancy in spiritual discipline over their co-religionists in all nations of the globe, will easily abandon their position by a suicidal delegation of their authority to crowns or states.

In the course of years the ambition to acquired territorial possessions grew with the assertion of Papal supremacy, and both combined to excite among its priesthood intense anxiety for the general aggrandisement of their church. That feeling acquired for the Papal Court on its long and varied career, a reputation for the falsification and fabrication of its titles. Its forgeries were not confined to territorial donations, books pretending to express the prophetic inspirations of the pagan Sibyls were also fabricated, even Eusebius, one of the greatest among the early Christian Fathers, did not disdain to commend the pious fraud, and in a discourse, still extant, dwelt with complacency on the insertion of specious predictions in Sibylline verses, when they suited the requirements of the church.* The donation of Constantine was supposed to have been conferred by that imperial convert, so as to render the Bishop of Rome his Viceroy, when he was himself absent at Byzantium in the east, the new capital which he founded and which bears his name. Time was when to question its authenticity would have been deemed heresy, but it is now acknowledged by all the authorities even at the Vatican, to have been an audacious and clumsy forgery. Under colour of that fraud, the early popes assumed and exercised supreme authority, secular as well as spiritual, over every land which was presumed to have submitted to the dominion of pagan Rome.

The adoption of a corrupted Latin into the religious service of the church was in furtherance of that design with the view of its substitution among nations in which it was neither spoken nor understood, for their own language would render the Papal authority co-extensive with the conquests of the most remarkable people that ever existed.

* "De Sibylla Erythræa! Constantini Imperatoris Oratio ad Sanctorum Cœtum. Opera Eusebii," tome viii. cc. 18-19, Paris, 1842.

There is no name in the long line of pontiffs, whose memory is regarded with more admiration by Ultramontane devotees, or whose elevation was viewed with more awe by his cotemporaries, than that of Hildebrand, the ambitious Benedictine from the monastery of Cluni, in the ancient Duchy of Burgundy. The Bishops of Rome had, in the eighth century, adopted the practice of changing their names, in which they professed to imitate the Apostle, who was first Simon, then Cephas, and finally Peter. Hildebrand, whose name would imply a Teutonic origin, commenced his Pontificate by a declaration that he had been elected pope against his will, but he immediately assumed the title of Gregory VII. As pope he had early acquired the favour, and was even suspected of having fascinated the affections, of Matilda, Marchioness of Tuscany, distinguished in history as the Great Countess. The Marquisate had been a fief of the ancient family of Este, which in Italy had given Ducal titles to Ferrara and Modena, in Germany to Bavaria and Brunswick, and ultimately a line of sovereigns to Great Britain. Matilda, who had inherited large Italian territories, but whose previous reputation had not been unstained in becoming the favourite of Gregory, subjected herself to those peculiarly persuasive influences, which even to this day continue to make their deepest and most lasting impressions on high and titled dowagers. Having proved herself by her piety a most devoted daughter of the Church, by her heroism and martial bearing in the wars which the ambition of Hildebrand entailed on her patrimonial territories, she obtained the distinctive appellation of being its Amazon. The Pope finally succeeded in procuring from his wealthy and zealous devotee a donation, after her death, of her rich domains.

These possessions, thus acquired, formed the principal portion of the Papal States, in right of which the popes asserted their temporal power as sovereigns. In the hope of inducing the inhabitants to believe that they had been derived through an Apostolic title, they were further designated as the patrimony of St. Peter. They were governed for centuries by an elective hierarchy, the ministerial officials having been either prelates or priests; and from their analogy to legates, the Papal estates also acquired the name of the Legations. Under the management of such rulers it may be naturally assumed that the population of those states exhibited but few of the characteristic qualities of their Roman ancestors. All the noble instincts and aspirations of their manhood, so illustrious for ages, would seem to have been extinguished or subdued; lassitude and idleness pervaded every class beneath the pressure of sacerdotal exaction; agriculture declined, manufactures became extinct, and that of the mendicant was the only profession or branch of trade that flourished. This degradation

continued down to our own times, until the Papal States were embodied in the modern kingdom of united Italy.

We know but little of the cloister life of Hildebrand, but as pope he may be deemed the despotic reformer of the Church, and his pontificate forms the political and religious history of Europe during his time. He was the author of that enforced celibacy which still prevails among the Papal clergy, and he compelled married priests to part with their wives ; thus sanctioning divorce — a practice which the Church now condemns with dogmatic denunciation. Although the reputed successors of St. Peter had early commenced their career of usurpation, no pope had ever advanced the theory of Papal ascendancy over sovereigns and states so arrogantly as Gregory VII. By his haughty anathemas he succeeded in reducing Henry III., Emperor of Germany, bare-headed and bare-footed at the castle of Canossa, in Northern Italy, to the lowest level of self-abasement. The humiliating degradation would be scarcely credible if it were not established by the terms of adulation with which the scene has been treated by Ultramontane enthusiasts, who even now seek to celebrate its anniversary as the most signal triumph of the Church.

The Norman Conquest has been ever deemed a most important era in the historical annals of England. Gregory VII. had favoured at Rome the claims of William, Duke of Normandy, declaring that he was the rightful heir to the English crown, and that his rival, Harold, was a usurper. The Pope, after the death of Harold, sent a special legate, named Hubert, to the first of our Norman sovereigns, to collect tribute in the shape of Peter's pence, and to demand submission from the king. Hildebrand had probably been emboldened by his success over the Imperial potentate, and perhaps anticipated some return for his previous support of the conqueror. Gregory admonished the king to prove his liberality to St. Peter, in order to make that saint his debtor, who would assuredly repay the amount in time of need.* William, as a pious son of the Church, was willing to accept the security, but sternly refused to acknowledge the fealty ; and the legate announced that without the submission the money would be valueless. When refusing the oath of vassalage, " I hold my kingdom of God and of my sword" was the stern and dignified declaration of the Norman warrior. The tribute he would pay because his predecessor had paid it, but in a letter missive, which he forwarded to Rome, his determination was equally emphatic : "*Fidelitatem facere Nobis, nec Volo ; quia nec Ego promisi,*

* Bowden's "Life of Gregory VII." London, 1840. Vol. ii. p. 40.

nec antecessores meos antecessoribus tuis id fecisse comperio."* It had been the policy of William to retain and consolidate the existing Anglo-Saxon laws, and, as a statistical record, *Doomsday Book* exceeds all subsequent compilations even of our own times. In dealing with the Papal Court, the king merely followed his Anglo-Saxon predecessor, Saint Edmond, king of the East Anglians, who died A.D. 870, by whose laws the supremacy of the Crown was declared, and that it should govern and rule the people of the land, and, above all things, the holy Church.† The Pope affected to be indignant at the tone of the Norman's epistle, but the legate, finding William inflexible, accepted the coin and waived the fealty.

The founder of the Norman dynasty still further restrained the assumptions of the Church by assertion of the Royal prerogative, in forbidding his people to recognise the authority of any pontiff without his previous consent. He also decreed that all letters coming from the Court of Rome should be submitted to him for his approval. He would not permit the decisions of synods, either national or provincial, to be put in execution without his approbation, and he enjoined the ecclesiastical courts not to pursue or excommunicate any of his subjects without consulting the Crown as to the nature of the offence. The recent publication of the *Chronicles of William of Canterbury*,‡ throws light upon the contest between Henry II., the earliest Plantagenet sovereign, and Becket, the first native-born Englishman who, after the Conquest, was raised to the primacy, and who was afterwards canonised as St. Thomas. Henry, having early determined to imitate the founder of the monarchy, had, for that purpose, assembled a general council of nobles and prelates at Clarendon, near Salisbury, in Wiltshire, where the famous constitutions which bear that name were proposed and confirmed. It was the spirit of those decrees, sixteen in number, to control the assumed authority of the clergy over the civil classes, and to render them submissive to the same allegiance as the other subjects of the Crown. In framing these laws by a National Assembly, it was intended to assert the superiority of the Crown and of the legislature over Papal and ecclesiastical synods. Becket, as Archbishop, refused to seal the articles as affecting clerical immunities, and attempted to escape beyond the seas. The King became

* Selden's "Notes," p. 164, quoted in Thierry's "History of the Norman Conquest," lib. iv. p. 357.

† Chapter xix., quoted in "Memoirs of the Supremacy," by Thomas Brooke Clarke, LL.D. London, 1809. P. 10.

‡ "Materials for the History of Thomas Becket, edited by James Craigie Robertson, M.A., among the Ancient Chronicles and State Papers." London, 1875.

indignant, and caused him to be summoned before the Royal Tribunal, where he was charged with having denied justice as Chancellor, and with not having accounted for his receipts while in office. He did not appear on an appeal, and was convicted of contumacy by a council held at Northampton. Being deserted by his English adherents, he secretly escaped from the monastery of St. Andrew at night, and fled to the Flemish coast. When the constitutions were transmitted to Pope Alexander III., they were summarily condemned, as infringing the sacred privileges of the Church, and formally annulled at Rome. The fate of Becket and the subsequent penitential abasement of the King are matters of history which do not fall within the purport of these pages. The memory of King John, the youngest son of Henry II., has been transmitted to posterity in darker colours than any of our early sovereigns, but Shakspeare, the truest chronicler of English feeling, has conferred on him one redeeming attribute in his answer to Pandulph the Papal legate, which we may perhaps assume was similar to that framed for transmission to the Pope at Rome.

“ Tell him this tale, and from the mouth of England,
 Add thus much more—That no Italian priest
 Shall tithe or toll in our dominions;
 But as we under Heaven are supreme head,
 So under Him that great supremacy,
 Where we do reign, we will alone uphold,
 Without the assistance of a mortal hand:
 So tell the Pope; all reverence set apart
 To him, and his usurped authority.”*

Edward I., who from the wisdom of his laws, had acquired the name of the English Justinian, in the seventh year of his reign, A.D. 1279, enacted at Westminster the statute of Mortmain, entitled in Latin, “*Statu' de Viris religiosis.*” “It is ordained by the advice of our prelates, earls, barons, and other of our subjects being of our council, that no person, religious or other, shall, under the colour of gift or lease take, or receive by reason of any other title, whatsoever it be, or by any other craft or engine, will presume to appropriate to himself any lands or tenements under pain of forfeiture of the same, whereby such lands or tenements may any wise come into Mortmain.” The statute then declared, “that if the Chief Lord immediate of the fee be negligent, the next Chief Lord was to take the benefit of the forfeiture, and on their neglecting for twelve months, that the King shall take it for the defence of the Realm.” By the Statute 3,

* “King John,” act iii. scene 1.

Edward I., c. 5, it was enacted that the election of bishops should be free, and by the 35 Edward I., c. 11,

“That no abbot, prior, master, or other religious person of whatsoever state, shall by himself or by merchants or others secretly or openly by any device or means carry or send, or by any means cause to be sent, any tax out of this kingdom and his dominion under the name of a rent, tallage, or any kind of imposition, or otherwise, or other contract howsoever it may be termed;” “And if any will presume to offend this present Statute, he shall be grievously punished according to the quality of his offence, and according to the contempt of the king’s prohibition.”

This penal law, which would seem to have been aimed at Peter’s pence, was confirmed by the 4 Edward III., c. 6, and also by the 5 Edward III.* The weak and timid Edward II. was deposed A.D. 1327, on the ground that he had received and allowed Bulls from the Bishops of Rome. His son Edward III., so renowned in our annals, and his Parliament, A.D. 1350-1, passed the famous statute of “Provisors of Benefices,” (25 Edward III.). It commenced by a declaration in the original Norman French, that “Le Pape de Rome acrochant à lui la Seignie de tieles possessions et benefices,” “comme il ne feust de droit selonc la loi D’Engleterre,” “et en offens and destruccion des lois et droites de son Roialme, et grant damage de son Peuple,” “et contre la bone disposicion de primis fondeurs.” It was then by the assent of the earls, barons, nobles, and all the community, and at their instance and request, ordained that the said grievances, oppressions, and damages in this same realm should not be suffered in any manner. The statute then prohibited all such collations being made by the Court of Rome [la Court de Rome], under pain of imprisonment or *death* of all persons who shall come from the Pope. The bishops were also forbidden to act contrary to its provisions. The Pope forwarded to England an angry missive against the Statute of Provisors, indulging in the same vituperative language with which we have become so familiar, when proceeding from the lips of Pius IX., in vain stigmatising the legislative measure as an “execrabile statutum,” and its enactment “*foedum et turpe facinus*.” A subsequent Act was shortly after passed in the same reign, A.D. 1351-2, which ordained that the purchase at the Court of Rome of provisions to have abbeys and priories in England was the destruction of the realm [“en destruccion du Roialme and de Sainte religion”]. It then declared that all persons offending should be out of the

* This statute is also in Latin, and the extract we have given is from the translation by the Record Commissioners, vol. ii. p. 151.

king's protection, and that a man might deal with them as enemies of the king and his realm.

A subsequent Statute of the same sovereign, 38 Edward III., c. 12, A.D. 1363, again complained of the enormity of citations obtained from Rome, and declared that the franchises of the realm had been, and be thereby impeached, blemished, and confounded, the Crown of the King [*abesse*] and his person [*fausement diffamée*] the treasure and riches of the realm carried away, and the inhabitants and subjects [*empovriz and troubli*]. The Statute then contained a declaration from the king [*etant regard à la quiete de son poeple, le quel il desire,* "à sustener en tranquillite, pais et repos, and governir selone les lois usages & franchises de sa terre, and si come tenuz yestp son serment donez en sa coronacion."]. Language could not more clearly define the cause and object of a legislative measure, or the evils which it was designed to suppress.

Even the feeble and vacillating Richard II. was compelled, by the encroachments in which the Papacy still persevered, to repeat and re-enact, by the 13 Rich. II., stat. 2, c. 2, the law as declared by the Act 25 Edw. III. against provisors. In order to give further effect to its intent, the prior statute of his grandfather's is set forth at length in that of his reign. This legislation was speedily followed by the famous statute also in Norman French of *Præmunire*, 16 Rich. II. c. 5—a term corrupted from, or perhaps synonymous with, the Latin word "*Præmonere*"—to warn. It commenced by a declaration that the Pope had awarded processes and sentences of excommunication against English bishops for executing the judgments of the King's courts. It then declared the dangers to be apprehended therefrom, should the Crown of England be submissive to the Pope, in which event the laws and statutes of the kingdom would be in abeyance, to the destruction of the king's sovereignty, his crown, his regalty, and all his realm. The statute, then, in accordance with its title, admonished all men not to hold communication with the See of Rome; and on the proposed measure being submitted to parliament, the Commons declared that they would stand by the king. The lords temporal answered every one for himself, that the causes aforesaid were clearly in derogation of the crown, and even the spiritual peers gave a reluctant and qualified assent. Henry IV. succeeded to the Crown, and, by another Act in his reign, A.D. 1400-1, the penalties of *Præmunire* were extended to any person of religion, and to any other person who should accept provision from the bishop of Rome, to be exempt from canonical obedience to the diocesan authorities. The period at which that Act was passed may perhaps be said to have been the first establishment of the English or Anglican Church. The

statutes of *Præmunire* are considered to be still in force, and even during the present reign, their provisions were deemed sufficient to prohibit diplomatic relations between Great Britain and the Papal Court of Rome. We have the authority of Lingard, the Roman Catholic historian, that in the succeeding reign of his illustrious son, Henry V., the hero of Agincourt, "Europe saw for the first time three pontiffs contending for the chair of St. Peter." We learn from the same source that—

"six persons from each of the five nations of Italy, Germany, England, France, and Spain entered the conclave, and at the nomination of the Bishop of London the Cardinal Colonna was unanimously chosen. He assumed the name of Martin V." "If the schism was thus terminated, it had previously given a shock to the temporal authority of the pontiffs, from which it never recovered. The contending rivals dared not employ the imperious tone of their predecessors." "Hence the pretensions which had given so much offence to the sovereigns were allowed to fall into desuetude—enactments hostile to the immunities or claims of the Church—were either passed over in silence, or but feebly opposed."*

So candid a confession of its previous audacity could scarcely have been anticipated from the apologist of the Papacy—an ecclesiastic of that church—and we commend the passage to the consideration of the ultramontane belligerents who now threaten the peace of Europe. One of those rival popes having issued a Bull requiring a tenth from the English clergy to carry on a war of extermination against those whom it styled "The Bohemian Heretics," Henry and his parliament, in the fifth year of his reign, A.D. 1418, rejected the papal authority, and ordained that the alien priories and abbeys of foreign monks should be suppressed, and their lands given to the Crown.

These protective laws were passed in the reigns of Roman Catholic kings, and sanctioned by parliaments in which sat Roman Catholic prelates and peers. The Reformation subsequently prohibited these islands from even acknowledging the assumed supremacy of the popes and from entering into those treaties which, under the name of "Concordats," have been concluded between the Papacy and France. Louis IX., known in history and canonized as St. Louis, before he had embarked in his first crusade, felt himself constrained to define in six articles the limits of temporal as well as of spiritual authority within his kingdom, and thus founded the future independence of the Gallican Church. That Church had early exhibited a strong feeling of nationality, and its most striking manifestation appeared A.D. 1258, in the

* "History of England," by John Lingard, D.D. London, 1849. Vol. iii. pp. 536-7.

council from which emanated "The Pragmatic Sanction of St. Louis.* A similar spirit was again displayed in the Assembly of the Estates in 1439 at Bourges, where the same principles were extended into twenty-three articles under the same title by the ordinance of Charles VII., who has been termed the last King of the Middle Ages. These articles compelled the popes to solicit as favours privileges which they had previously demanded as rights. The concordat between Francis I. and Leo X., signed at Bologna, in Italy, A.D. 1516, conferred on the French Crown the nomination to all bishoprics, abbeys, and priories, and it also abolished appeals to the Court of Rome. Some of the decrees issued by the Council of Trent were afterwards rejected by France as incompatible with the laws of the State. The great era, however, in the history of Gallicism was the assembly of the Gallican Church in 1682, from which emanated the celebrated declarations of the clergy. The articles containing its constitution were drawn up by the eminent Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, one of the Corinthian columns of the Church, and notwithstanding the intense bigotry of Louis XIV., they were confirmed and proclaimed by a royal ordinance. They emphatically declared, after the example of England, that kings and nations were not in temporal matters subject to spiritual authority, and that the Papal power was limited, at least as to France, by the established usages of the Gallican Church. These propositions, as tending to undermine the pretensions of the popes, were in the first instance denounced, and finally burnt by the common executioner at Rome. They continued, nevertheless, to be the governing code of the French Church until the storm of the Revolution drove the clergy into exile and overthrew the monarchy in France. When Napoleon I. was First Consul, the project of a concordat was revived, and after protracted negotiations, settled and signed by Papal and Republican plenipotentiaries. In the language of M. Thiers, "Le 15 Juillet, 1801, on signa ce grand Acte, le plus important que la Cour de Rome ait conclu avec la France, et peut-être avec aucune puissance Chrétienne." "Pour la France, il faisait cesser un schisme déplorable, et le faisait cesser, en plaçant l'Eglise et l'état dans des rapports d'union et d'indépendance convenables."† The previous negotiations had been delayed by the reiterated demands

* The term "Pragmatic Sanction" was derived from the Latin word *pragmā*, signifying action, and would seem to imply a determination to enforce its provisions. Originally designed to insure liberty to the Gallican Church, the name was, in the last century, applied to the settlements by which Charles VI., Emperor of Germany, confirmed his hereditary dominions to his daughter, the Archduchess Maria Theresa, afterwards Queen of Hungary and Empress.

† "Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire." Paris, 1845. Vol. iii. p. 267.

of the Papacy, that the Legations then occupied as part of the intended Cis-Alpine republic by the army of France, should be restored to the Pope as their sovereign. The republican rulers, contemplating the future annexation of Italy as a subject kingdom to France, were inflexible in their refusal to entertain that proposal. The motives which governed such refusal may yet be relied on as a precedent, in case Ultramontane attempts should be hereafter made by a European power to sever the Papal States from the present united and independent kingdom of Italy. We may hereafter record the varied vicissitudes which have befallen the Papacy, and trace to its arrogant pretensions the frightful retaliations which Roman Catholic warriors and potentates, both regal and imperial, have, with their attendant calamities, in successive ages, inflicted upon Rome and its devoted inhabitants.

ART. III.—THE RUSSIANS IN TURKEY.

1. *Memorandum on the Census of British India of 1871-72.* Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty. London: 1875.
2. *Correspondence respecting the Proceedings of the INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION sent to the MOUNT RHODOPE DISTRICT.* (No. 49.) London: 1878.
3. *Further Correspondence respecting the Proceedings of the INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION sent to the MOUNT RHODOPE DISTRICT.* (No. 50.) London: 1878.
4. SCHAFARIK'S *Slawische Alterthümer.* Leipzig: 1843-44.
5. *The "Russki Mir."* 1878.
6. *Die Thronbesteigung des Kaisers Nicolaus I. von Russland.* Nach seinen eigenen Aufzeichnungen und den Erinnerungen der Kaiserlichen Familie auf Befehl Sr. Majestät des Kaisers Alexander II. Herausgegeben von Baron M. VON KORFF. Berlin: 1857.

"THE torch of a madman may burn down, in a moment, the edifice that it has taken all the skill and labour and lavish prodigality of generations to raise." No truer words have been spoken, in all the discussions on the Eastern Question, during the last two or three years, than this sentence, uttered in the House of Commons, on the occasion of the Afghan debate, by Mr. Gladstone.

But how are we to apply his wise words? Are we to say that those among us act with prudence and foresight, like sane and reasonable people, who exclaim: "*Perish our dominion in India!*"* if their own crotchety, bigoted views about the desirability of extending the beneficent rule of the Czar, or reviving the spirit and the deeds of the Crusaders, are not put into practice? Again: are we to assume, with Mr. Gladstone himself, that it does not matter in the least whether, by some vast convulsion, the transmarine possessions of England were all submerged†—which, in figurative words, is to say that it does not matter at all whether the edifice of the British Empire in Asia, which it has taken the skill, the labour, and the lavish prodigality of generations to raise, were, by some vast political convulsion or conflagration, to be reduced to ruins and ashes?

England's rule over India is by all impartial minds, by all fair-thinking men in the world, acknowledged now to be favourable to general progress. In truth, that rule secures peace, orderly government, and the means of culture, to countries which, if left at present to themselves, would either become the scene of sanguinary wars between their manifold races and creeds, or the prey of the barbaric tyranny of a Power which has already crushed out in Europe the independence of many a freer and more highly civilised people. The ultimate destiny of India is a vast problem of the future. For the nonce, she herself would suffer grievously, were the ties of connexion between her and this country suddenly

* Mr. E. G. Freeman has again written a letter to a daily paper, with the object of denying that he had ever made use of the offensive expression. Strange to say, in all the space of more than half a column of close print, he has not found room for such a quotation of the words he spoke at St. James's Hall, as would show their context and their real significance. This is extraordinary in an historian who is aware of the importance to be attached to the context, and most extraordinary when we consider that the whole passage in question, if correctly quoted, only occupies a few lines, as will presently be seen. These were his words, according to the official "Report of Proceedings of the National Conference at St. James's Hall":—

"But we are told that the interests of England demand that we should withstand the advance of Russia. We are told that our dominion in India will be imperilled, that the civilised world will fall into atoms, if a Russian ship should be seen in the Mediterranean. I answer: If it be so, duty must come first, and interest second. *Perish the interests of England, PERISH OUR DOMINION IN INDIA*, rather than that we should strike one blow or speak one word on behalf of the wrong against the right."

It requires but little insight to understand that the "right" is here represented by "the advance of Russia," and that Mr. Freeman wishes the interests of England, and her dominion in India, to perish, rather than this advance should be withstood. Nothing can be plainer; and when Mr. Freeman, nevertheless, accuses speakers in Parliament of a "lying spirit," because they refer to his now famous phrase, he simply aggravates his original offence.

† See "England's Mission," by the Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE. 1878.

severed. Nor would England escape from the tremendous consequences of such a convulsion; for the maintenance of her dominion in Southern Asia gives England—in the face of the overgrown, ever-aggressive Muscovite Empire—her position as a great world-Power, whilst the keeping open of the large Indian market (30,000,000*l.* a year) is of the highest importance for English trade and commerce.

Yet this country's sway over India rests on a narrow basis indeed, so far as physical force goes. Nearly 200,000,000 people between the Indus and Cape Comorin are under direct English rule. Upwards of 48,000,000 live in the so-called Feudatory States which are englobed within that vast territory. Now, do many of those who so glibly talk about the perfect innocuousness of Russian intrigues in Afghanistan, know what the whole British population in India is? It may have been our special misfortune to have so often met men to whom the dry science of political statistics was a book sealed with seven seals, and which they never seemed to have even a wish to open. "Dry" that science is called, at least, by those who lack the imagination wherewith to conjure up, from arithmetical figures, the moving image of a nation's life. But, be that as it may, at any rate we have often, in the heat of discussion, suddenly put the simple question to otherwise well-informed men of considerable political standing or pretension, as to what they thought the British population of India was?

Usually the answer was an evasive one. After much pressure, a reply would sometimes be given in this way:—"Well, I suppose there are about 3,000,000 English, or so, in India!" Wonderful delusion, which shows how many are fit to discuss the questions relating to the security of England's Asiatic Empire.

Only for the edification of those happy dreamers we will mention a plain statistical fact, which, by this time, might be universally known. The whole non-Asiatic population of British India, according to the official census publication of 1875, consists of 121,147 souls—who are pitted against the 190,563,048 of the natives under direct English sway—to which 48,267,910 of the Feudatory States may be added. The 121,147 people of "non-Asiatic" origin are by no means all British, or even Europeans. They comprise English, Scotch, Irish, Welsh, Austrians and Hungarians, Belgians, Danes, Dutch, Finlanders, Germans, Greeks, Italians, Norwegians, Poles, Portuguese, Russians, Spaniards, Swedes, Swiss, Turks; other Europeans, or unspecified people; also Canadians, Creoles, Nova Scotians, West Indians; other Americans, or unspecified people; Africans, and even Australasians.

Of British people alone, there are not more, in this aggregate

number, than 75,734—men, women, and children. Add to these the 63,000 English soldiers—and you have the sum total of the basis on which the rule of this country over India rests, so far as English physical force goes.

It is true, there are 190,000 troops of native origin under the British banner ; and also 190,000 men of the native police. On the other hand, the semi-independent Feudatory States have, in the aggregate, an armed force of about 300,000 men. It is a well-known maxim that it is not safe to increase England's native army in India beyond the proportion of two-thirds to the European force stationed there. At the same time, the European force is strictly limited by the necessities of a free parliamentary government, as well as by the circumstances connected with the recruiting system of this country. One should imagine, considering such weighty facts, that, in the face of new Russian aggressions and intrigues, no statesman, no patriot, would do anything, in so great a crisis as the one through which England at present passes, which might be calculated to diminish the moral influence of the nation in its vast Asiatic concerns.

Has this natural hope been fulfilled? Have we not rather seen an "Afghan Committee" established by the same agency which practically acted as a "Russian Committee" during the attack upon an Empire whose mere existence forms a valuable outer bastion for England's Indian dominion? Can any sane man deny that in a war (and how soon may such a war come!) between the two great rival Powers in Asia, Turkey could effect the most serviceable diversion for this country against Russia?

If we are averse—as we must needs be, in our quality of freemen—to the introduction of an Imperialist Militarism at home; if we are disinclined to adopt, even for purposes of home defence, that system of universal compulsory army service which not only the Germans, the French, and the Russians now possess, but which has been long ago the system of the Swiss, as it was the system, in olden times, of England herself; if, in short, England means to remain content with her small army of freely recruited men, and yet to keep her vast possessions abroad: was it not madness, is it not madness, to encourage Russia to drive out, "with bag and baggage," that Ottoman race which virtually acted as a sentinel and as a fighting power for us at the mouths of the Danube, and at the Bosphorus? Who, then, has endangered a State edifice raised with great labour and at great costs? Who promotes that danger of "national downfall," at the mention of which there was such strange clapping of hands at Greenwich?

It is not the object of this article to treat of the war in Afghanistan, and we turn now to the blessings which have come in the

wake of Russian conquest in Turkey. Here we have, first of all, to speak of the labours of the Rhodope Commission:

An attempt has been made to impugn the evidence collected by that European, International Commission in the course of more than a month's journey through the ravaged districts. We need scarcely say that the despicable attempt proceeded from those who had eagerly grasped at every unsupported newspaper statement sent forth by Russophile writers or agents on the "Bulgarian Atrocities" of 1876. The audacity with which the simplest facts have been denied or perverted, is strangely instanced in the case of the Rev. Mr. M'Coll, of questionable impalement notoriety. Him we may, however, leave to the tender mercies of the official "Further Correspondence respecting the Proceedings of the International Commission," in which his more recent loose and unscrupulous allegations are properly transfixed, or nailed down, by the Italian Government, as well as by the English Ambassador at Vienna.

The Rhodope Commission was established in accordance with a resolution taken at the Berlin Congress. In the eighteenth protocol of that Congress—as the *Pall Mall Gazette* has properly reminded Mr. M'Coll—we read that, after a question from Prince Bismarck and a reply thereto from Count Schouvaloff, "Prince Gortchakoff is of opinion that, whilst carrying out the mission about to be entrusted to them, the Commissioners should equally undertake to *verify the correctness of the facts reported to Lord Salisbury.*" The resolution thereupon taken by Congress was to the effect that the facts to be investigated were, the present sufferings of the population of the Rhodope district and the neighbouring countries. The duty of the Commissioners was, "to verify on the spot the serious nature of these facts, and, as far as possible, to remedy them."

For this purpose, Colonel Raab, Military Attaché to the embassy of Austria-Hungary at Constantinople; Mr. T. H. Fawcett, Consul-General of England, and Judge of H.B.M.'s Consular Court; M. Challet, Consul of France; M. Basily, Second Secretary to the Russian embassy; M. Graziani, Second Dragoman to the Italian Legation; and M. Müller, Vice-Consul of the Emperor of Germany, were afterwards appointed as members of the Commission. Of course, Turkey also was represented in it; her own subjects having been the victims of a cruelty for which there is scarcely a parallel in the darkest annals of mankind.

This Commission had scarcely begun its work when M. Basily, the Russian delegate, rose up, in the sitting of July 25, to say that—"the Commission, in his opinion, has several times exceeded the limits of its mission;" and that—"the Commission, shall confine itself to receiving general statements, *without*

entering into details of facts; otherwise he will be obliged to leave the Commission, and return to Constantinople!" In the face of the Berlin protocol, this protest can only be described as an astounding piece of faithlessness and impertinence. Other members of the Rhodope Commission naturally pointed to the clear text of their instructions, from which it resulted that "the Commission is to inquire both into the motives which have induced the refugees to quit their homes, and into those which they allege as a reason for not returning to them."

Still, there being a great desire to conciliate Russia, it was resolved, at the suggestion of the Chairman, "to leave the point undecided for to-day, and to continue the investigation in terms which will, to a certain extent, satisfy M. Basily." All through its labours the Commission did its utmost—far more, indeed, than can be approved—to spare the delicate susceptibilities of the delegate of that Power which had converted the fair districts of Roumelia into a Hell on Earth.

However, in the following sitting, on July 26, M. Basily at once returned to the charge. Declaring that the object of the Commission ought to be "humanitarian and philanthropic" (excellent words from a representative of Czardom!), he again pretended that the Commission was "diverging from its instructions." M. Müller stooped so low as to truckle to, and support, this barefaced assertion. Upon this, the French delegate replied in a well-reasoned speech which—judging from the tone of the vast majority of German Liberal journals—may be said to have expressed the views of the German nation far better than the Emperor William's Consul did.

"Could Europe (M. Challet exclaimed)—advise the emigrants to return (to their former homes), if it appeared from the investigation that there was danger that the two populations, when placed in contact, will massacre one another, or that *one will massacre the other!* . . . For his own part, he (M. Challet) trusts that all the depositions made against the Russian army may be so many calumnies and lies, for that would facilitate the task of Europe, since there would then be no danger in replacing the emigrants under the guardianship of the Russian troops. But if they were true, Europe should be made aware of it, for the purpose which she has in view. He does not admit that the Commission is transforming itself into a Tribunal. *M. Basily alone assumes the part of judge; and he even judges without hearing and without knowing*, as he did when pronouncing on the depositions of the emigrants, and particularly on the occasion of the measures taken against Abdallah. The Commission cannot follow him (M. Basily) in this course. It listens now; and it will form its judgment later with knowledge of the facts. The French Commissioner demands that the investigation shall be complete, in order that they may report to Europe all that will throw light on the question of the facilities or the

obstacles to the repatriation of the emigrants; he therefore wishes the proceedings to continue as they have begun."

Noble words of indignant protest, which merit the fullest praise. The same view was upheld by the Italian delegate—let the Rev. Mr. M'Coll take note of it! In the end, by a majority of five to two, the opinion of the French Commissioner was adopted—the representatives of England, France, Italy, Austria-Hungary, and Turkey voting for an investigation of the facts, in accordance with instructions; M. Basily and M. Müller forming the minority. Three days afterwards, on July 29, M. Basily, in accordance with a telegram from Prince Lobanoff, resigned his functions, "as the state of his health would not allow of his following up their work!" A M. Lischine, interpreter of the Russian embassy, was then left to watch the proceedings. He signed all the subsequent protocols, "under protest as before."

Every unbiassed reader will see from this that the Russian Government—guilty, in the eyes of Europe, of the most enormous atrocities committed for a long time past, and down to the last few years, in Poland, the Caucasus, and Turkestan—simply wished its new horrors on Ottoman soil to be hidden from the inquiring glances of a Commission to the establishment of which it had itself assented at Berlin, though probably with internal reluctance, and with the secret intention of keeping its promise of co-operation in the same way as in the question of Khiva.

Thanks to Russian influence, the delegate of the Emperor William withheld his signature from the final report of the Rhodope Commission. The delegate of Austria-Hungary pleaded indisposition when the day for adopting the text of the identical Report came. Any one who has read the protocols, will however acknowledge that Col. Raab, all through those investigations, stood on the right side, and fulfilled his duty as chairman most honourably. If his Government, at the last moment, wished to refrain from openly branding the infamy which he had helped to bring to light, such diplomatic reserve and vacillation does not in the least alter the previous bearing of the delegate of Austria-Hungary, nor detract from the weight of the evidence that had been gathered under his effective presidency. The artificial doubts which have been raised by the founder and the disciples of the M'Coll school, are fully disposed of by the following report of the English Ambassador at Vienna, dated Nov. 26, 1878:—

"Those who are anxious to throw discredit on the identic Reports signed by four of the Rhodope Commissioners, have laid great stress on the abstention of Major Raab, which they have represented as a

proof of his disbelieving the evidence upon which the accusations against the Russian troops were based. I am able to inform your Lordship that *such was not the case*, and that Major Raab stated to his Government that he was too unwell at the time the Report was being drawn up to take any active share in preparing it, and that he thought it dealt (dwelt) too much upon the misconduct of the Russian troops, to the exclusion of the points for which the Commission had been appointed to examine. According to my information, upon which I have no hesitation in saying your Lordship may entirely rely, Major Raab, though not approving the whole Report of his colleagues, DID NOT REPRESENT THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE RUSSIAN TROOPS IN A MORE FAVOURABLE LIGHT *than they had done*, in the separate Report which he had sent to his own Government, who, however, have not made it public."

It requires but little acquaintance with diplomatic forms to see from this, that the main point at issue—the barbarity of the acts committed by Russian troops, and within the radius of the Russian occupation of European Turkey—is fully acknowledged also by the Government of Austria-Hungary. Sir H. Elliot only reports what he has been officially told at Vienna.

The delegates of all the European Powers are therefore practically agreed—with the exception of the representative of that Power which stands in the position of the accused and the convicted, and of the representative of the Emperor William, who sides with his Imperial nephew. Now, the horrible facts brought to light by this official International Commission are all the more important, because—as the identical transmitting despatch of the French, Italian, English, and Turkish delegates says—

"The delegates had done their best to soften everything that relates to acts alleged or proved against the Russian army. Commissioned as we were to find a remedy for the sufferings of the emigrants, both in the present and the future, this was the limit of the concessions our conscience permitted us to make in deference to the requirements of courtesy due to a Government which, in our opinion, is DOING ITS UTMOST TO PREVENT THE MUSSULMANS FROM RETURNING TO THE TERRITORY OF BULGARIA AND EASTERN ROUMELIA.'"

In other words, the Czar is carrying out the "bag and baggage" policy by means of blood-curdling atrocities the full hideousness of which is even partly veiled in the Report of the International Commission. Still, that Report says:—

"We found about 150,000 refugees, distributed in the following manner:—7000 scattered in the Caza of Xanthi; 62,000 in that of Ghumuldjina; 10,000 at Kirdj-Ali; an equal number at Mastanli; and the remainder in the regions defended by the volunteers of the country between Demotica and Nevrecope. . . . According to their own account, all these refugees belong to the Mussulman religion—all

have come from territory in Bulgaria and Roumelia, at present *under military occupation by the Russian troops*. The period of their departure seems to have always coincided with the entry or approach of the Russian troops; they appear to have fled, some from murder, pillage, incendiarism, and violation, of which they had been witnesses or victims; others under the effect of a panic perfectly intelligible from the account of the cruelties suffered by their co-religionists in the neighbouring villages. According to an account which we have heard from the lips of several thousands of individuals, the invading army, either by the force of circumstances, or possibly by chance, found before it this compact mass of fugitives, who were endeavouring to gain the mountains (the Balkans, as the peasants said), carrying with them on 'arabas' their families—old men, wives, children, and such effects as they had been able to preserve from the cupidity of the conquerors; and *this large mass of individuals, driven at the point of the bayonet, when once concentrated and crowded together in the gorge of Harmanly, was SHOT DOWN, MASSACRED, AND DROWNED IN THE MARITZA AND THE OURLOU-DÉRÉ. MORE THAN 2000 CHILDREN WERE THROWN INTO THE RIVER BY THE MOTHERS THEMSELVES, DRIVEN WILD BY TERROR, and believing this death to be gentler for them than that which they would receive at the hands of the enemy.* The protocols will explain to you all the horrors of that day, of which we have received on all sides the lamentable description from the survivors, the unfortunate remnant from the indescribable slaughter, in which those who have fared best have to lament the loss of at least one of their family. If we have noted down many heartrending details, *we have omitted a still greater number. . . .*"

The identical Report further says that—"the majority of the Delegates have no doubt that the Mussulmans withdrew to the country of their exile with the object of escaping from the evils of a struggle during which, according to their statements, everything was pillaged." Nevertheless, a feeling of irreconcilable enmity is declared scarcely to exist between the Mussulmans and the Bulgarians as a race. Some of the former even felt gratitude towards their Bulgarian neighbours; owing, as they did, their liberty or their life to the intervention of some of these latter, who shielded them against Russian atrocities. It is true, the Russians made short work with any Bulgars who showed humane inclinations.* At all events, no acts of revenge have been perpetrated by the fugitive Mussulmans against the Bulgars:—

"There exist, in the district of Ghumuldjina, rich villages exclusively inhabited by Bulgarians. Around them are encamped 60,000 refugees in the most terrible distress imaginable; *and not an act of reprisal has been committed.* We have seen the same thing in the heart of the Rhodope,

* "Whilst he was being beaten some Bulgarians appeared, and begged the Russians to be merciful. The Russians struck them with the knout." (Testimony of Mollah Hassan; *International Commission Report*, p. 35.)

at Gabrova, for example—where all the houses, as well as the fields, belonging to the Bulgarians, are untouched and free from any act of brigandage, *while all the surrounding Turkish villages have been razed or burned.* The Report ‘insists particularly on this last fact, of which the Commission have ascertained the authenticity at a great number of places.’ ”

At first, the Commission—

“refused to believe the accuracy of stories which described to them, on all sides, an inexorable conqueror, scattering everywhere in his passage death, ruin, destruction, and conflagration. It seemed that an exaggeration, which misfortune made excusable, must have given rise to unheard-of accusations which imagination can scarcely conceive. They resolved, therefore, to satisfy themselves of the fact; this would be at the same time a means of testing facts of which they might thus obtain proof; and such proof, once obtained, would furnish presumptions towards forming a judgment on other allegations. For this reason they decided on visiting several districts where these devastations were stated to have occurred. To these distressing excursions several days were devoted, the proceedings of which are related in the *procès-verbaux* in terms ONLY TOO MODERATE to depict adequately the pain experienced at the sight of ruins blackened by the traces of conflagration. In a score of villages, taken at random, out of the eighty and odd which were mentioned to them as having been burned since the 1st June—that is to say, after the armistice—the Commission has seen the sad spectacle of destruction. It is death in the midst of a lovely country, the cultivation of which bears witness to recent activity of life. Nothing has been spared; it is noticeable that artillery fire has been only a secondary agent in this destruction; and that it has been necessary to employ torch and firewood to consume houses, isolated one from the other, and often separated by long distances; mosques standing remote on some neighbouring hill; and farms several kilometres distant. It was conceivable to every one that the man who was capable of kindling such a fire might also indulge in pillage and murder. And this devastation stretches along a line of more than 150 kilometres, marked out by the advanced posts of the RUSSIAN ARMY.”

The Commissioners, summing up the evidence, declare themselves therefore—

“justified in affirming that the Mussulmans have fled before the army of invasion. . . . The picture is a gloomy one; the pen refuses to describe these miseries; they can only be imagined. Conceive a long line of human beings, for the most part in rags, broken down by fatigue, privation, grief, and sickness, stretching from the first spurs of the Rhodope towards Philippopolis and Adrianople, and ceasing only at the borders of the pestilential marshes of the plain, which is washed by the *Ægean* Sea; widows by thousands, little tottering orphans, fading each day, and condemned to a premature death; all without other shelter than the foliage of the trees; having shivered

under the snow, and now melting under the rays of a fiery sun; sleeping on ground drenched by the rains; breathing the marshy miasmas of these districts; struggling in vain against all kinds of sickness, without any other assistance than a little barley bread parsimoniously distributed by the authorities or the inhabitants; without doctors, without remedies—in a word, decimated by certain death, which mows down their ranks, already greatly thinned, without mercy. And these last victims are, perhaps, not the most to be pitied. ‘Physical sufferings are reparable,’ would exclaim some of the unfortunate women, still bearing the traces of the most cruel privations; ‘but what are they compared with our moral sufferings? . . . WHO WILL RESTORE TO US OUR HONOUR?’”

Shall we now go once more, with the official protocols before us, through those heartrending details of wholesale slaughter of helpless prisoners and innocent villagers? Shall we repeat the ten thousands of facts of murder, arson, rape; of hanging, shooting, chopping-off hands, and so forth; of cruelty and lust mixed up in a horrid confusion?

Even the Press reports which we gave in the October number, and which at that time may have seemed almost incredible in their outrageous details, actually pale before this fresh official evidence. We will not transcribe this sad tale of fiendish horrors. We can only advise those who were hitherto influenced by the sickly cant about the deliverance of the East through the agency of the generous Czar, to cast a glance, at random, at these protocols of the Rhodope Commission; and we fully trust they will be cured for ever from the views hitherto upheld by Mr. Gladstone.

And what reply has the Government of Alexander the Benevolent made to these charges of the International Commission? None whatever—except that it did protest against the investigation taking place at all! The accused did not wish his deeds to be inquired into. This is the sum and substance of the Russian defence.

Coming to the question of relief and remedy, and of the speedy repatriation of the emigrants, the identical Report says:—

“On this subject we have consulted all those interested. The answer has never varied. *Not only have they no confidence in the Russian authorities, but THEY FEAR THEM—AND NATURALLY SO, since they attribute to them all their misfortunes: and if some of them have thrown off their reserve, and trusted to the word of the new functionaries who administer their villages, and of whom several have come to their places of exile to offer them permits to return, their hopes of safety appear to have been destroyed by vexations of every kind, and by exactions of which they seem to have been a second time the victims. We were shown one of these permits, which the Russian authorities themselves*

acknowledged as authentic; and if the inhabitants who trusted in it are to be believed, THE GREATER PART OF THOSE WHO RETURNED UNDER THIS SAFEGUARD WERE MASSACRED. At Haskeui the Commission was able to judge by facts, that the Mussulmans do not enjoy the rights which the general laws of all countries grant to proprietors. Thus, for example, if they have emigrated, they have not the right of being represented by proxy in the countries occupied by the Russian army. Moreover, they say, what confidence can they feel in a Government which has confiscated their crops, and which declares itself incapable of causing their properties, which the Bulgarians seized after their departure, to be restored to them? They declare, therefore, that they will not return until the Turkish authority has regained its rights over the country."

The Commissioners add that, for their own part, their conscience and their duty compel them in some degree to approve this prudent resolve. The danger to the fugitives, in case of return, is acknowledged to be too great, seeing that the invading Power itself asserts that the task of reinstating the unfortunate population in its former homes is "beyond its strength." Unfavourable in the extreme was the opinion resulting from the interview of the Commissioners with Prince Dondukoff-Korsakoff.

"This provisional Governor of Roumelia presented to us a set of regulations as to the conditions to be imposed on the Mussulmans who wish to return to their homes, *the arbitrary character of which appeared in every line.* In it, the offices of accuser and judge are confounded one with the other, and the difficulties are such that years would be required to effect the repatriation of the whole of the emigrants."

Such is the picture of the humanity shown by the Czar's troops towards what Mr. Gladstone calls the "one anti-human specimen of humanity"—an expression, we much fear for the sake of the fame of the Liberal ex-Premier, which a future historian may be tempted to describe as having been a moral (or maybe, immoral) free-leave for a cry of: "*Tue! tue!*"

We now come to the faith with which the Russian Government have kept the stipulations of the Berlin Treaty.

Among the systematic attempts at overthrowing the clearest enactments of that Treaty must be reckoned, first and foremost, the acts and speeches of Prince Dondukoff-Korsakoff. At the Congress, the line of the Balkans was established as the boundary of the new semi-independent Principality. The Czar's lieutenant does not acknowledge this provision. He openly says so; and he adds that he only acts, in this, in accordance with the promptings of his Imperial Majesty. So audacious were his declarations that the English Government could not but insist on explanations being given. Whereupon, in due course of time, according to the smooth-tongued habits of Muscovite diplomacy, Prince

Dondukoff-Korsakoff was invited to Livadia, and a semi-official note appeared afterwards in a St. Petersburg paper, declaring that—so far from Russia being behindhand in carrying out her part of the Congress stipulations, it is “she that urges the execution of the Berlin Treaty!” Furthermore, we were told that “the Emperor, in the speech he delivered at Moscow, had declared that he hoped for the speedy signature of a definitive treaty of peace with Turkey.” The meaning of all this is, that the Czar, before fulfilling his obligations, first intends to bring the Porte under his more direct influence and sway by means of a special treaty.

Now, these are the words which Prince Dondukoff-Korsakoff had addressed at Sofia to a Bulgarian deputation:—

“His Majesty the Czar has summoned me to his Court at Livadia, because the question is now, to form a definitive resolution for the constitution of Bulgaria. You, gentlemen, know as well as myself, that in the first instance the junction of all the different parts of Bulgaria must be brought about, which were so unhappily cut in twain by the enactments of the Berlin Congress. I hereby give you the assurance that this is, and will always remain, the most ardent wish of our All-good Emperor Alexander and his wise Government. The heart of this Most Gracious Monarch beats warmly for the Bulgarian people and the beautiful Bulgarian land. . . . Trust therefore, gentlemen, to the future! Russia is strong; and that which she earnestly means to do, she has always attained: so it will be in the present case. A partition of Bulgaria is an impossibility. Bulgaria will and must be united.”

It might be imagined that the heart of the “All-good” Czar—as the Divine Figure from the North is called by his courtiers—would beat, first of all, for the enslaved nations under his own sceptre. At least, there is ample cause, in the condition of those down-trodden populations, to awaken the pity of the most obdurate heart. Is not the living flesh of the unfortunate Polish nation continually racked by the Autocrat’s minions? Are not these true Slavs of the Vistula denied even their rights of language? Has not Europe rung with indignation at the authenticated revival of the most hideous practices of the Inquisition in the case of the Greek Uniates of Russia? Do not voices of distress and wrath reach us even from the Germans of the Baltic Provinces? Those provinces furnish to the administration of Russia the most efficient men, who are at the same time acknowledged, throughout the Empire, as the most industrious and most honest workers—sometimes, unfortunately, workers in the interest of an irresponsible Government. Yet in their Baltic homes, those Germans find themselves driven to a struggle of despair for the maintenance of their own ancient civic charters—nay,

even for the preservation of their language-rights, just like the Poles! Again, have not the Finlanders, who are in a similar position, to tell the same tales of woe? And in what wretched plight is the real Muscovite nation, whose best-educated classes have taken to the pistol and the poignard as the last resort of the hopelessly oppressed—writing their hitherto inefficient protest, almost week by week, in letters of blood!

Could not the warm heart of the “All-good Czar” do something there for the cause of humanity? But Bulgaria and Roumelia themselves, with their thousands of Turkish houses in ruins, with their hecatombs of men, women, and children savagely murdered by Russian troops, are only fresh proofs of the strange blessings which follow in the wake of the conquering Russian Autocracy. The speeches of Prince Dondukoff-Korsakoff gave rise to new outbreaks of this murderous propensity. Even so Slavophile a print as the *Politische Korrespondenz* writes:—

“Wherever he (the Prince) goes, he is the lion of the day. For the gaiety which his words created among the Bulgars, the latter sought at once a proper expression; and what else could that expression be than a wholesale attack upon defenceless Turks, Greeks, and Jews? Of the insecurity of life and property which exists here, no idea can be formed abroad. The members of the International Commission at Philippopolis have, however, had a pretty specimen of it. More than 3000 Turkish houses destroyed (the houses still half-inhabitable here and there are being pulled down, and the wood and building material is carried away by the Bulgars);—a number of mosques and public baths lying in ruins;—the same with the public fountains erected by the Turks: all these are patent facts, and speaking evidence, for the passions let loose. Nor can the International Commission ignore that the Turkish population in Roumelia has been utterly plundered, and that nearly 2,000,000 Turks have become the merest beggars, many of whom daily die from hunger and misery.”

This is not a partisan account, but on the contrary a report published by a paper rather favourable to Slav claims. No wonder that a somewhat more humane man like General Totleben—whom, as he is of German extraction, the full-blown Muscovites of the Dondukoff-Korsakoff party treat as a sort of “alien”—resolved at last to make an example of a number of the worst criminals. At his order, eighteen of the most sanguinary evil-doers were arrested. We apprehend, however, that General Totleben has not thereby increased his further prospects of Imperial favour, if we may judge from the esteem in which General Kaufmann is held at Court, who gave the order in Turkestan:—“Kill all! Spare no sex, or age!”

In one of his carousal harangues, Prince Dondukoff-Korsakoff, who is known to aim at being elected Prince of what he calls a United Great Bulgaria, attacked England as the chief enemy, because she insists on the provisions of the Berlin Treaty being upheld. "The fact of the English being afraid of this United Great Bulgaria"—he exclaimed—"must only incite us to the fullest display of our forces, so as to carry out our object." English policy being thus openly challenged by the Czar's representative, we think it right to express our views of Bulgarian nationality more fully. In doing so, we are certainly quite unhampered with any predilection for an existing order of things, or with any theologico-political theory about the predestined damnation of this or that race.

An utterance in the *Russki Mir* ("Russian World"), the organ of General Tcherniaeff, is of interest here, as indicating the drift of that Pan-Slavist propaganda of which the Russian Government have so largely made use during the recent war. The *Russki Mir* is an out-and-out champion of the "Great Bulgarian" policy of Prince Dondukoff-Korsakoff. It writes, we need scarcely say, with a censor lying in wait for it. The audacious tone it assumes towards Europe, is therefore all the more noteworthy. Speaking of the rising in the Rhodope Mountains, that paper, with a refreshing frankness, declared that these events can "only induce Russia to extend still further the rights she possesses in her character of a conqueror." It then continued:—

"Russia will simply return to the Treaty of San Stefano, and calmly inform the Powers that the Anglo-Turkish intrigues have imposed this necessity upon her. There is no Power in Europe which could resist the action of Russia. For any resistance to be offered to Russia, Europe has virtually ceased to exist. We can arrange matters in the Balkan according to our *bon plaisir*, simply by taking care of the interests of Russia and of Slavism, and completely ignoring everything that Lord Beaconsfield or Count Andrassy may say or do. We cannot dream of restoring to the Anglo-Turks the country south of the Balkans, and thus allowing them to extend their influence, from thence, over the principality of Bulgaria itself. We have to think of the future. We have to establish a firm and lasting peace, instead of the mere truce which is marked by the Berlin Treaty. Time and circumstances are in our favour. Let us take advantage of the opportunity and of the condition of our foes."

When we thus see a noted Pan-Slavist organ taking up the cue of the Russian Governor, this country has all the more cause for the fullest watchfulness.

Whoever has studied the questions of race-distribution in European Turkey, with an eye to fact and truth, must be aware that the "Slav nationality of Bulgaria," as propounded by writers

and map-makers in the Russian interest, is a glaring exaggeration—not to say invention and imposture. By race, the Bulgars are originally not a Slavonian people at all. Nor do they even belong to that Aryan stock which the modern preachers of the doctrine of political election declare to be the only one entitled to the right of dwelling in Europe. Originally, the Bulgars were of Turanian descent. They are, in blood, kindred of the Turks. In earlier centuries they spoke a language allied to that of the “one anti-human specimen of humanity.” Hence, the older Arab writers, who as Semites knew very well the difference between their own and the Turkish race, called the Bulgars simply “a kind of Turks.”

The name of “Bulgar,” or Volgar, is by some supposed to have arisen from the fact of that “kind of Turks” having at first dwelt near the river Volga. Together with Huns, Avars, and other non-Aryan, Turanian, Mongolic tribes, the Bulgars pushed their way into Eastern Europe, ousting or temporarily over-running the Germanic (Gothic), Slavonian, and Greek populations which then inhabited the lands near the lower course of the Danube. Having spread between the Danube and the Balkans, and made occasional incursions also south of that mountain-range, the Bulgars gradually gave up their Turanian language. A mixed tongue then arose among them, in which the Slav element predominated, but which afterwards again became changed through the infusion of Greek and Turkish locutions. This non-Slavonian origin of the Bulgars has been acknowledged even by the arch-advocate and father of the Pan-slavist theory, Mr. Schafarik. He confesses that the Bulgarian language itself contains the proof of the people in question being a mixed or “bastard race.”* He distinctly puts the Bulgars among the Turkish stock, and says that they have arisen from an intermixture between Turkish tribes and Mongolic and Finnish hordes. He calls them relations of the Huns. He brings to recollection that, before they were converted to Christianity, Mohammedanism had made its mark among them—that they had polygamy; that they were accustomed, even when they had become Christians, to sit in church with their turbans on the head. He utterly rejects the idea of their being originally Slavs.

In blood and history, in manners and customs, in physiological type, and even partly in speech, the Bulgars show their Turanian descent. However, we are not among those who lay exclusive stress on such points; or else we should be compelled to say that all existing national ties ought to be dissolved into their earlier component parts, when hopeless confusion would ensue. We, at

* “*Slavische Alterthümer*,” i. 5; ii. 29.

least, shall therefore not deny the importance of the Slavonisation, as regards speech, of the originally Turkish and Mongolian Bulgars; and we have no desire whatever to speak of them as if they were a Tatar horde freshly arrived in Europe. Greeks, in their easily explicable impatience at the modern sham-Liberal rant about the "great Slav nationality of the Bulgars" may be led to say harsh things about these "Volgarian Tatars with a Slav veneer." Our object is simply to state the real facts of the case.

Of the predominance of the Slavonised Bulgars between the Danube and the Balkan there can be no doubt. Even there, however, the Ottomans (for the European followers of the Mohammedan creed distinctly repudiate the name of "Turks," always using that of "Osmanli") occupy a large space, at least in the eastern part of the territory usually assigned to the Bulgar nationality. South of the Balkan, there are fragments of the Bulgar race, intermixed with the Greek, Greco-Wallachian, and Ottoman populations. But the idea put forward by Russia of extending "Bulgaria" to the *Ægean* Sea is a gross ethnological imposture. Pseudo-statistics have occasionally been published to make out this ridiculous claim. Such statistics are, in truth, simply non-existent; a census of that kind, or even any census, has not been taken as yet. Those who know the concocted race-maps of the Russian Empire, as furnished by the interested tools of the Government of St. Petersburg, will, however, not wonder at the impudence with which another "Bulgaria," south of the Balkan, has been fabricated by Muscovite agency.

Much as we should wish, in times to come, to see the Hellenic race resume the heritage of its sway all along the southern range of the Balkan up to, and including, Constantinople, if ever Turkish rule should collapse, we cannot assert with any show of truth, that the Greek population is the majority in those parts. Immeasurably still less, however, can the same be asserted of the Bulgarian stock. The medley of races is most intricate all throughout Roumelia. The confusion is worse confounded by the existence of various mixed populations—such as the so-called "Bulgarophone" Greeks, who, Hellenes by race and tradition, have adopted a composite Bulgar and Greek speech.

All we can say is, that, for the present, the Turks hold the firmest political sway throughout Roumelia, over which they are also ethnographically scattered from east to west, along the whole line. At the same time we trust that the superior culture of the Greeks, and their power of assimilation, will gradually operate in such a manner as to imprint their stamp more and more upon the populations between the Bosphorus and the Gulf of Volo. Meanwhile—with the autocratic foe of European secu-

rity, freedom, and culture, thundering at the gates of the East—we cannot desire the power of the Ottoman Empire, in its present reformed condition, to be weakened by fresh experiments which would only bring Russia and her vassals still nearer to Constantinople, or “Czarigrad.”

On this point, the *République Française* has some sensible remarks, founded on facts which our professedly Liberal Russophiles would do well to digest. Throughout this controversy about the Eastern Question, the Continental Liberals and Republicans have in their large majority held to the principle of restraining Russian aggression, and of being mindful of the future “Hellenic factor.” Our violent anti-Turks here have, on the contrary, sung the praise of the magnanimous Autocrat, and, in spite of talk about the Hellenes, patronised Bulgarian encroachment.

Now, the mouthpiece of the French Republican leader, speaking of the attempt of Russia to render the establishment of East Roumelia as a province under Turkish sway impossible, observes that Muscovite diplomacy is exceedingly clever in breaking a treaty even when apparently doing homage to its letter. As long as the Bulgarian Question remained in suspense at the Berlin Congress, Russian diplomatists and generals—so the Republican Paris print said—incessantly spoke of Tirnova (north of the Balkan) as the future capital of Bulgaria. At last, the Congress added Sofia to the new Bulgarian Principality. Immediately, poor Tirnova was depreciated, rejected, and forgotten; and the resolution was formed to make Sofia (south of the Balkans) the capital,—Sofia, where the great highways of Servia, Thrace, and Macedonia meet, and which has so excellent a situation that Constantine already asked himself whether he ought not to transfer the seat of his Empire thither?

“This choice of Sofia”—(the *République Française* goes on)—“was the first act of hostility against East Roumelia. With good reason, it was looked upon, at Philippopolis, as a virtual declaration of war. But this step was not an isolated one. Whilst the European Commission works with laudable zeal at the political constitution of Roumelia, the Russians are on the best road of oppressing and Slavonising the Hellenic race in East Roumelia with the aid and succour of the Bulgars. Thus the great onslaught from the North against the South is continued with ever-increasing force. Nothing is simpler than the system followed by the Slav agents and the Russian officers. First, it was sought to intimidate the Greeks, who form more than a third of this province. Threats and promises, everything was attempted, in order to induce them to refrain from bringing their wishes before the Commission. But all threats and promises remained equally fruitless. The Greeks have openly demanded full equality for all inhabitants of the province, without difference of race and religion. Then, force was

used against them. The Russians rendered the fatal schism which divides the Bulgarian Church from the Phanariote Church, complete; they drove away the Greek clergy, replacing it by Bulgarian priests; and thus, in the place of more enlightened and more Liberal men, the most ignorant of all the *popes* of the East were installed. The province had been covered, before, with Greek schools. The Northern Slav, however, likes instruction as much as an owl does the daylight; three-fourths of these schools were therefore closed. In the administration, for centuries, only Greeks and Mussulmans had been at the head of the communes. Both the Greek and the Mussulman officials have been expelled by the Russian military authorities, and replaced by Bulgars, who, accustomed to obey under the old Turkish administration, will continue to do so—only with this difference, that now they will obey the Russians who are the authorities in the great neighbouring province. In the same way, the police has been entirely formed by Bulgars. Under the very eyes of the International Commission—as all the news in the press of Constantinople and Athens proves—this system of proscription, as employed by the military authorities of Russia, is daily continued against Greeks and Turks, in favour of the Bulgars. These facts need no commentary. Energetic representations are required to stay these Russian encroachments; soon it will be too late.”

The evil is a crying one. In our opinion it would best be cured by the reconvoation of the Ottoman Parliament. Why do we not hear any more of this representative assembly in which all races and creeds had their spokesmen—and some of them very able spokesmen too? Is it because Russia, still holding the bayonet at the throat of Turkey, will not allow the meeting of a legislative body whose mere existence would be a living reproach against the autocratic system of the Czar? We can understand this nervous apprehension of Alexander II. But does not the Government of this country, especially since the Convention which gave England the provisional administration of Cyprus, become guilty of a virtual dereliction of duty in not encouraging the Porte to re-convoke the Ottoman Parliament? Are the despatches Sir A. Layard once wrote on the parliamentary change in Turkey to go for nothing? This is a subject we recommend to men like Mr. Joseph Cowen, Mr. Roebuck, and others of the Liberal party, who have not allowed their perception of the true political situation to be dimmed by factious pro-Russian talk, or rather by talk in the interest of the oppressors of the Russian people.

It may be useful to quote here the opinions of men whom the practices of despotism have driven to despair—if not into exile. We refer to the so-called “Underground Press” of Russia..

In one of the numbers of a clandestine paper, which bears the title of *Journal of the Revolution*, we read:—

“ We Russian revolutionists are but the echo of the whole people, when we preach war to the knife against this rotten, corrupt, and bankrupt system of government. The nobleman, the merchant, the man of the lesser middle-class, the peasant—all are sick of the tyranny of the *tchinovniks* (officials). We will not bear any longer a rule of satraps, after we have sacrificed more than 300,000 lives for removing a Government in Bulgaria which was far more humane, far more liberal and honourable than this misbegotten Mongol system which governs us. The Russian people will not be so silly as to allow itself to be led again to the shambles for the sake of foreigners, whilst its own condition is a far unhappier one than that of the Bulgarians whom the swindlers at Moscow had promoted to the position of ‘brethren’ of ours. Does a Russian peasant possess a house and farm like those which a Bulgarian in the Rustchuk district possesses? Can any *mujik* among us dispose of such provisions of corn as the Bulgarians in the fertile valley of Sofia and Adrianople? And when had Turkey ever such tyrants like Kleinmichel, Muravieff, Trepoff, or Mesenzoff, who in Russia may be counted by the hundred? We are the unhappiest nation on the earth; and our misfortune is the existence of Czardom. It has mollified our bones by sucking our marrow. It has made us slaves, and taken all moral dignity from us. We have been degraded, unnerved, robbed of all feelings of liberty. If ever we are to regain our human rights, we must remove the Romanoffs, and root out the last vestiges of the governmental system introduced by them.”

This is a literary specimen of revolutionary dissatisfaction in Russia. In practical politics, the outraged feelings of a down-trodden people lead to ever-repeated deeds of sanguinary revenge, fresh instances of which have once more occurred within the last few months. Meanwhile, Alexander II. endeavours to fence off the rising tide of progressive and parliamentary aspirations within his own dominions by fastening himself tightly upon the neck of Turkey, preventing the Porte from re-convoking her own Parliament, and thus rendering Russian would-be reformers unable to rouse the spirit of their compatriots by a reference to the example of the much-abused “inexpressible Turk.” In every respect, there is system in the Czar’s aggressive policy and in the concomitant cruelties which are practised by his Army of Occupation.

ART. IV.—THE CAIROLI FAMILY.

ON the 24th of October, 1875, the little Italian village of Gropello assumed an air of unwonted excitement; public men, known for their championship of the most opposite political opinions, members of Parliament, officers of the army, municipal authorities, university professors, together with the delegates of many patriotic societies and artisans' associations, formed part of the crowd collected in the small piazza. Gropello is so obscure a place that it will be as well to indicate its locality. From the heights of La Superga, whence north-western Italy may be described, spread out like a map, the silver ribbon of the Po is seen running eastward along the face of the great plain of Piedmont; carrying the eye to where the course of the river bears to the right, it surveys a district called the Lomellina, and in this district lies the village of Gropello, not far from the Lombard border. The cause of the notable October gathering was the uncovering of the statue of a lady, seemingly bowed with years, though of gracious presence—on the base of which might be read, amongst other inscriptions: "A Cairoli-Bono Adelaide . . . Benemerita del Comune colla Fondazione dell' Asilo Infantile." The statue stands in the grounds of the Home and School here mentioned; when the veil was removed, a troop of little children came forth from the adjacent building, bringing flowers to lay at its feet. But the monument meant something very different to the mere acknowledgment of an act of local benefaction. It is our purpose to offer a more detailed account than has as yet appeared in England, of the larger claims possessed by Adelaide Cairoli and her house, not alone to the thanks of the people of Gropello, but also to the gratitude of the Italian nation.

Adelaide, eldest daughter of Count Benedetto Bono of Belgirate, was born at Milan, on the 17th of March, 1806. Count Bono had adhered from the first to the order of things which replaced the hated supremacy of the Austrians. Napoleon went before the Lombards as a deliverer rather than as a conqueror, as a compatriot rather than as an alien. His dazzling career enthralled their imaginations, and the conscription itself, onerous though it was, scarcely tended to decrease his popularity. The men who fought with him felt that his glory was theirs. Till almost lately, there existed in Milan a compact regiment of Napoleonic veterans who spent the best part of their time in discussing the exploits of *l'uom fatale* over sour wine. Count Bono was in the service of the State during the whole period of French ascendancy, acting as Commissary under the *régime* of

the Cisalpine republic, and as director of the communal administration under the vice-regency of Prince Eugène Beauharnais. He was also a member of the legislative body. After the fall of Napoleon he retired into private life, but the Austrians paid an indirect compliment to the ability with which he had executed his official duties by retaining in force the code of municipal law instituted by him. His daughter Adelaide, and her sister Ernesta, were still children, when Lombardy was handed back to the house of Hapsburg-Lorraine. They were not, however, too young to be vaguely sensible of the blank dismay that overwhelmed their beautiful province, when it saw itself abandoned to the tender mercies of De Metternich, and from the day when the white coated soldiery reappeared in Milan—in defiance of the solemn engagement to leave it inviolate, entered upon but forty-eight hours before—sad tales of wrong and oppression would from time to time reach their ears and move their girlish hearts to pity and indignation: tales not only of suffering inflicted upon men, but also of cruelty resulting in the deaths of young and helpless women. These stories, which every now and then evoked a stifled cry of horror from end to end of Europe, made an indelible impression, more especially on the mind of the elder of the two girls. At the age of eighteen, Adelaide Bono married Carlo Cairoli of Pavia. Although his name would be scarcely widely remembered did its title to fame rest solely on his own acquirements, Carlo Cairoli was in many respects a man of note. His parents were not of precisely the same rank in society as the aristocratic family to which Count Bono belonged, but they were refined and well-educated people, and had done all in their power to foster the exceptional talents of their son. At that period the University of Pavia stood very high among European schools of medicine, so that his native town provided young Cairoli with first-class instruction in the department in which his tastes chiefly lay. His great aptitude and unwearied diligence caused him to be soon regarded as a student of singular promise, and when he had served his apprenticeship, recognition was followed up with reward; he was in succession promoted to a lectureship, a post at the Municipal hospital, a professorship at the Surgical Institution, and finally to the presidency of the School of Surgery, left vacant by the death of the illustrious Scarpa. His repute became largely extended, particularly as a skilful and successful operator, while his gentleness of manner, and his untiring devotion to his patients, made him no less popular as a man than he was esteemed as a surgeon. The well-to-do admired and trusted him; the poor held him in little short of veneration—notwithstanding that time was literally money to him, his services were always at their disposal, as for that

matter, was also his purse. From his youth upwards his strongest hopes had been set on the emancipation of his country, and the Austrian police looked upon him with no very friendly eye. In 1830 he had been a widower for several years, his first wife having died early. Such was the man who took Adelaide Bono to his home, which grew to be the acknowledged centre of all that was intellectual and distinguished in the society of Pavia. In the first years of their marriage, two sons were born to the Cairoli; Benedetto, so called after his grandfather, and Ernesto, named after Ernesta Bono, who was now married to Signor Cavallini of Belgirate. Only two or three summers had passed over the heads of these children when a painful sensation was created throughout Italy by the death in a Venetian prison of Enrichetta Castiglione Bussoli the devoted wife of one of the unwilling subjects to Austrian rule. It is related that when Adelaide Cairoli was told of the fact, she clasped her little sons in her arms and made a vow to bring them up in abhorrence of their country's oppressors. Later on, three other boys were born; Luigi in 1838, Enrico in 1840, and Giovanni—Giovannino as he was always called—in 1841. Nothing else has to be recorded of the Cairoli household until we meet its members in the stormy arena of revolution. Carlo Cairoli continued to enjoy the undiminished goodwill of his fellow citizens, and if the professional labours which brought him celebrity and fortune were not to be performed without a severe strain upon a not very robust constitution, an unfailling relaxation awaited him when his day's work was concluded, in a hearty game with his children, who were as bright and promising lads as any father could wish to see.

On June 16, 1846, the Bishop of Imola was elected to the Papal throne. It is not too much to say that the decision of the Conclave formed the turning-point of the nineteenth century. That Italy was already approaching the verge of a stupendous effort to assert her national existence when Mastai Ferretti assumed the triple crown it is impossible to doubt; but on the other hand, it is unquestionable that the cardinals who gave him their vote, unconsciously decreed the moment, and to a certain extent the manner, in which the Italian, not to say the European Revolution should begin. The memorable prayer of the new pontiff, "Benedite O sommo Iddio l'Italia!" marks an epoch in history. It is true that the patriotic aspirations of Pius IX., in so far as they exceeded the limits of a few local and elementary reforms, were so essentially vague and chimerical that they vanished in thin air at the mere prospect of a logical deduction being drawn from them. But for the time being, the attribution to him of ideas which he later declared that he had never

even dreamed of, served much the same purpose as would have been served by his actually entertaining them. Europe witnessed the extraordinary spectacle of Italian patriots threatened with imprisonment at Naples and shot down in Lombardy for singing the pope's praises. By both those Catholic monarchs, Ferdinand I. and Ferdinando, II., the people were forbidden to make direct or indirect allusion to the reigning pontiff, or to breathe his name under any pretence. It wanted no prophet to discern that a crisis could not be long delayed. Yet it is probable that the Viennese Government did not anticipate serious trouble with the Italian provinces. The Austrian officials were blindly rooted in the notion that the harmless if uncomplimentary cries of "Va Via!" with which old Kaiser Franz was once saluted by all the daws and magpies of Milan, might be taken as a fair type of the kind of opposition they were likely to meet with in Italy. But times were changed since the Lombards could devise no better plan than to make magpies and jackdaws their interpreters. Times were changed since an Italian gentleman exclaimed in the hearing of an English traveller that he wished with all his heart the Austrians would carry their tyranny to the length of ordering every one of his countrymen, himself included, to receive daily a hundred blows with the bastinado, for that he believed that this, and nothing short of this, would rouse them to a general insurrection. The first important sign of awakening in the Lombardo-Veneto kingdom was the step taken by Nazari, deputy for Bergamo, in the central congregation, who ventured upon the unheard-of innovation of proposing that a project of reform should be forwarded to Vienna. The project was sent; but of course it was not heeded. The hour had come when it was the plain duty of the more influential among the Lombard patriots to co-operate together in the work of preparation for the day of action; and in Pavia the prime mover in this direction was Carlo Cairoli. Full of boyish ardour, and of more than boyish resolution, his two eldest sons exerted themselves in the same cause for which their father was labouring. That was a time when the youth of an entire people thought less of the story of great deeds than of the doing of them. The occasion is very rare when beardless boyhood becomes a factor in the progress of events affecting the destinies of nations; and it is well that it should be so. Nevertheless that will be a fine page of Italian history which tells how in '48 the youth of the country uprose as to a man to wipe out with their blood the sin and shame of centuries of faction and inertia.

Benedetto and Ernesto Cairoli were in the thick of the agitation of which Pavia became the scene. This agitation was not in itself of capital importance; but it may be briefly described

as being illustrative of the way in which the latent forces of discontent took palpable form all over the peninsula. It is worth noting that the first sign of open murmur seems to have been "got up" by the Austrians. Those mysterious bodies known as the secret police have ever and everywhere cherished as a cardinal article of faith the theory that a suppressed *emeute* is the surest provision against a successful revolution. A suppressed *emeute*, they no doubt argue, affords in the first place an edifying opportunity for an exhibition of the might and majesty of the ruling power, and in the second, a convenient justification for the summary arrest of all persons obnoxious to the Government. Whether experience does not show that, having sown the wind, the promoters of immature risings most often reap the whirlwind, is possibly a moot question, but it is one into which we are not just now called upon to inquire. On a certain Sunday afternoon in the beginning of January, 1848, agents sent from Milan mixed with the holiday crowd in the public places of Pavia, and raised cries of "Down with Ferdinand." The trap was suspected, and at first the bait did not take. The military and the gendarmes brought out to quell the desired disturbance seemed likely to find nothing to do. But at length a scuffle between a soldier and a townsman gave the wished-for excuse, and a troop of cavalry charged down the streets. Several students were wounded, and many arrests were made during the night. The day after intelligence was received of the revolution which had broken out at Palermo on the 12th of January—a revolution which is particularly memorable, because, as Carlyle has remarked, it set the torch to Europe. The youth of Pavia assembled in the church of the Gesu to return thanks for the victory of the Palermitan insurgents. The heads of the Italian movement were apprehensive lest its progress should be retarded by ill-considered and precipitate action; and the Pavese were urgently advised to keep quiet until some decisive blow could be struck. But there was small chance of the students taking heed of these sage counsels, especially when some fresh cause for irritation was constantly cropping up. At the funeral of a citizen, whose death had occurred in the recent events and whose body the students were accompanying to the grave, an incident took place that led to serious consequences. An Austrian officer ostentatiously kept his cigar in his mouth whilst passing close to the coffin, which so raised the indignation of one of the spectators that by a well-aimed box on the ear he dashed the offending weed to the ground. The officer drew his sword, and a row ensued, ending in a bayonet charge, in which two students were killed. A little later the university was closed, and the students dispersed to their homes. Benedetto Cairoli had already betaken himself to Pied-

mont, having been warned that his arrest had been decided upon ; but Ernesto was able to remain in safety under his father's roof, his fifteen years saving him from suspicion.

On the 18th of March began those famous "Five Days" of Milan in which the unorganised, and at the outset all but unarmed citizens, overthrew Radetsky and his host. In the opening of the contest the Milanese had no weapons but a few hundred fowling-pieces. The Austrian force consisted of from ten to fifteen thousand perfectly disciplined soldiers, who had at their command sixty or seventy pieces of artillery. No impartial looker-on in his senses would have predicted, when the first shots were fired in the afternoon of the 18th, that five days later the Austrians would be crushed and flying. But in that tremendous life and death struggle for freedom, the Milanese seemed endowed with superhuman power ; "their character," as Radetsky somewhat naïvely stated in his report, "had become quite transformed !" Thousands of barricades appeared as if by magic ; the very foundations of the city were torn up to construct them ; lads but just in their teens fought with the endurance of veterans ; white-haired men with the impetuosity of youth ; even women and children engaged in the conflict. When night fell, the incessant rattle of the musketry, the cries and groans of the dying, the clang of bells flinging the sound of the tocsin out of seventy towers, and the roar of the furious storm which raged overhead made such a symphony as human ears have rarely heard. Scenes of increasing terror were brought by the succeeding days and nights. The half-frenzied, half panic-stricken Croats were guilty of crimes unspeakable ; the committal of these horrors spurred on the Milanese, not happily to retaliation (the enemy's abandoned wounded were kindly tended and German residents were left unmolested)—but to renewed and desperate attacks. The dreadful drama culminated at midnight on the 22nd, when the Austrians evacuated the city, pursued by the deadly fire and triumphant shouts of the enfranchised citizens. The castle, the single point yet in the foreigner's hands, kept up meantime a violent cannonade, and burning houses lit the path of the retreating legions. "Never while I live," said an Austrian officer in after years, "shall I forget that Milan night !"

Venice expelled the Austrians on the day of their inglorious departure from Milan, and throughout all Italy they were now in flight. They retreated of their own accord from Pavia, where a Provisional Government was immediately formed. Carlo Cairolì was unanimously appointed mayor. Benedetto hastened home from Piedmont, and left again the same day with a company of volunteers who were on the march for Milan—his brother Ernesto taking it sorely to heart that he was not permitted to go too.

All Lombardy was flocking to the capital. Thirty thousand volunteers poured through the gates almost at the moment that the Austrians went out of them; and assistance, in which still firmer hope was placed, was soon on its way. On the 29th of March, seven days after the liberation of Milan Charles Albert, King of Sardinia, crossed the Ticino at the head of his army and made his entry into Pavia through streets strewn with flowers and thronged by an applauding multitude. The people no longer entertained a doubt but that the stranger was gone for good.

Had the people only known the manner in which the coming campaign was to be conducted, they would have looked forward to it with other and sadder expectations. In the month of April there were hardly 50,000 Austrians left in Italy, and these were demoralised to the last degree by the succession of discomfitures they had suffered at the hands of the civil population. A whole precious month was wasted before any sort of decisive action was taken against this three-parts beaten opponent. The numerical strength of the Piedmontese army—supposed to amount to 72,000 men, but the figure stands somewhat too high to represent the available force—was squandered in uselessly garrisoning places in the occupied territory, and even the troops yet at liberty were never massed into anything approaching a compact body: in such wise that not more than 25,000 men seem on any occasion to have been got together in the field. Austrian reinforcements invaded Italy, attacked Venetia, and effected a junction with Radetsky's army without being seriously interfered with; the Volunteers were turned to no account—nay more, they were recalled from the passes of the Trentine Alps, where, with but slight support from the regular troops, they might have held in check an enemy vastly superior in numbers and organisation; the King's ministers refused the services of Garibaldi, the man of all others, according to the afterwards stated opinion of an Austrian commander, who could have reversed the ultimate fortunes of the war; to crown all, the infatuated policy of delay which marked the opening of the campaign was repeated after the brilliant successes of Pastrengo and Goito, and Austria was allowed to quietly and leisurely recruit her strength at a time when she regarded her position as so perilous that she would have gladly renounced Lombardy in return for peace, an arrangement which the British Government was asked to countenance, but which failed to obtain their approval because it involved the sacrifice of the independence of Venice.

In the middle of August the Sardinian King, with what was left of his army, recrossed the Ticino, and Radetsky could inform his master that every inch of Lombardy was restored to his

empire. But though the stranger renewed his hold over the Lombard soil, though his ensign cast its shadow once more upon mountain and plain, upon palace and homestead, the Lombards were not his, at least not all. Three-fourths of its inhabitants streamed out of distracted Milan before the Austrians came back. From the whole province there was an enormous exodus, and in this exodus was included the Cairoli family, which sought a refuge in the village of Gropello, just across the Piedmontese frontier. Thither went Benedetto to rejoin his parents. Before the recall of the Volunteers he had been noted for cool courage in action and had risen from the ranks to a captaincy ; but heavy was the heart of the young man who returned from the war which he had fondly hoped would effect the regeneration of his country, to find the birthplace of his fathers again enslaved and the home of his childhood broken up and abandoned. The ensuing winter was clouded with private as well as patriotic anxiety for the Cairolis, for as it wore on, the health of the head of the family visibly declined. His spirit, however, remained free from the common egotism and the still commoner despondency of sickness. His mind was engrossed in the interests of Italy, and when, after the new year had set in, fresh efforts for freedom were prepared, he hailed them with the most sanguine satisfaction, fearing only lest death should cheat him out of witnessing in their triumph the fulfilment of the object to which he had given his last energies and a large portion of his well-earned fortune. Unhappily death came not too soon but too late to Carlo Cairoli. On the 23rd of March, 1849, a sound as of distant thunder announced the battle in which the Austrian and Italian forces were engaged upon the field of Novara. The sick man anticipated from hour to hour the arrival of the news of a decisive victory. A victory indeed was won—but the victors, as in the battle of Novara twenty-six years before, were Austria and the internal reaction. An endeavour was made to keep Carlo Cairoli in ignorance of what had happened, but without success, and the shock he underwent when he knew the truth was such, that it was plain he could not survive it. He expressed the single desire to be taken to his native town to die ; Marshal d'Aspré—he who had so gallantly served his sovereign on the 23rd—willingly granted the needful permit, nor was this, it is pleasant to be able to add, the only mark of respect paid by that Austrian officer to the dying physician. But the doctors placed their veto on his removal, and in a few days he expired at Gropello under the blow of the great national sorrow. He was buried in a small private chapel attached to the house.

Of the decade that divides the March of 1849 from the May of 1859 it is not necessary to speak at any length. The history

of those ten years may be summed up in a single word—preparation. When the nineteenth century attained its meridian, Piedmont alone in Italy—did we say in Europe we should not go far wrong—appeared on the face of things to have gained aught by the cataclysm of revolution. For the rest, Italian and German princelings were dancing in a ring upon the charters they had sworn before God and man to defend; France had glossed her fine sentiments concerning a universal championship of freedom by letting Louis Napoleon dispose of her as he list; Austria, with the aid of 200,000 Russians, had made herself secure. Italy had been deluged in a sea of blood as pure as any that was ever shed for liberty; the best Italians who yet lived were wanderers and proscripts in foreign lands. Chief among the exiles was Joseph Mazzini, who returned saddened but not disheartened, because incapable of disheartenment, to the task of keeping alight the lamp of Italian nationality in the midst of the prevailing darkness. In 1850 there was set on foot by him a propagandist society called the National Committee—an outgrowth of the *Giovine Italia*, the principles of which it shared. The heads of this association were chosen from the elect of the patriots in every town. The Austrian authorities, whenever they could lay their hands on any of them, punished them with extreme severity, often with death. In Pavia, where the Cairolis were again living, Benedetto made himself the most active member of the committee, until the police, naturally suspicious of the ex-volunteer captain, contrived to get some clue to his proceedings. Warned in time, he escaped, as also did Ernesto, after whom the Austrians sought diligently when they found that his brother had eluded their grasp. The two Cairolis continued in exile, working indefatigably for their cause up to the time when the granting of a general amnesty to persons politically compromised enabled them to return to Lombardy. In the meanwhile their mother remained quietly at Pavia, absorbed in the education of her younger children.

When in the spring of the year 1859 the Emperor of the French announced his intention of "making war for an idea," a phrase of which, by-the-by, Mazzini was the original inventor, there were some Italians who could not find it in their hearts to greet this new plan of liberation with the exultation of spirit with which they had hailed the spontaneous overthrow of Austrian power in '48. Still, a general feeling prevailed that a mistake had been made in the cold reception formerly given to French suggestions of assistance, the more so because the event had shown that there was no security against France playing the part of a most deadly enemy if she were not taken as an ally. And then the prospect, the approach of freedom after the

last long spell of reanimated oppression was of itself so delightful, that the bulk of the nation did not care to scrutinize the offer of imperial help too closely, did not think of looking the gift-horse in the mouth, but took him readily at the giver's own valuation. The day was indeed to come when people should open their eyes in dismay and amazement at what a little more circumspection would have led them to fear from the first; but for the moment they were full to overflowing of unquestioning joy. The work of preparation was prosecuted with increasing energy as the crisis drew near. It was Benedetto Cairoli's business to keep up the communication between the patriots of his native town and the leaders at Genoa, and to this end he had to make many a secret and adventurous journey. Ernesto organised political manifestations in Pavia, in consequence of which he got a fortnight's imprisonment. On being set at liberty he crossed over into Piedmont and immediately enlisted in the First, later changing into the Second Regiment of the Cacciatori delle Alpi. Presently, when his other duties were brought to a conclusion, Benedetto followed him. Like his brother he enrolled himself as a common soldier. Garibaldi soon raised him from the ranks, but the fact that a man of his long services and former standing in the Volunteer force of '48 should have joined them as a matter of course, without dreaming of soliciting any more brilliant position, is characteristic of the stuff the corps of Cacciatori was made of. It was just as when on some grand occasion at the opera, first tenors and popular cantatrice take a pride in singing even in the chorus; the reason, too, was the same—the "occasion" of the freeing of Italy was so grand, so memorable, that men were near forgetting the comparative magnitude of the individual rôle in which they figured. Luigi, next in age to Ernesto, and gifted with an exceptional taste for mathematical studies, had been learning the technicalities of military science at Torea. He entered upon the campaign as sub-lieutenant in the Aosta Brigade of the regular army. Enrico stayed in Lombardy up to the very last moment, engaged in the hazardous work of canvassing enrolments, but when the war actually began it found him in the same regiment which contained his two elder brothers. Giovanni, the youngest son of Adelaide Cairoli, fretted and chafed at home in Pavia at not being old enough to shoulder a musket, and some outburst of his youthful patriotism led to his being thrown into prison. As soon as he was released his mother sent him off to the School of Artillery at Turin.

On the 23rd of May the officers in the Austrian barracks at Varese were finishing their supper, when they were surprised by the sudden appearance of an uninvited visitor. "Who are you?" they asked. "I am Garibaldi, and you are my prisoners," was

the answer. Believing that the redoubtable chief was accompanied by his whole force, the officers promptly surrendered their small company into his hands. The truth was that he had come into the town in advance of his men, and almost alone: but, half an hour later, the "Hunters of the Alps" arrived, and Varese was formally occupied in the name of Victor Emanuel. The day following was spent by the townspeople in the wildest rejoicings and in enthusiastic fraternisation between them and their deliverers. But the time for holiday keeping was short; the *Cacciatori* were come to fight for their Lombard compatriots, not to feast at their expense. In the course of the 25th information was given of the approach of an Austrian army under Urban, and an improvised defence work, in the shape of a barricade, was thrown up on the road leading to Como, close to a place called Biumo Inferiore—this being the direction in which the enemy was expected. Among the most active of those who helped in its erection was Ernesto Cairoli, who repeatedly expressed his impatience for the moment which should bring him face to face with his country's oppressors. At dawn the Austrians came up, making the barricade the central point of their attack. They were, of course, well armed and well equipped, whilst precisely the opposite was the case with the Volunteers who were about half—by some accounts less than half—their number. The Italians also laboured under the disadvantage of having no artillery; but their spirits were of the highest, and, bayonet in hand, they flung themselves on to the mouths of the enemy's heavy ordnance with a will and a dash that carried all before them. The brothers Cairoli were constantly at the front, animating their comrades by words and by example. At a quarter to six A.M., a friend of the family, Gaspere Polli, who was connected with the ambulance, chanced to meet Ernesto on the barricade, and inquired after his brothers. Ernesto replied that he had just seen Benedetto, who was safe and sound, but that he did not know what had become of Enrico. Hardly had he made this answer when "Forward!" was sounded along the ranks, and he hurried into the midst of the *mêlée*. The Austrians were no longer the attacking party but the attacked. Pushing his way to the fore, Ernesto accidentally came across Enrico, and the brothers led the charge side by side: then the men near them heard a shout of "Viva l'Italia!" broken in utterance into a cry of pain, and saw the elder of the two fall lifeless into the arms of the younger with two bullets in his breast. Without opening his lips Enrico kissed the dead face and gave the body into hands which bore it away, himself hastily brushing from his eyes the tears that would not be kept back, and returning to the hottest of the fight. The battle having lasted three hours, ended,

as all the world knows, in Urban's precipitate retreat. There must always appear a sort of injustice in isolating the story of one man killed in battle from the story of his fellows, in singling out his name for separate praise and honour, especially when this man was no great commander, no general officer, on whose life hung important issues, but a simple officer who simply did his duty with the rest. Yet our sympathies are in their nature so narrow that, for the most part, they require concentration on individual types and deeds of heroism in order that our hearts may be quickened to a sense of generous and ennobling admiration, and if the thing must be done we may assuredly look far before we find an instance when the doing of it be less open to question than in this of the first of the Cairoli's who shed his blood for Italy. There were possibly many who were his equals in Garibaldi's band—his superior in pure and enlightened patriotism there could not have been. Ernesto Cairoli was a person whom to know was to love and to respect, and there was something about him which made a lasting impression, even on casual acquaintances. It is said in the inscription to his memory in the chapel at Gropello where, by his mother's wish, he was buried, that his face bore on it the stamp of "a melancholy and sublime aspiration;" his was, in fact, one of those ardent souls which seem enamoured of martyrdom. Could he have foreseen that he would die in the May morning of the first contest and the first victory, with the name of his country on his lips, he would certainly have been well pleased—nor was he without some kind of presentiment that he would not sit down to the banquet of freedom he went forth to prepare. "*Quand on est si près de la mort, toute rayonnante de gloire, qui vous sourit dans l'ombre, peut-être l'aperçoit-on?*"* When the volunteers halted for a brief rest between long marches at Salasco, on the 15th of May, Ernesto made his will, a document which gives so touching an insight into his character, that it may not be amiss to sketch its main clauses. After stating that he is a doctor of laws and private in the 2nd Regiment of the Cacciatori delle Alpi (General Garibaldi), the testator begins by entreating every member of his family to aid the Italian cause so far as in him lies—a cause which he is firmly convinced will triumph, because it is just and holy. Then follow his bequests. To his darling mother, the beloved example of all tenderness to her children, he leaves his watch, and a life interest in all he possesses, praying her to set apart a sum sufficient to cover a number of small legacies to be specified further on. To his well-loved brother Benedetto, now serving as sub-lieutenant in the Cacciatori delle

* Victor Hugo.

Alpi, with heartfelt thanks for unceasing proofs of confidence and regard, he leaves a souvenir to be chosen by his *amatissima madre*, to each of his dear younger brothers, Luigi, Enrico, and Giovanni, "the first fighting in the Piedmontese army, the second a private in my company, the third still at home, owing to his tender years," a ring bearing his initials, also to be of his mother's choice. Ten of his friends, some fellow-citizens, some companions-in-arms are asked to accept various keepsakes in token of his constant and grateful friendship; one among them, a painter, is moreover requested to undertake the execution of a work representing some patriotic subject for the School of Painting at Pavia, for which he is to receive 1800 lire, a delicate way of helping an artist friend. An annual donation of 150 lire is to be presented to the most diligent and proficient pupil in the said school; 1500 lire is bequeathed to necessitous families of his beloved native town who have lost one or more of their members in the wars of independence, the distribution of the money to be superintended by his "best of mothers," and by his heirs. The cook, the nurse, the parlour-maid, and the porter are to receive in his name little gifts varying from one hundred to six hundred francs, as a mark of his appreciation of their disinterested and affectionate behaviour to the family. Finally, the testator makes his brothers his heirs, adding a short paragraph expressive of the hope that to these "dearest brothers" their mother's life may long be spared; it is needless, he says, to commend her to their care and love, since they have ever and equally consecrated to her the most devoted, fervid, and tender gratitude for the inestimable blessings they owe her. He trusts that they likewise may see length of days, and winds up by wishing all good fortune "to our sacred Italy, *libera e indipendente*." It only remains to be told of this brave and gentle champion of freedom that, a few days after the engagement at Biumo Inferiore, Garibaldi, who before the fatal bullets struck him, had notified his intention of specially recommending him in his report to the Minister of War, gave his army a new watchword—"Santo Cairoli."

In the wake of a dozen victories came the peace of Villafranca, signed on the 11th of July. It was an instructive commentary on the Imperial promises of the previous May. It is not easy to decide whether or no those promises of liberty from the Alps to the Adriatic were all along as hollow and delusive as the making-war-for-an-idea flourish with which they were ornamented. For ourselves, we incline to the opinion that Louis Napoleon did really mean to place Venetia under the sceptre of his Sardinian ally, but that the diminishing prospects of the accomplishment of his private designs relative to Central Italy, Genoa, and the

island of Sardinia, the indications of possible complications at home and abroad in the event of the continuance of the war, and lastly, a secret doubt as to the chances of the allied armies if they entered the much-dreaded Quadrilateral, combined to turn him from his original plan. Solferino was a "glorious victory" in the eyes of the world, but in the minds of military men it did not give rise to satisfactory reflections on the probable "staying power" of the French. We recollect to have heard it said by an Italian with whom we were discussing the point in question—a gentleman by-the-by whose estates lie within a few miles of that famous battle-field—"Napoleon was wonderfully clever in convincing the Emperor of Austria that he had reason to congratulate himself on the cessation of hostilities!" And the remark embodies the views of not a few well-informed persons, both at the time and after. Be all this as it may, the public indignation aroused by the renewed desertion of Venice was as intense as it was universal; and in no part of Italy was it more deeply felt than in liberated Lombardy. From '48 downwards if there was one thing on which the Lombards had shown immovable resolution, it was precisely on the often-mooted scheme of securing their own freedom by trafficking with that of Venetia, and the fresh edition of the discreditable transaction of Campo Fermo cast a gloom over the birthday festivities of their independence. As a fact, the French alliance which had been heralded by such tremendous trumpeting, became the mere instrument for carrying out a plan which M. Thiers, the avowed enemy of Italian unity, is stated to have submitted to Charles Albert as early as 1840—a plan which consisted in the freeing of Lombardy by the aid of French arms, and in the cession of Nice and Savoy to France. For it could not be said that thanks were due to Louis Napoleon for the accession of Tuscany and the other central states to the Italian fold, seeing that he did everything in his power to prevent it—and even after it had been happily brought about, we should not forget that in a certain sense De Metternich's old taunt still held good—Victor Emanuel was still known as the King of Sardinia, and there was not yet an Italy among the powers of Europe.

When the *Cacciatori delle Alpi* were disbanded, Benedetto and Enrico Cairoli returned to their home, discouraged about their country and mourning for their brother; the first to devote his time and talents once more unremittingly to the Italian cause, the second to take up the interrupted course of his surgical studies. They were presently joined by Luigi, who had thrown up his commission directly peace was declared. He took this step in the first flush of the general exasperation excited by the turn of events, but it is unlikely that in any case he would

have found the normal routine of military life other than distasteful to him. He was an enthusiast for the true and the beautiful, whether they were made manifest in science or in art, and his sensitive and impressionable temperament was keenly alive to the poetry pervading nature in all her moods—life in all its phenomena. Without dreaming of considering himself a poet, he was fond of framing his ideas in verse, and one little poem of his which happens to have been preserved, bears touching testimony to the passionate veneration he entertained for his mother: "It is our mother," he says in it, "who points to us the heavenward path, holding before our eyes a veiless light;" Again—"The fairest, holiest love is filial love, it is nature's smile—it is the divine song upraised by the blessed ones in Paradise." He was more in his element in the serene world of art and books than he could ever have been in camp or barracks.

The anomalous situation created by the peace of 1859 was not fated to last long. On the 4th of April in the ensuing year the citizens of Palermo rose in rebellion against the masters who had repaid Sicilian fidelity to the House of Bourbon when its scions were flying to the rightabout all over continental Europe by a policy of bad faith and terrorism which it is hardly an exaggeration to term unparalleled. But the rising of the Palermitans was crushed, even as it had been crushed in '48, and the movement was saved from instant collapse only by the efforts of armed bands in the mountains, of whose ultimate subjugation, notwithstanding their unquestionable hardihood, there could not be the shadow of a doubt, were they compelled to rely solely on their own scanty resources. This was the state of affairs when Garibaldi, who had lately been living peaceably at Quarto on the Eastern Riviera, came to the determination of going to the relief of the revolution in Sicily. A wilder or more infatuated resolve as far as appearances went could not well be imagined, nor can it be too often repeated that, although the chief was sanguine, there were numbers of brave men in his "Thousand" to whom the expedition seemed to promise no brighter alternatives than death or the Castle of St. Elmo. We know not which to admire the most, the heroic hopefulness of the one, or the hopeless heroism of the others. In the evening of the 5th of May the little host assembled on the shore of Quarto, to await the ships that Nino Bixio was commissioned to bring thither under the veil of secrecy from Genoa. A modest memorial stone now marks the place where it halted, and these surf-washed rocks of the old Roman station are become, since that evening nineteen years ago, not the least interesting of the myriad Italian spots where we "tread on history." The men and boys gathered together by

the sea formed a motley throng, dissimilar in dress and social condition, devoid of training and organisation, but at one in their perfect loyalty to the leader of their election, and uncontaminated with that common infirmity of revolutionary forces : the eagerness of all to command, the reluctance of all to obey. Not far from Garibaldi stood Benedetto and Enrico Cairoli, who had brought with them a goodly contingent from the town and University of Pavia. The General occasionally exchanged words with the former, and was struck by the calm serenity of his bearing in the midst of the anxious excitement of the expectant crowd. Such was the enthusiasm which prevailed that several business men who had come from Genoa solely with the purpose of seeing off their friends, and who had brought the keys of their offices in their pockets, intending to be back at their desks next morning, could not resist the impulse to set sail with the rest, when at length, after hours of feverish impatience, Bixio duly arrived with the *Piemonte* and the *Lombardo*. On the 7th the first order of the day was issued, in which it was announced that the corps would adopt its old designation of "Hunters of the Alp," and that the cry was to be "Italy and Victor Emanuel." The expeditionary force was found to be composed of 170 Pavese, 150 Brescians, 150 Milanese, 110 Venetian emigrants, 70 Genoese, 60 Parmesans and Piacentese, 50 Tuscans, 27 Modenese, and these were forthwith divided into seven companies, the seventh, made up entirely of volunteers from his native town, being entrusted to Benedetto Cairoli. Garibaldi landed at Marsala on the 11th of May, advancing on the 12th to Rambigallo, and thence taking the road to Salemi, where he hurriedly organised his force, and amalgamated with it the recruits who flowed in from the surrounding country. At Salemi also he assumed the title of Dictator, "by the will of the Italian people and in the name of Victor Emanuel." The Bourbon troops despatched to intercept and annihilate "the Filibuster" made their first attack on the 15th of the month near Calatafimi. They mustered about 4000 men, and were commanded by Landi. Tranquilly seated on the grass Garibaldi watched their approach, which was rendered conspicuous by their indulging in a lavish expenditure of powder and shot long before they were close enough to inflict any damage on their opponents. As soon as they were within range the Pavese and Bergamasque companies were ordered to return their fire. Still they came on, and but a short space parted them when the captain of the Thousand sprang into his saddle with the cry, "Forward boys, to the bayonet!" The Volunteers charged vigorously, their chief riding at their head, his charmed life escaping as usual amidst the hail of balls which whistled about his ears. Enrico Cairoli, with four companions,

made a dash upon one of the enemy's guns and took it. Some hours of desperate fighting resulted in the complete success of the most critical action in the whole campaign, and when the day was won the General called for a special cheer in honour of Benedetto Cairolì's gallant Pavesi—he would go anywhere and attempt anything he said, with such a band of heroes to support him. Twelve days later, in the taking of the Sicilian capital, when the bells of the churches were already proclaiming the certain victory of the side on which he fought, Benedetto was wounded in the leg. Witnessing his brother's misadventure, Enrico became all the more prodigal in acts of extravagant daring, and he also was soon struck down by a bullet, which fractured his skull. As he was being carried out of fire Garibaldi embraced him with fatherly affection, and appointed him staff-major on the spot. Both brothers were nursed with every attention by Palermitan families. Enrico's case was at first regarded as hopeless, but by a fortunate chance the ball had touched no vital part, and its extraction—an operation undergone with great stoicism—was successfully accomplished. On the other hand, Benedetto's wound, though not imminently dangerous, turned out to be such as to lay the seeds for more or less life-long suffering. During this eventful period Adelaide Cairolì lived at Gropello, "like Cornelia at Misenum," says an Italian writer, to whom we are indebted for much valuable data, "telling the story of what her children and their comrades had done for their Sicilian brethren." More especially she would speak of three young Palermitans, Salvatore, Pasquale, and Raffaele di Benedetto-Mignaro, who were the worthy companions in arms and in faith of her sons. Raffaele was severely wounded in the chest in the freeing of Palermo, but he recovered: it was reserved for him to die before Rome in 1867. The two others, who were in prison when the struggle of the 27th of May began, were set free by the people in the course of the day, when they rushed to the defence of the newly-erected barricades and both were killed. Thus far, the dreaded "worst" was absent in the news which reached Adelaide Cairolì of her own dear ones—though grievously injured, they were alive. But the shadow of death was also upon her house. Benedetto and Enrico being placed *hors de combat*, there remained no Cairolì fighting in the patriot army; this was not as it should be; so at least thought Luigi, who started instantly for Sicily. It must have cost him a double pang to leave the congenial repose of his quiet home for the perilous uncertainties of war, since he had lately lost his heart to a beautiful and charming girl, who returned his affection, and who was soon to become his wife. Luigi joined the volunteers as sub-lieutenant in Sirtori's division. It is almost superfluous to add that he was noted for extreme valour in every

action he took part in. Garibaldi mentions him as well as his brothers in the address to the ladies of Sicily, dated from Messina, in which he publicly signalises Adelaide Cairolì as an example to them all. The enemy's balls respected the life of the young student who accompanied Sirtori to the mainland when the scene of operations was there transferred; but the Indian sun of Calabria proved more fatal than Bourbon bullets. Worn out by forced marches under its burning rays, Luigi fell ill of fever at Cosenza: thence he was removed to Naples, where he died on the 13th of September, whilst the city was yet rejoicing in the first gladness of the freedom for which his life was a sacrifice. His body was buried at Gropello.

From Garibaldi's point of view the liberation of the two Sicilies was not a work complete in itself, but the means to an end, and the end was united Italy. Napoleon, who saw this clearly, was so much disturbed by it that Cavour knew that he could count upon French neutrality when he took the so-called anti-revolutionary step of occupying Umbria and the Marches with Piedmontese troops. So it happened that while the volunteers were preparing to strike a final blow at the Bourbon monarchy on the banks of the Volturno, the Sardinian regulars were making short work of the Papal mercenaries at Castelfidardo and Ancona. In November the armies met, and the king shook hands with the king-maker, who retired to Caprera—postponing, not renouncing, the completion of his great undertaking. Those who supposed that Garibaldi meant in future to devote himself wholly to the culture of potatoes, or even that he would never more unsheath his sword except at the express orders of the prince to whom he had given a kingdom, ostensibly at least "*malgré lui*," must have been indeed simple. For the moment, however, he let events take their course. On the 14th of March, 1861 (Gaeta, the last Bourbon stronghold having fallen in February), Victor Emanuel assumed the style and title of King of Italy, Rome being at the same time indicated as the natural and rightful capital of the newly-constituted state. There can be hardly a doubt but that Cavour's attention was now turned steadfastly to the acquisition of the Eternal City, but what expedients he may have been devising to effect his aim will be ever a mystery. In the first week of June his career was cut short with a suddenness which gave rise to all sorts of wild and outrageous rumours. What was plain was that the one statesman who then knew how to checkmate the French Emperor was removed from the scene; Imperial influence soon became paramount in Italy and dangerously powerful elsewhere.

The party of action, as it was called, grew to be more and more convinced that the questions of Roman and Venetian in-

dependence could only be settled by an appeal to arms, and that further they were bound to accept the responsibility of making this appeal since there was no prospect of its emanating from the Government, though there were hopes that the latter might be induced or obliged to give assistance when once the enterprise was fairly started. These hopes were indirectly confirmed when Ratazzi, on being summoned to the premiership in 1862, requested Garibaldi to make a tour through the country in order to superintend the institution of the *Tir Nationale*, or national shooting practice—a measure which appeared to have a strong political significance. People vaguely suspected that something was in the wind. Then more definite reports got afloat, and it was whispered that Garibaldi was planning an attack on the Trentino. Such was in reality the case, but the movement was abruptly and somewhat violently repressed by Government. Yet Garibaldi was encouraged to continue his tour which everywhere took the character of a semi-Royal progress. In the beginning of July he reached Sicily, and foiled in his proposed attack on Austria, his thoughts went back to the old programme of an expedition which should start at Marsala and end at the Capitol. On the 19th of July he assembled a handful of his most faithful adherents in the cathedral of Marsala, where, with one voice, they raised the cry and took the oath of Rome or death. When he came out into the presence of the crowd he was greeted with loud acclamations; it seemed as though the people guessed that some act of peculiar moment had been performed within the church. Near him walked a young man who attracted notice by his tall figure and handsome face, and the deep scar upon his forehead. This young man was Enrico Cairoli, who had not yet completed his twenty-second year, but whose character, which was naturally firm, serious, and constant, had been ripened into early development by sorrow. His brothers' deaths occasioned him no common grief, for he and they were united by an intimate spiritual sympathy which constituted a stronger bond than any mere ties of blood. He had spent long hours in solitary meditation beside their silent graves in the little chapel at Gropello. But he was not the one to make private trouble an excuse for shunning the active duties of life; and in the tedious time of his convalescence from his Sicilian wound he worked hard to qualify himself for the final medical examinations—through which he passed with honours. He declined a tempting offer of the rank of major in the Royal army, being determined to adopt his father's profession. Not for one instant, however, did he hold himself exempt from the moral obligation of serving under the banner of his country's freedom whenever and wherever it might be raised; and thus,

in 1862 we find him back at his post in the van of Italian patriotism.

On the 1st of August Garibaldi joined a body of two or three thousand volunteers in the woods of Ficuzza. A Royal Proclamation was then published which denounced the expedition as treasonable; but there was a wide disposition to regard this and other measures launched against it in the light of so much dust flung in the eyes of foreign potentates. Everybody recollected how in 1860 the Sardinian army was professedly sent south "to combat the revolution personified in Garibaldi," and how somehow or other it ended by combating Lamoricière's Papalini instead. Circumstantial rumours were circulated of an understanding between the Prime Minister and the illustrious "rebel"—to this day it is the opinion of nine out of ten Italians that some such understanding did exist. Garibaldi was perfectly able to keep out of the way of the troops which were supposed—or were not supposed—to be in quest of him, and what was still more surprising, was that he crossed over undisturbed into Calabria. His plan was to go on avoiding any encounter with the regulars, and to push forward with all possible speed towards the Papal States. But of a sudden Ratazzi became most terribly in earnest. Somewhat after noon on the 29th of August the volunteers, not at present exceeding 1000 or 1500 men, stationed on the steeps of Aspromonte, discerned an advancing body of regulars. The Redshirts had been warned throughout in no case to use their arms against their brothers of the Italian army, and Garibaldi repeated the injunction as he stood to the fore, looking through his spy-glass. When on coming within range the regulars began a sharp fusillade he passed down the front of his men exhorting them on no account to return it. The left and the centre heard his voice and obeyed; but before he could reach the extreme right, where the Sicilian Picciotti were stationed, a responsive fire was opened from that quarter. It was at this juncture that Garibaldi was struck by two balls—one inflicting a slight, the other a very serious wound. He remained standing, uncovered his head, and waving his cap in the air, cried again to his men, "Don't fire." After he was led away to have his wounds examined under the shelter of a tree, his officers made every endeavour to carry out his orders, and no one strove more manfully or at greater personal risk against the horrors of civil conflict than Enrico Cairoli, who did all in his power by shouts, gestures, commands and entreaties, to prevent resistance. "Cease firing" was sounded by the Garibaldian bugles, and in a few minutes the insubordinate Picciotti desisted; the whole calamitous affair ending about a quarter of an hour after it had begun. Hardly was the attack discontinued, when numbers of the regulars might

be seen shaking hands and exchanging friendly greetings with the volunteers. Relations, acquaintances, old comrades, stumbled upon each other in this inauspicious meeting on the Bitter Mount. Enrico Cairoli hastened to where his General lay, and step by step he followed the litter on which Garibaldi was carried up rough and precipitous paths to the cabin of the shepherd Vincenzo, who, by a strange coincidence, recognised among his present visitors several volunteers to whom he had given refreshment when they were on their victorious march for Naples. Enrico did not leave Garibaldi until he was separated from him in the prison of Varignano and conveyed to a fort near Genoa. Here he was retained up to the issue of the general amnesty, when he returned to Pavia, taking with him a stock of very painful memories.

The Austrian war of 1866 calls for but few observations. The Cairolis were all engaged in it; Benedetto and Enrico respectively as colonel and major in the 9th Regiment of Volunteers; Giovanni, who was now for the first time able to bear arms for his country, as subaltern in the regular army. One of the fundamental mistakes committed by those who had the management of the campaign was the field of operations assigned to Garibaldi. Reference either to history or to the map should have proved that the choice was wrong—that other ground offered incomparably greater facilities to a bold offensive movement such as both strategic and political considerations demanded. Badly placed and indifferently armed as they were, the Garibaldians advanced, although not without check, along the mountainous defiles, and they were gradually fighting their way to effect a junction with Medici's too tardily despatched corps near Trento, when on the 25th of July, came the order "to evacuate the Tyrol in twenty-four hours." Peace was made, and the Trentino, a province Italian in language, sentiment, and to a great extent in tradition, was handed back to Austria, inevitably to become, sooner or later, a disturbing element in the relations between that empire and the kingdom of Italy. After the cessation of hostilities, Benedetto Cairoli was decorated with the cross of an officer of the military order of Savoy, "for having shared in all the principal actions by the side of the general in command, notwithstanding that he was still suffering from wounds received in the former war." The silver medal for military valour was conferred upon Enrico in recognition of "intelligence and gallantry" displayed in the engagements of Condino and Bezzecoa, and the communal council of Pavia made him one of its members as a mark of respect to the family. As for young Giovanni, he particularly distinguished himself on that fatal day of Custoza, when what the Archduke Albrecht called the "unendlich tapfer" of the Italian troops was only equalled by the indescribable incapacity

[Vol. CXI. No. CCXIX.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LV. No. I. G

of their commander. Adelaide Cairoli had the happiness of seeing her three sons back under her roof without the slightest casualty having befallen them. Their good fortune was not extended to their cousins, the sons of Count Bono's second daughter, Emilia Cavallini, one of whom was mortally wounded at Custozza, and another stricken with fatal illness whilst serving in the Trentino. Less lion-hearted than her sister, Madame Cavallini literally died of grief.

This year of 1866 brought independence to Venice, and only one great historic Italian city was left waiting for its freedom. It is astonishing how so many otherwise clear-sighted persons should still have refused to admit that *Roma capitale* was no Utopian dream but one of those facts of the future which are no more doubtful than are the facts of the past. There was, however, much more justification for uncertainty about the date of Rome's union with Italy. Behind the last remnant of the long disgrace of Europe, the mercenary force charged with the provisional defence of the Pope King against his subjects—loomed the armies of the *grande nation*. To all save the few who believe there is a Nemesis on the watch for crowned as for uncrowned offenders, it seemed that the disposer of these armies was never more firmly seated on his throne than when some twelve months after Sadowa he was presiding over the world's fair in the Champs de Mars. The hands of the Italian Government were tied by the September convention, and altogether the Roman question was at a species of dead-lock, as satisfactory to politicians who sought the prolongation of the existing state of affairs, as it was the reverse to patriots who were impatient to see its end. And apart from impatience, there were many who thought that the evil from which Italy was suffering had reached a stage when it was necessary to choose between trying an heroic remedy or allowing the mischief to become chronic. It appeared to them that in the former course there was less risk, or at least more hope, than in the latter, and the result was Garibaldi's Roman expedition. How far the Prime Minister approved, nay supported the enterprise, is not known with any exactitude. It has been conjectured that by fits and starts he gave it both his approbation and his support. It has also been conjectured that had he been a Camillo di Cavour instead of an Urban Ratazzi, Garibaldi would have entered Rome before a single French transport had left Toulon. The Italian army must perforce have followed him, and then nobody could have prevented the Romans from proclaiming Victor Emanuel their king. Such was the grand possibility of the moment, and Napoleon's curious delay in despatching his troops almost favoured the idea that he himself was not totally averse to its realisation. But the Premier spoiled



everything by his bungling, and the history of his administrations, which began with Novara and went on with Aspromonte, was to conclude with Mentana.

The arrest of Garibaldi at Sinalunga on the 24th of September excited so strong a feeling throughout the country, that if the Government ever seriously meant to keep him shut up, they were soon induced to abandon the intention. A protest was presented in Parliament (one of the signers of which was Benedetto Cairoli, who had been returned to the Chamber in the last elections), popular manifestations took place in great number, the very soldiers on guard over Garibaldi at Alessandria did nothing but shout, "Long live the hero of Italy," and "Hurrah for Rome!" On the 27th it was announced that "in accordance with his own desire, seconded by the wish of the Government, the General was to return to Caprera;" and he left Alessandria by special train for Genoa, where he was enthusiastically welcomed. There was no escort. Garibaldi had given his word that he would go to Caprera—questionless he would keep it; how long he meditated staying there was quite another thing. In the meantime the movement did not rest wholly in abeyance; but no event of importance occurred. At the time of which we write the Romans were without arms. It is essential to bear this fact well in mind in order to understand what follows. Had it stood alone, it would have gone very far to condemn them to inaction. It did not stand alone. In the past eighteen years the idea ever present with them that the vast military resources of France were arrayed against their freedom had told upon the spirit of the people, and the persons best fitted to fill their hearts with braver hope were far away. "What would you have?" said a poor old Roman to an English visitor, "all who could lead are in exile . . . all who have *la testa*." The natural leaders of the people of Rome were the 15,000 proscribed who for three years more were to taste the saltness of *lo pane altrui*; the men who endeavoured to be their substitutes lacked authority and local knowledge. Still the greatest difficulty to be got over was the want of arms. Were this surmounted, it was not improbable that the citizens would recover their self-confidence, and show themselves able and ready to help in the efforts made on their behalf. Several clandestine attempts were made to supply the want; but the Papal police was on the alert, and they failed utterly. One expedient was yet untried—the introduction of arms from across the frontier by an armed force. This desperate measure, this forlorn hope, was planned and undertaken by Enrico Cairoli, faithful to his oath "Rome or death."

The news spread like wildfire on the 20th of October that Garibaldi had escaped from Caprera in a canoe. The same day,

in the town of Terni, while little children ran about the streets singing "Andiamo à Roma santa," Enrico Cairoli was completing the preparations for his heroic venture. At eight o'clock in the evening he and his companions—about 70 men from all parts of Italy—left that place, and after marching through the night, halted at ten next morning near Cantalupo. Each man received a franc with which to buy his breakfast. When they had rested a short while Enrico Cairoli read them an order of the day.

"The time draws near," he said, "when it will behove us to prove that we know how to *act*. If we are to succeed we must be organised: that is, we must agree to be placed under the conditions which permit of the greatest concentration or the widest extension of our force, conformable to the ground we shall have to traverse. I have decided, therefore, that our little band shall be constituted in the following manner:—One commander, E. Cairoli: one adjutant, E. de Verneda; one quartermaster, G. Muratti; three sectional commanders—Section I., G. Tabachi; Section II., C. Isachi; Section III., G. Cairoli. Every section to be composed of five sub-divisions, each made up of four persons and a head. Friends, I feel it to be once more my duty to remind you that the undertaking is difficult—more than hazardous—desperate. I know your valour. I will not speak to you of the peril, of the extreme fatigue, we shall have to go through. But if anyone among you, from circumstances over which his will has no control, is not fit to follow us, let him frankly declare it, inasmuch as he would have the remorse of causing damage to the operation. Whosoever is indisposed or footsore is bound not to conceal it, for woe betide him if, persisting, his illness masters him when we are on other ground. He must choose . . . a different road, and we will salute him with, 'Adieu, till we meet in Rome!' We shall be *en route* at four o'clock."

The address is like its author—modest, generous, honourable. Once again, for the last time, the young captain spoke to his comrades, saying that all who followed him must be ready to lay down their lives, and bidding who would proceed to proceed, who would withdraw to withdraw. Not one of them turned his back on Rome or death.

The rain was falling in torrents when the volunteers resumed their journey. Somewhat before midnight they stopped at a hostelry not far from Passo Sfondato, where they encountered several Italian cavalry officers who were eager to shake them by the hand and wish them well. Thence they marched to Passo Coress, which was reached at eight o'clock in the morning of the 22nd of October. A few minutes more and they had crossed the fictitious frontier line which they desired to blot out with their blood. A waggon accompanied them laden with 300 muskets. The next halt was made on coming in sight of the Tiber, upon

whose waters one large boat and sundry smaller craft lay in readiness for them. In the evening the Seventy embarked with their precious cargo, and the strength of the current bore them swiftly up the river. A profound stillness prevailed, but few if any of the travellers slept. Enrico Cairoli stood at the prow, silent and thoughtful, his face turned fixedly towards Rome, as though his eyes sought the outline in the darkness. At the mouth of the Tevere there was stationed a boat carrying a Papal guard; a party of volunteers boarded it, disarmed the men, and took them prisoners. By two o'clock the Seventy were close to Ponte Molle (Pons Milvius), a couple of miles from the Porta del Popolo. It was here that they expected to receive certain instructions by means of signals from the patriotic agents within the city. They listened attentively, and kept a sharp look-out, but there was not a sound except of the tinkling of distant bells, nor were there any lights visible in the starless night. The absence of these signals, which was the prime cause of the failure of the expedition, has never been thoroughly accounted for, but it is pretty clear that there must have existed some misunderstanding between Cairoli and the Insurrectionary Committee. The uncertainty in which they were placed prevented the Seventy from moving a step forwards or backwards, and as the night wore on their position became hourly more critical. Still they did not renounce the luxury of hoping for the best. Enrico Cairoli's present plan—if action could any way be concerted with the Insurrectionary Committee—was to convey the muskets into Rome under cover of the night, to arm 300 picked citizens, who were to be in waiting on the bank of the river, and to join with them in heading an immediate rising. By the light of subsequent events we can estimate the importance of this scheme had it proved practicable; a revolution in Rome on the 23rd of October would have meant no more and no less than Garibaldi's triumphal entry after his victory at Monte Rotondo on the 24th. Soaked to the skin in the pouring rain, the Seventy watched and waited for the return of a boatman—an old Red-shirt—who was sent to obtain news of the condition of the city. The man did indeed return, but he had nothing encouraging to tell. It seemed that by a fatality which could not have been foreseen the expedition had arrived just twenty-four hours too late. The revolutionary movement, which was on the verge of breaking out the day before, had been stifled in its birth; Rome was tranquil. A young artist named Candida was now sent to the committee to inquire what remained to be done, but he did not come back. At length day dawned, and the dawn brought with it almost the certitude of death and defeat. As it was obviously necessary to quit the boats, the volunteers landed on the left bank of the

Tiber and retired to a marshy field under the Monti Parioli. They explored the environs, and, finding them unoccupied, their captain ordered them to ascend the height. The third section, with Giovanni Cairoli in command, was the first to gain the summit, the others quickly following. It had left off raining—the morning was as bright and balmy as a day in June. From the hill-top the dome of St. Peter's could be seen glistening in the earliest rays of the sun, and there went up from the little band a spontaneous cry of "Là è Roma!" More than one of the Seventy looked on Rome that day for a first and a last time.

On Monti Parioli there is a vineyard with a farm house and buildings belonging to the Gloria family, and here it was that the volunteers took up their position. After a while a scout noticed a body of Pontifical Dragoons on the Roman high-road, but it turned suddenly and retraced its steps. Enrico Cairoli sent a third messenger into Rome, a native of Trieste called Muratti, who went in by the Porta del Popolo, putting the sentries off their guard by addressing them in German. From what may be gathered from the statement of the Insurrectionary Committee, it seems that by the hour when Muratti reached them—about one o'clock—the gates were closed, and further egress from the city was impossible. The answer they would have made had they been able to transmit any communication, was to the effect that they would strain every nerve in the course of the ensuing night to bring out a number of Roman youths, as near as might be corresponding to that of Cairoli's muskets, with a view to arranging an attack upon one of the gates. Had this answer reached the Seventy, it could not have altered their fortunes. Between four and five o'clock when they had almost come to the conclusion that for the moment at least they were safe, Giovanni Cairoli, who was stationed on the highest ground, informed Enrico that numerous bands of Papal soldiers were advancing in the direction of Vigna Gloria. The enemy's force was composed partly of Papal Zouaves, partly of men of the Antibes Legion, in which it was said there were many French soldiers in receipt of pay from the Imperial exchequer. The attack was quickly opened, but so vigorously was it repelled that the Papalini fell back—to return, however, supported by fresh reinforcements. Enrico Cairoli gave the command to charge with the bayonet, and rushed forward at the head of his men to the cry of "Viva Roma, Viva Garibaldi." Giovanni, whom chance had thrown a little in the rear, shouted to his brother? "Wait a minute, Enrico, let us go together." Nothing heeding, Enrico pursued his way, and Giovanni overtook him only in time to catch him in his arms, wounded in the cheek and in the breast. "Dastardly French!" he had cried as the foreign bullets shot him down. Whilst

Giovanni was bearing his burden out of the confusion, a ball struck him in the forehead, and, his strength failing him, he sank to the ground, his arms still clasped about his brother's neck. He battled with his faintness, so that he might hear the few sentences Enrico was able to stammer forth: "I am dying you know, Giovannino, I am dying. Let me be buried by Ernesto and Luigi. Greet Mamma—Benedetto—my friends. The problem is solved . . ." The younger brother mistook the exhaustion caused by loss of blood, for the approach of death, and he answered, "I am also dying, Enrico." As they lay there, the Pope's mercenaries thrust their bayonets again and again into their flesh. The diminishing remnant of the Seventy went on gallantly resisting its threefold superior opponent. The Papalini tried without success to get between the house and the volunteers, who at the end of half-an-hour's hard fighting, took up their stand within the building, intending to defend it to the last man. To their surprise the firing very soon ceased, and they discovered on coming out, that the enemy had disappeared. The attack was not renewed, so they applied themselves to collecting their dead and wounded, who amounted to about a third of their full number. They found that their captain had been dead some time. Giovanni, who for a while had lost his consciousness, was employed in trying to succour a wounded fellow-citizen. The dead and wounded were placed under shelter, and their comrades stayed with them for the best part of the night, hourly expecting a fresh assault. As nothing of the kind occurred, Giovanni urged on them the wisdom of retiring from a position which plainly could not be tenable for long, and they dispersed, a few at a time, taking with them such of the wounded as could be moved. The rest, including Giovanni, were left in charge of three companions. The bulk of those who departed got across the frontier into the Italian kingdom; two or three lost their way and were made prisoners, several were arrested on entering the city, under the delusion that something might still be done. The remaining dead and wounded were conveyed in rude country carts down the streets of Rome in the course of the following day—the day upon which Garibaldi's ill-fed, ill-armed boys routed the Papal troops at Monte Rotondo. Rather more than a week after, the Garibaldini were well-nigh getting another success, when the big battalions of France hurried up to try experiments with their new breechloader. "The chassépôts did wonders." The name of Napoleon became connected with a new victory—that of Mentana. Three years later an Emperor and a Pope lost their thrones, France lost two provinces, and Italy gained one. These were among the "wonders" wrought by General de Failly's chassépôts.

Giovanni Cairoli's friends had to endure weeks of cruel uncertainty as to whether he was alive or dead. Then strange rumours got abroad: he was said to be in one of the Roman hospitals, and to have had a remarkable interview with Pio Nono. All mystery was at length dispelled by his arriving—unlooked for as a ghost—at the Florence railway station, with his hair cropped and his clothes soiled and ragged, but “in pretty good case,” so it was reported, “for a man who had received only six weeks before a rifle bullet in his head and four bayonet thrusts in his body.” Some of his wounds were still open. He had never conversed with the Pope, for the good reason that the latter had never visited the hospital where he was lying; he had however seen and spoken to Monsignor Stonor, an ecclesiastic belonging to a noble English Catholic family, who showed much kindness towards the wounded Redshirts. The Papal authorities treated Giovanni as a political prisoner, not as a prisoner of war, and the strongest efforts were made to extort from him a promise never more to bear arms against the Pope's Government. One fine day he was unexpectedly sent off to Florence, which he reached in the state above described, and which he left again at-once for Gropello, where his arrival had been preceded by the sad ceremony of the home-bringing of Enrico's remains. Powerful influence was believed to have been exerted to obtain his release. For more than a year hopes were cherished that his injuries were not incurable, and even that their cure was already far advanced; but in the beginning of 1869 acute symptoms set in of a kind that destroyed all prospect of recovery. The next eight months formed one prolonged death agony, supported without a murmur of complaint or regret. Not in his worst paroxysms of excruciating pain did Giovanni Cairoli repent having renounced all things that he might die for Rome. Yet his life was well worth living: as youngest born he had been ever as it were the spoiled child of the family, and the greater world outside his private circle had smiled on him hardly less kindly than the little world within it. A captain of artillery when he was scarcely twenty-three, with a high reputation for personal gallantry and the *prestige* of a name synonymous with patriotism, he was sure to attain brilliant and early distinction in his profession. But these reflections, if he made them, weighed lightly on his mind; his only real sorrow was the grief he involuntarily caused his mother by his sufferings. At his dying hour his brain was crowded with confused thoughts of the great objects of his political faith, and in his delirium he spoke of Italy and Garibaldi, of Enrico and victory and Rome. He died on the 11th of September, 1869, a few days after his twenty-sixth birthday. The wound in his head had healed long before. What killed him was an

internal injury due to the bayonet thrusts inflicted by the Pope's soldiers whilst he was stretched helpless on the ground listening to his brother's last messages of love.

"After the sons, the mother died." So ends the sublime story of martyrdom written in that Book of Maccabees, once said by Mazzini to seem as if it was meant expressly for the Italians. The words adapt themselves singularly to the story we have told in these pages, and, still keeping to the language of the old Hebrew author, we may add:—"The mother was marvellous above all, and worthy of honourable memory." Adelaide Cairoli could not well be made the subject of a long biography. Her name can find no place in heated discussions as to the fitness or capacity of women for a share in public life. Her mission on earth was at once so high and so humble that it removes her out of the sphere of contested opinion. She sought no sort of publicity; she was mild, courteous, charitable—the model of every domestic virtue. She never knew the quickened pulses, the intenser consciousness, the swift, ardent life, which is their portion who are the makers of history. Sorrow came to her in its nakedness—it was her lot to stand aside and to suffer. Nevertheless, it was by no accidental circumstance that her sons were what they were; they did but obey the precepts she had given them, and act in accordance to the code of duty she had laid down. As one after the other of the children who had been the charge and comfort of her widowhood went forth to convert her teaching into deeds—as one after the other they were brought back lifeless to her door, she was aware that as she had sown so she had reaped, and she was content, accounting herself, if most unhappy, yet most enviable. The deepening of the furrows of care, the saddening of the calm smile, alone betrayed the anguish of the mother wrestling with the fortitude of the patriot. Adelaide Cairoli's patriotism was broad and simple, and untainted by the transient irritations of party politics. In her youth, she saw her country possessed of nothing except a splendid past; she desired for it the advent of a commensurate future. She saw it divided, oppressed, impotent; she desired that it might be united, free, powerful—in a word, that Italy might exist. And, believing that she was of the generation which should witness this thing brought about, she esteemed no sacrifice too great. Love of country was not, with her, a vague or spasmodic sentiment, it was the master-passion of her life—of the woman of seventy as of the girl of seventeen. In trials like hers, all the sympathy in the world can give no consolation, if by that is implied a lightening of the load of sorrow; at the same time, she took a melancholy pleasure in the tokens of loving homage sent to Gropello from every part of the Peninsula, recognising them as a proof

that Italy remembered with gratitude the faithful service of her sons. These mementoes she arranged in the room that contained the tattered and riddled accoutrements in which the brothers had fought and fallen. She was careful to acknowledge even the slightest testimony of respect and good will. Replying to one of the many addresses presented *à propos* of the affair of Vigna Gloria she wrote the following lines, which have a pathetic interest :—

“ May the blood of my darling Enrico, and of my other, and our other, martyrs, not have been shed in vain. In the confident hope that better days will come, and that at no distant date, for our unfortunate country, I find the courage to live and struggle on, supported by the tender affection of my two dear survivors.”

One of these “ dear survivors ” was to be taken from her, and at the loss of her youngest born the strong, brave heart gave way. We have been told, by one who was admitted into the intimacy of the family at Gropello (a lady herself bearing a name venerated wherever Italian patriots abide), that after Giovanni's death Adelaide Cairoli “ was never the same.” She strove valiantly to regain the grave cheerfulness which had characterised her through life, but the task was beyond her power. She lived, however, until the 17th of March, 1871. By that time, Rome was capital of Italy—the problem was solved.

This article cannot be closed without some few lines of further reference to the sole remaining representative of the Cairoli family. And before saying anything else, we will return for a moment to our starting-point—the monument unveiled four years ago at Gropello. On that occasion, for him beyond all others touching and significant, Signor Benedetto Cairoli delivered a short speech, of which one or two passages may be cited with advantage, since they strike the keynote as well of his public as of his private life. “ There are emotions,” he said, in thanking those who had come to Gropello to attend the ceremony, “ which forbid words ; but your hearts will understand me. The feeling that suggested this display of affection will tell you how impossible it is for me to give just expression to my gratitude. In this house—that was once the refuge of my sorrows, and that even now, after the new birth of home consolations is made the dwelling of my choice alike by the ties of memory and by the bonds of duty—soul and mind are often under the empire of those transporting thoughts which outsoar the earthly horizon ; but the lips hold their peace. . . . I turn, in the first place, to the promoters of the monument. The honours rendered to the holy woman who gave her life many times over to the fatherland in the lives of her children, are to me the most availing balm against the blows of fortune ;

but I am aware of the higher scope embraced in the initiative of our worthy municipality. By the act of leaving an enduring mark of its tribute to the glorious dead, not alone does it console the survivors—it speaks also to the multitude, and, as it were, transmits a lesson to posterity. For in honouring the virtue of sacrifice with lasting testimony of admiration, you point to it as an example." Having alluded to the time "when the devotion of mothers prepared the country's triumph," Signor Cairoli went on: "The union of all classes and parties in homage paid to martyrdom is a symbol of the sublime faith that inspired it and of the sentiment of nationality which welded together the arms and the conscience of all in the hour of battle. The comfort I have to-day received is an encouragement to duty—from whose path, however, I have not swerved, because it was illuminated by a light issuing from these tombs."

Piety for the dead, hope for the country, for himself duty: this is the drift of Signor Cairoli's words. In November, 1877, he was the first speaker at another sad festival, the uncovering of the memorial to all who died in the campaign that ended at Mentana. A slight incident occurred which may have come back to the minds of some who stood in the throng under the historic balcony of the Quirinal, a year after, almost to a day, when the prime minister of Italy was led forth to receive the applause of the Roman people by the king whose life he had saved.

The morning of the gathering at Mentana was dull and down-cast, but as Benedetto Cairoli mounted the steps of the monument, raised six or seven feet above the crowd, a clear ray of sunshine burst from the stormy sky, falling full upon his grey-streaked hair, whilst it threw into relief the names of the slain engraved in red letters on the stone and the bright tints of the flags grouped near its base—old Rome's crimson and orange mingling with the Italian tricolour. A murmur of "Bello! bello!" passed from mouth to mouth among the Roman folk standing round—their ancestors' true children in readiness to accept an omen. Little, however, could they then foresee the combination of events which was very soon to make Signor Cairoli the foremost man in Italy. It was, if we are not mistaken, at the last New-Year's Day reception held by Victor Emanuel that he was introduced to the Crown Prince Humbert, who expressed his warm gratification at making his acquaintance, and remarked that he well recollected young Giovanni, who had served under his command at Custozza. Eight days later Humbert was king of Italy. In the month of March a change of ministry became unavoidable, and Signor Cairoli, who had just been appointed Speaker to the Chamber of Deputies, was called upon to form a Cabinet. During

his short tenure of the Speaker's chair, he addressed the House in terms which convey his unflagging confidence in the vitality and stability of the State, be the ups-and-downs of parliamentary government what they may: "Parties dissolve, one assembly succeeds to another, the ministers pass away, but the nation, born in tears, matured in martyrdom, built up by the valour of her sons, this is an edifice that does not crumble to decay, this is a Pharos whose light grows not dim." Of the choice that had been made of himself, he said, "There are persons who represent programmes, names which, without any special merit in those who bear them, express a loftier meaning, a high idea, through the light reflected on them from the graves of the dead. They remind the living of the blood that sealed the right sanctioned by the plebiscites after triumphing on the battle-field, bearing aloft a glorious banner under which were gathered hearts, hands, and human wills, resolved to fulfil a sacred duty." After some delay a ministry was formed, and Signor Cairoli entered upon the cares of office. It was no secret that the young king was well satisfied to have as his adviser a man for whom he entertained the most profound esteem, but it is unlikely that the proffered trust was accepted without somewhat of regret. Signor Cairoli had now to exchange the simple heroic part of the soldier always ready to give his life for his country for the perplexing, we had almost said the contaminating, rôle of the statesman. He had to quit the quiet of home life, enlivened with a fresh gleam of happiness by the presence of the lady he had made his wife, for the wearing exigencies of official routine, which, from the uncertain state of his health, could not fail to be peculiarly trying to him. The time of his accession to the Presidency of the Council was one of unexampled difficulty and delicacy. There was a new king of tried courage but of untried capacity, full indeed of upright intention, but in a way unknown to his people; there was a new pope, whose policy was certain to introduce a grave and unfamiliar element into the politics of the Italian kingdom; there were in Europe rumours both of wars and of settlements, and either eventuality might be safely predicted to bring to Italy, if not peril, at least disappointment; worse than all, the existing Chamber of Deputies was so constituted as to leave small hopes for the accomplishment of any important legislation. It is not within our province to examine the course of Signor Cairoli's administration, or to review his political aims. The two chief measures advocated by him involve so many complicated questions that this consideration alone would demand far more space than we have at our disposal. But we may say without fear of contradiction that it is not easy to over-estimate the benefit accruing to the dignity and good

name of Italy at home and abroad from the mere fact that in the opening year of the reign of her second king, a patriot stood next the throne who wore not laurels only, but the "white flower" of an unsullied reputation. No better wish can be made for the Italian nation than that the day may dawn when a statement such as this regarding one of its public men becomes superfluous or impertinent. To his countrymen Signor Cairoli gave a sound lesson in political morality. His principles did not mysteriously disappear the instant he crossed the charmed threshold of an official residence. Opposed, and ultimately defeated, by every device of what cannot be freed from the ugly designation of faction, he commanded throughout an unanimity of respect. The most heinous crime brought to his charge was too large a faith in freedom—freedom of the pattern of which he once declared that England offered to the world the most perfect model.

A good deal has been said and written about Signor Cairoli's republican antecedents, by which we suppose is meant that he belongs to the party which, had it been theirs to choose, would have established Italian unity on a republican basis. More than this cannot be said truly. In 1859 Benedetto Cairoli was already striving his utmost to still dissensions which might place hindrances in the way of achieving the liberty of the country under a monarchical flag. In that year, and in the years succeeding it, he fought on twenty fields between the Alps and Sicily in the name of the sovereign "who" (to use his own eloquent words) "risked his peace and life and throne to listen to the cry of grief ascending from his people." From then till now he has not ceased preaching the gospel of concord and conciliation, and urging the necessity of that moral unity without which political unity can avail nothing. The cause for which the Cairoli's shed their blood cannot be rightly spoken of as that of republic or of monarchy; it was the broad cause of the common weal of the land which gave them birth.

The Neapolitan event is a matter of very recent history; yet our best way of referring to it will be by giving a brief recapitulation of the facts. On the 17th of November, King Humbert made his entry into Naples, accompanied by the queen, the boy Crown Prince, and Signor Cairoli. It seems that the latter accidentally took his seat in the carriage opposite the king, etiquette requiring that place to be occupied by the Crown Prince; on finding out his mistake he offered to change, but the answer was that it did not signify. When the procession had reached San Giovanni a Carbonara, a number of petitioners pressed round the carriage, which was quite unprotected, the king having forbidden the mounted escort to ride beside it. It was then that a man named Passananti, advancing under the pretence of present-

ing a petition, pulled out a dagger and dealt a blow at the king, who caught it in his arm as he sprang to his feet, and struck his assailant with his sword. The man aimed another blow, this time at the heart, but at the same moment Queen Margaret uttered a cry of "Cairoli; save the king!" and the prime minister threw himself upon the would-be assassin whose knife ran deep into his flesh. He held him by his hair "as in a vice," in spite of his violent struggles, till an officer of cuirassiers rode up and secured him. In two minutes the procession moved on, no one noticing anything particular in the bearing of the occupants of the royal carriage, except that Signor Cairoli was smiling radiantly. During the half-hour's drive to the palace he lost much blood; the stab he had intercepted would have cut the femoral artery had it borne in the slightest degree more in that direction. It was in the same leg that had been hit by a bullet in the war of liberation in Sicily. On the 22nd the king went to him in his bed and gave him the gold medal for military valour, with many expressions of affection. The Sunday after he travelled with the royal family to Rome, though his wound was not properly healed, a step which went near to imperilling his recovery. Happily the fever and local inflammation that set in subsided, and, as we all know, he was able in the early days of December to receive in person the ovation and the defeat prepared for him in the Chamber.

The occurrence above recounted gives one more episode to the record of lives of which the least thing to be said is that they are valiant. Such lives must be viewed as a whole if their true value is to be appraised. We read in them a text that transcends its illustrations; they show us a steady realisation of a high ideal that is finer than the finest isolated actions. The Cairoli's have made their father's name a part of the inheritance of Italy, and to their share falls the honour most worth coveting. "There is an honour, likewise," says Bacon, "which may be ranked amongst the greatest, which happeneth rarely—that is, of such as sacrifice themselves to death or danger for the good of their country."

ART. V.—AFGHANISTAN.

1. *Correspondence respecting Central Asia.* Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty. 1878.
2. *Correspondence respecting the Relations between the British Government and that of Afghanistan.* Published by Order of the Secretary of State for India. 1878.

A YEAR ago the doctrine that Indian affairs do not belong to the domain of party politics was still unimpeached. To-day it is an exploded tradition. The temper of the Liberal party has become more and more bitter as its opposition to Lord Beaconsfield's foreign policy has been prolonged and baffled. It imputes to him an absolute influence over his colleagues, and conceives him as reckless alike of the honour and true interests of the Empire and of the constitutional privileges of Englishmen. In the section of this REVIEW devoted to the affairs of India and the Colonies, we have had frequent occasion to express our sympathy with the general aims of the Government, and have indicated the feelings which, in our opinion, have influenced the action of the Opposition. We have pointed out the danger which threatens India from the unregarded advance of Russian power in Asia, and we have urged the necessity of taking steps to prevent her from obtaining control of Afghanistan. The danger which we then regarded as distant and speculative, has since proved real, and we have to deal no longer with abstract arguments, but with accomplished facts. For a time there seemed to be some hope that the Liberal party, which, as regards action in Asia, was as yet free to choose a policy, would join cordially in the necessary measures for securing our position. But the rooted distrust of Lord Beaconsfield prevailed. All the evils predicted of the time when English apathy would give way to ignorant and meddlesome interest in the affairs of India, were soon realised. The Liberal party had been so long engaged in denouncing the unscrupulous policy of Lord Beaconsfield, that its conscience had grown morbidly sensitive. The question which had in so unwelcome and unexpected a fashion presented itself for solution was of intense interest. Though there are Englishmen who advocate the abandonment of empire, there are none who would willingly surrender it. In the minds of most an Afghan war was connected with dim associations of disaster, and however confident we were of ultimate victory, the effort would add to public burdens, already felt severely, and a local war seemed likely to lead to complications which might precipitate a great struggle. But this intensity of interest seemed, no less than

prejudice, to blind the judgment. There was an unwillingness to look facts fairly in the face. There was an eager credulity of extreme views. There was a too ready reliance on authority—when the authority spoke in favour of opinions which prejudice had already suggested. All the headlong sentiment which had so much embarrassed the action of Government in the earlier phases of the Eastern Question, was still ready to respond to the appeals of political agitators or uninformed enthusiasts. When Earl Grey—a veteran statesman—and Lord Lawrence, whose private character and splendid public services have justly won for him the respect and gratitude of the country—when men like these descended into the arena of public controversy and wielded the old arms of argument as to the inexpediency of advancing beyond our present frontier—when they asserted that the war against Shir Ali was unprovoked and aggressive, there was no longer any question as to what the attitude of the Liberal party would be. Had the war been simply inexpedient, or had it been simply unprovoked, the voice of protest would never have risen to a roar. Lord Lawrence's arguments were addressed to the reason of the nation, not to the passion of a party, and if it be only admitted that his views as to frontier policy were sound, his condemnation of the acts of Lord Lytton must be allowed to be just. But the very neutrality of his position made his declarations peculiarly effective. When it was once understood that the Afghan war was but a new phase of Lord Beaconsfield's nefarious policy, further consideration of the questions involved was unnecessary. The anti-Ministerial press, the anti-Ministerial platform, the anti-Ministerial pulpit, echoed the commonplaces of "inactivity" literature, and gave them point with all the catch-words of contemporary Liberalism. It would perhaps be unfair to say that Lord Lawrence's arguments were unconsidered, but they were certainly not examined. His authority was enough. We will not say that the heated orators of Liberal gatherings suppressed facts or dishonestly evaded argument. They stated all the facts they had taken the trouble to acquire: they relied for convincing others on the only arguments they had admitted to their own minds. To the ordinary Englishman the Afghan Question had in fact dropped from the clouds. The discussions regarding the occupation of Quettah had excited as little interest as Indian questions generally do. None of our daily journals think it part of their duty as public instructors to give intelligible information of the course of events affecting our Imperial interests. Few English statesmen, we venture to say, who have not had official connexion with India, and very few Englishmen of any class except returned Anglo-Indians have had any acquaintance with that slow development of events on the North-Western Frontier which we have endeavoured to trace in our periodic survey. But when events had reached a crisis,

this utter ignorance of all the antecedents was in itself a reason why so many rushed to pronounce a reckless judgment. There was no hesitation about facts, for there were no facts to be considered. The case was clear. Lord Lawrence had considered it, and given his opinion. We had sought a quarrel with Shir Ali, to rob him of a possession which would be fatal to us when won. When Sir J. F. Stephen argued that, on certain assumptions (the truth of which might fairly be matter for argument), control of Afghanistan would be essential to the safety of India, and that in such a case we should be justified in taking by force, if necessary, the desirable guarantees, excited Liberalism answered that he was striking at the basis of the law of nations, and that he was an official advocate. When he explained that the law of nations did not apply to such relations between States as those between England and Afghanistan, he was told by unscientific enlightenment that he was the enemy of justice. When Sir Bartle Frere's Memorandum on the Central Asia Question was published—a document unequalled among State papers for fulness of treatment and the fairness with which objections are stated and discussed—a document which does not, like Lord Lawrence's, ignore all the contingencies in which the working of the policy contended for may seem likely to be difficult or perilous—his arguments were unnoticed, or were at once decried, because he was a well-known advocate of the policy of advance. It was forgotten, apparently, that Lord Lawrence's policy had been tried, and that by the confession of its most ardent advocates it had not secured for us what they admit to be eminently desirable—the friendship of Afghanistan; that the author of a policy is hardly the best judge of its merits, and that the virtual condemnation which its abandonment would imply is hardly like to free his mind from unreasonable bias: and it was forgotten, too, that a man may be an excellent administrator and a poor politician. We should be sorry to put to sea in a ship commanded by Mr. Reed or built by Admiral Hornby.

We are speaking now of the agitation that preceded the publication of the Blue Books which form the subject of this article. The attack on the Indian Government rested on two assumptions—1. That our relations with Afghanistan before Lord Lytton's assumption of office were satisfactory. 2. That he wantonly destroyed those relations in order to initiate a new policy of aggression. We shall have more than once in our examination of the correspondence to express our disapproval of the measures and language of Lord Lytton. We have elsewhere condemned the ambiguous—if not insincere—assurances given by Lord Salisbury last year regarding the state of our relations with the Amir, and we are not concerned to show that paragraph 9 of Lord Cranbrook's despatch is a fair summary of the correspon-

dence between Lord Northbrook and the Duke of Argyll in 1873. But as professors of that true Liberalism which desires to see the national policy moulded by the well-informed reason of the nation and freed from the control of bigotry and passion, we have to condemn the silence of the Liberal leaders—we ought rather to say, the sympathy and approval of the Liberal leaders, while the policy of Government was attacked on grounds which they knew to be false, and which they have since virtually repudiated.

The Blue Books are perhaps the most comprehensive collection of materials that have ever been submitted by a Government to enable the public to decide on the merits of a political controversy. But their very completeness renders them unmanageable. The journals of both parties have hardly attempted to summarise the contents. They have preferred to detach from all that goes before and comes after, particular passages, and submit them as damaging to the position of their adversaries. The debates in both Houses were lively and lengthy. But they can hardly be said to have done much to clear up the issues to those readers who have had the hardihood to peruse them. There was a want of consistency—of due coherence of parts both in the attack and in the defence. Each speaker urged with greater or less effect a number of points the relation of which to the general issue was not clear, and he was answered by a similar insistence on details, and a reminder that the question was not properly one of details, and that the points he urged were susceptible of different treatment from a different point of view. Each member treated the Blue Book as if it contained all the facts of the case stated categorically. But in truth, much as they reveal, they leave far more unrevealed. Whether the methods of Government were judicious is to be decided by facts known at Cabul, and perhaps at Taskkent, but hidden from the knowledge of Calcutta and Westminster. Sir W. V. Harcourt has, we doubt not, brought a very keen intelligence to the study of his brief, but he knows less of matters necessary to the determination of the only important issue in the case than the humblest sweeper in the Bala Hissar. We know much of what the Amir has written, but hardly anything of what he has thought. We can assign a proper weight to the influence of known inducements, but we cannot say how far caprice and infatuation have determined his conduct. A question such as this baffles even the imaginative acumen of Mr. Edward Jenkins. Whether the intentions of the Amir were friendly or not is surely a question not to be decided by the tone of a letter or the assurances of his Envoy. It is a question to be decided by the general probabilities of the case, and these probabilities are to be inferred from all the surrounding circumstances. But the Parliamentary advocates reversed the process and sought to infer the probabilities from particular expressions.

In this respect the debate was unsatisfactory, but in one most important point it has been most useful. If its result has been to strengthen the position of the Ministry—its course defined the position of the Liberal party. That position is still, we believe, a mistaken one, but it is no longer one of indifference to national interests or blindness to obvious tendencies.

Had we before the debate attempted to frame issues, we should, relying on the arguments used to inflame public opinion and employed by Lord Lawrence, whom Liberal opinion seemed for a time to adopt as arbiter, have framed for preliminary investigation some such issues as these:—

Is there risk of Russia's acquiring a predominant influence in Afghanistan? If so, would that endanger the peace of India or the security of our position there? Is it a danger from which we must at any cost secure ourselves? If we cannot do so by peaceable means, are we justified in doing so by employing force against the ruler of Afghanistan, even though he has not given us a *casus belli* according to the rules of Grotius and Vattel? To these questions the Liberal party, as represented by its most trusted leaders, have, we think, given an affirmative answer, and they at once cease to be matters of serious controversy. We are thus spared the necessity of repeating what we have so often urged before, and we can only deplore that Liberal organisations were permitted by Liberal leaders to use arguments now repudiated by the party to inflame popular indignation against the Government. We must also protest against the carping and ungenerous criticism to which every act of Government has been submitted. The whole body of distinguished Indian officials who approve of the measures of Government and co-operate in carrying them out share the honourable obloquy which party fanaticism has thus thrown. It has been customary hitherto to assume that English officers, whether they share the views of Lord Lawrence or of Sir Henry Rawlinson, are animated by a sentiment of honour and fairness. But this is one of the many traditions which the present Parliament has contentedly seen disappear. We have heard a good deal of the degeneracy of Mussulmans. But wherever a point is doubtful in this present controversy, everything is presumed by Liberal critics against the Indian Government and its officials and in favour of the Amir. We have had the assurances of Government that the intimations sent to the Amir regarding the sending of the Chamberlain mission were friendly in tone. Several were published in the Blue Book, and, so far as friendliness consists with firmness, they are friendly. But the Amir in his reply refers to the previous receipt of four letters addressed by the Commissioner of Peshawar to his subordinates, which were, he says, not the letters of a friend.

An intelligent—not to say a liberal—interpretation would find in this remark, when taken in connexion with all that preceded, a mere peevish evasion of a direct answer. But the Liberalism of the Caucus does not care to exercise intelligence. It proceeds on the safe principle that all the acts of Government and of its subordinates must be wrong. Forthwith the Liberal papers discover that they can recover all the ground they had lost by the publication of the Blue Book. Letters are suppressed! hectoring, insulting letters, no doubt! part of the scheme to render a peaceful settlement impossible! The bewildered Government telegraphs to Calcutta for information as to the contents of these diabolical missives. They are found to be an intimation that the mission was friendly, and that the refusal of a free passage to it would be regarded as an act of hostility. No shame is felt at such discomfiture. The charge remains unretracted, and will probably do duty at many party gatherings during the vacation. If orators are forced to acknowledge that the letters are not of a worse character than those published before, they will probably impeach the honesty of Government because the envelopes have not been published. We have said that the Liberal party has abandoned the positions it was at one time supposed to hold. But we must do Lord Lawrence the justice to admit that he has not abjured his old beliefs. He repeats that even in the event of victory we should still abstain from all interference of any kind with Afghanistan, except that of maintaining general friendly relations and strengthening the *de facto* rulers with subsidies. He would give no pledges of support, dynastic or territorial. He apparently—even in the presence of recent events—refuses to contemplate the possibility of his policy failing to secure the end in view, *i.e.*, the existence of a friendly, independent Afghanistan. We must leave him alone in his complacency. But in bidding good-by to an old discussion we would ask one question—If our present frontier is safe and easily defensible—if even a partial occupation or control of Afghanistan would involve us in disaster or difficulty—if the Afghans are indeed so little disposed to obey the bidding of a conqueror—why should we trouble ourselves to keep it friendly and independent? Why has Lord Lawrence admitted that a Russian occupation would be a cause of embarrassment to us? Does he think that Russian ambition will destroy itself in order to trouble us? Or that a hostile Afghanistan alone can do us injury across a safe frontier? Or does he only think that the peace of the frontier and the security of trade is the only object for which subsidies are required? Whatever be the grounds on which he thinks the state of Afghanistan ought to be a matter of concern to us, he ought clearly to define them. He has never done so, and those who repose on

his authority have constantly asserted that the fate of Afghanistan does not affect the interests of India. If the authors of the recent agitation were but susceptible to shame their case would indeed be piteous. The rank and file of the party condemned Government on grounds which now its responsible leaders have repudiated. During the recess the agitation will, we suppose, be revived, but in another form. It will be no longer possible to arraign Government for abandoning a position which now no sober politician cares to defend. Nor will it be possible—even before a Birmingham audience—to accuse Government of acting in a spirit of truculent aggression. The old thwarting, carping spirit will remain, but it will concern itself with more reasonable and more practical issues. Candid men of all parties will ask, and will hesitate to answer, questions such as these :—

What is the precise degree of interference in the concerns of Afghanistan necessary to render our interests secure? At what stage of our relations could the necessary securities have best been taken? Were the requirements of Lord Lytton's Government reasonable and necessary? Was the Amir's unwillingness to concede Lord Lytton's requirements due to the mistaken policy of Lord Lytton's predecessors or to the measures of Lord Lytton or the intrinsic unreasonableness of his demands? Supposing the policy of preceding Viceroy's to have been, under the circumstances of their time, judicious, was there any change of circumstances which in Lord Lytton's time rendered a more vigorous policy desirable? Did Lord Lytton select a proper opportunity and employ proper methods for initiating the new development of policy? Was his failure to carry it out by peaceable means due to his own errors of diplomacy or to the settled hostile purpose of the Amir? These are questions which the correspondence published throws much light on, though, as we have already said, it does not give us complete materials for answering. We have to go in a great measure on probabilities, and in judging Lord Lytton we can feel that we have the same material to guide our judgment that he had to guide his. It would be easy from the materials the Blue Books offer to write a "slashing" article in praise or blame of the statesmen to whom this country has intrusted from time to time the administration of Indian affairs. Many such, we have no doubt, will be written. For ourselves, we prefer the humbler duty of examining the facts dispassionately, and helping candid judgments to decide not only whether what has been done in the past has been well done, but what it remains to do in the future. We shall not start by assuming a conclusion, and proceed to select all the passages which seem to support it, but shall rather attempt impartially to review all the facts which seem material, intercalating

only such criticisms as may help the judgment in appreciating the relative value of the facts. To those who are conscious of the importance of the matter to the future of England and of India, the indifference shown in the Great Council of the Nation to the permanent and essential aspects of the subject and the vehement subtlety with which questions of merely personal or party interests were discussed, seem symptoms of grave political disease. Yet while we regret that passion has so far perverted judgment and drugged patriotism, we do not wonder that it has been allowed free play. Indian questions which interest Englishmen are always treated in a spirit of ignorant confidence. The Afghan Question is part of that great Eastern Question which has so profoundly stirred political feeling, and though separable from the other elements of that question, the ardour of party sentiment transfers to its discussion the prejudices engendered in the long controversy. From influences such as these the true patriot must try to free himself. If it is alleged that Russia would not have interfered in Afghanistan if we had not introduced the Sepoy into the politics of Europe, an apologist for Ministers may answer that it was as necessary in the interest of India to keep Russia out of Constantinople as out of Cabul—that the native troops at Malta were a cheaper and more effectual menace to Russia than the presence of a Russian *corps d'armée* at Balkh would be to British India. And he may add that, reviewing the whole results, the action of the Government (as a means to the end it purposed) has been successful that the Russians are not in Constantinople—that they have withdrawn their mission from Cabul—that we are in a position to take the territorial guarantees we require in Afghanistan. But the simple patriot will decline to complicate the discussion by an inquiry as to whether the Ministry were right or wrong in its Eastern policy. It may some time be the lot of a Liberal Cabinet to withstand Russian pretensions. Mr. Gladstone himself has of late assumed the tones of a jingo. In such a case the Ministry will of course make no mistakes. But is there any probability that Russia will then refrain from using the advantages she possesses—will she not then be in a far better position to use them with effect? Is it not intolerable that we should depend for safety on her moderation? Mr. Gladstone would perhaps answer that our action suggests to Russia to use her advantage—that by using the resources of India in our European struggle we in effect absolved her from her engagement not to extend her influence to Afghanistan. To this many speculative replies are possible. But the patriot will prefer facts, and for the facts of Russian good faith he will with us refer to the Central Asia Blue Book, and not to Mr. Gladstone. Similarly, when we hear that

public meetings are asked to condemn the war because there is distress in England, and the Indian peasant is wretchedly poor, he will say that the fact alleged as a reason is in truth irrelevant, and is dishonestly used to prevent a fair consideration of the real issue. That a man has a large and delicate family is no reason why he should not assure his life. Lastly, the judicious patriot we are imagining will not in seeking for the causes of the rupture with the Amir confine his attention to specific acts. He will regard our general policy—or want of policy, or changes of policy. He will look for causes in tendencies and a thousand obscure conditions of individual temper, of the policy of rival nations, of geographical necessity. He will remember how great a part the unforeseen plays in human affairs—how much the needs of the moment obstruct and modify great schemes of policy—how often indeed a poor makeshift assumes the name of policy.

The correspondence is appropriately prefaced by the Treaty of 1855, between the British Government and the Amir Dost Muhamad Khan and the Articles of Agreement made in 1857. The former is distinctly what Shir Ali has since called a one-sided treaty. Each party agrees to respect the territories of the other, and to live in perpetual peace and friendship: but while the Amir undertakes to be the friend of the friends and the enemy of the enemies of the East India Company, the Company enters into no corresponding engagement as regards the Amir. The object of the Agreement of 1857 was to help Dost Muhamad to defend his possessions against the Persians, who had taken Herat. For this purpose we agreed to give him, “out of friendship,” one lac of rupees monthly during the war. The friendship, we need hardly say, was of a purely selfish kind. We have always feared as regards both Persia and Cabul that they may become the victim or the instrument of Russia. It has therefore been our policy to maintain both States as a double, and each as an alternative buffer. We have made use of Persia to restrain Cabul, and of Cabul to restrain Persia. Our object has been, in fine, to prevent each State from absorbing the other or injuring us. Dost Muhamad understood aright the nature and the value of our friendship. The events of 1837 and 1842 had left, no doubt, bitter memories in Afghanistan. We had dethroned the Dost and tried to maintain on the throne his rival. But when our experiment failed, we had viewed without regret the Dost’s recovery of power. The need of interference in Afghanistan, if it ever had existed, had passed away, and our relations with its ruler were, if not intimate, at least not unfriendly. One of the stock arguments against the present war is that it will permanently embitter against us the feelings of the Afghans. The passion for revenge is one of the characteristics of the race.

But instability is not less a characteristic. Revenge may be a duty to individuals or to classes as against other classes, but it has not been shown to operate as regards dealings with external races. Dost Muhamad and his son Shir Ali at any rate have been willing to enter into the closest relations with the nation that injured them so grievously. We shall have again and again to protest against the fatal error of estimating by a European standard the feelings of Orientals—above all of Afghans, whose characteristics are the characteristics of all Orientals, exaggerated. It would be paradoxical to say that it was the recollection of injuries that made Dost Muhamad our friend; but it may be confidently asserted that the recollection of the power which enabled us to inflict injuries made our friendship valuable. Had we accepted our discomfiture quietly—had we sent messengers to lament our error and solicit forgiveness and goodwill, our friendship would have been disdained. We are not cynically indifferent to right—we feel as deeply as those who condemn most loudly the iniquity of the present war—that good faith is even a more powerful weapon than force, especially among races who are not prone to practise it themselves. An Oriental can appreciate magnanimity; but if he does not see force clearly in reserve, he mistakes it for weakness. It was the recollection of the Army of Revenge of 1842—not the Treaty of 1855—which deterred Dost Muhamad from taking advantage of our troubles in 1857. The inference from all this is obvious. Whatever be the justice or expediency of the war, it cannot truly be asserted that Shir Ali will be less our friend because we have chastised him.

The Agreement of 1857 contains a provision which is peculiarly pertinent to the question, round which the controversy as to the causes of the war circles. Lord Lytton's contention is that the refusal of the Amir to accept or discuss the proposal for stationing British officers in Afghanistan was an evidence of the hostility of his feeling towards us. Those who are anxious to make Lord Lytton responsible for the war allege, on the other hand, that it was the proposal to station British officers that entirely alienated the Amir's feelings, which before were friendly; or, at worst, suspicious and wavering. The time at which the alienation of feeling was evidenced in acts is of course an important element in the controversy, but a no less important element is the intrinsic reasonableness of the demand. Now, in this Agreement of 1857 we find that the Amir consented to allow British officers with suitable establishments and orderlies to be deputed to Cabul, Candahar, Balkh, or wherever an Afghan army was assembled. The duty of these officers was to keep their Government informed of all that took place, and the Amir became responsible for their

safety and honourable treatment, and engaged to keep them acquainted with all military and political affairs connected with the war. It has been urged, and urged with truth, that the position of the officers thus deputed was, in fact, owing to the suspicions of the Amir, or the precautions which his guarantee rendered necessary, one of danger and harassing restraint. The mission was also sent for a temporary purpose, but its acceptance was an admission of the principle that English officers might, with safety and advantage, be deputed to such a position as Balkh or even to Cabul. The object of the appointments proposed by Lord Lytton was the same as that made by Lord Canning—namely, to give the Indian Government information necessary for the successful fulfilment of a guarantee it had given in the interest of Afghanistan.

In 1863 Dost Muhammad died. On the 12th of June, 1863, Shir Ali announced his father's death, his own succession, and his intention of maintaining the strong ties of friendship which existed between the British and his State. He hoped to be gratified with "gracious letters." His hope remained unfulfilled till the 23rd December, when the acting Governor-General, Sir W. Denison, acknowledged the receipt of his letter, reciprocated in general terms the wishes of friendship, &c, expressed, and ended by strongly pressing on his attention the necessity for taking the utmost care to prevent his officers on the Persian frontier (the Afghans had lately recovered Herat) from being led into any measures which could justly give umbrage to Persia. Even in 1863 Shir Ali's brothers had communicated to English officials accounts of proceedings of the Amir which were displeasing to them. In the years that followed he maintained with varying fortune a struggle for the supreme power. Afghanistan, it must be remembered, is not in the proper sense of the word a nation. The country of Afghanistan has formed at various times part of the domains of great dynasties, whose seats of empire were in India, or Persia, or Central Asia. In the early days of Mussulman invasion, the Punjab was ruled from Ghazni, where massive buildings, splendid even in their decay, still attest the greatness of the dynasty that once held sway. But the Afghans are but one race—the dominant race, it is true—among many which dwell in the region known as Afghanistan—the country of the Afghans. And the Afghans themselves are but a collection of tribes held loosely together by a precarious submission to the authority of one tribe or its leader. In the last century Ahmad Shah may be said to have created the modern Afghan power by making his supremacy unquestioned, and leading the subject tribes to the conquest of the neighbouring countries. But after his death the authority he had wielded

fell from the hands of his descendants. The Barukzais, another branch of the great tribe to which he belonged, supplanted them, and Shir Ali and his brothers were of this Barukzai clan. Even within the tribe there is no regular succession of authority. The best man succeeds, and the test of merit is fighting. As in the case of India, while the village system was still vigorous, it was not till the lesser units of social organisation was reached that anything like settled descent of authority was recognised. Shir Ali, then, and his brothers were struggling to obtain such sovereign power as they could. The authority of one was recognised in one part of the country, the authority of another in another. To many tribes who had never shown any real submission to Cabul the struggle was a matter of indifference. In 1866 Shir Ali's cause appeared almost desperate. But Sir John Lawrence was of opinion that it was better to adhere strictly to our engagements—whatever they were—with Shir Ali, so long as any prospect remained of his resuming authority, than to endeavour to secure the friendship of Afzul Khan, whose party was then in the ascendant, and might perhaps permanently retain power. But Afzul Khan was to be informed by every legitimate means, that beyond what our engagements rendered incumbent on us, we had no desire to uphold one party against the other. In 1867, however, Sir John Lawrence formally recognised Afzul Khan as Amir. In the kharita of recognition, Sir John Lawrence expressed his pity for the fate of Shir Ali, who had never given him cause of offence at any time—bemoaned the dissensions which had harassed Afghanistan and—congratulated Afzul Khan on his recent victory. The letter went on to say that the British Government had hitherto maintained a strict neutrality in Afghanistan—that all stories of assistance given to Shir Ali were false, and that the policy of the past would be continued in the future. Should the struggle commence again, Sir John Lawrence would side with neither party. Shir Ali was still *de facto* ruler of Herat, and would be recognised as such. But with Afzul Khan as ruler of Cabul and Candahar the Governor-General was prepared to renew the relations existing in Dost Muhamad's time. Later on we find the party in power at Cabul apparently feeling for English help on the plea that Shir Ali was seeking help from Russia and from Persia. The policy of non-interference and indifference followed by Sir John Lawrence is curiously illustrated by a passage in a despatch of June, 1867 (No. 9). A native agent was to be despatched to Cabul, but as at the time one of Shir Ali's adherents was reported to be marching on Cabul, the Government of India doubted whether, with reference to the possibility of Afzul Khan being ousted from Cabul before the agent could arrive, it would not be better to await the issue,

so that the credentials to be borne by the agent might be addressed to the party whom he would find actually in power at the Bala Hissar. The policy of inaction and indifference advocated by Sir John Lawrence, and adopted as we have said with such senseless avidity by opposition meetings has, since responsible politicians have given their opinion, fallen into such hopeless discredit, that it is almost slaying the slain to point out that in 1867 its distinguished author was ready to abandon it when adherence to it was likely to imperil a British interest. If, says a despatch of 3rd September, 1867 (No. 10), it should turn out that Shir Ali is making overtures to Persia, then we think it might be highly for the interests of British India to declare our treaty with him at an end, and to openly assist the party in power—with money and arms—if at the time it should appear likely, *with such assistance*, to hold its position against Shir Ali. In other words, in order to prevent Shir Ali from ceding Herat to the Shah, we were to break our treaty engagements with him, though he was then *de facto* ruler of Herat. The truth is, there has never been a policy of strict inactivity and unconcern. The difference of opinion has been as to the modes and degree and opportunity of interference. In these early days the Russian power was still far off, and few of those who advocate an energetic policy now are prepared to condemn the policy Sir John Lawrence followed in 1867. It is easy, after the event, to say we ought to have given active support to Shir Ali. No human prescience could have told that he would ultimately be successful. The same arguments could have been alleged for assisting Afzul Khan and others, and our aid would only have made the struggle more bitter. Thus “our relations,” wrote Sir John Lawrence, “should be with the *de facto* ruler of the day. So long as he is not unfriendly we should be prepared to renew with him the same terms and favourable conditions as obtained under his predecessor. In this way we shall be enabled to maintain our influence far more effectually than by any advance of our troops—a *contingency which could only be contemplated in the last resort*, which would unite as one man the Afghan tribes against us, and which would paralyse our finances.” We invite attention to the words we have printed in italics. That they were suggested by the Russian advance we cannot venture to say, but in the next paragraph Lord Lawrence and his colleagues in the Government of India say that the intelligence they have given suggests the discussion of the present position of Russia—a subject which has lately forced itself from time to time on their attention. By her late victory over Bukhara, her influence would no doubt soon, if it had not already, become paramount at Samarcand and Bukhara, as it

had for some time been at Kokand. Some Russian statesmen asserted that the true interests of Russia did not consist in the expansion of her posts and frontier among the bigoted and uncivilised population south of the Oxus, and they averred that the late advance had been made, not in fulfilment of any pre-determined line of aggressive progress, but by the hostile attitude of, and schemes of Bukhara, and in opposition to her normal policy. If this were so, it would be the interest of both countries that it should be acknowledged that their relations brought them into necessary contact and treaty with the tribes and nations on the respective sides of a certain border. England would thus welcome Russian influence among the wild tribes of the steppe, and on the bigoted and exclusive Governments of Bukhara and Kokand. Russia similarly would have no jealousy in respect of our alliance with the Afghan and neighbouring tribes. A charming vision of peace and goodwill among men if only the causes that brought Russia so far would bring her no farther—if only there were nothing beyond the wild mountains of Afghanistan but desolate plains and barren hills like those of Turkestan.

In December 1867, Sir Stafford Northcote, as Secretary of State for India, communicated to the Government of India his views in the various questions they had raised (No. 12). We have hitherto tried to give the sense of correspondence as nearly as possible in the words of the original, but here we are obliged to quote in full:—

“6. It is the desire of Her Majesty’s Government not to interfere in the internal conflicts of the Afghans, so long as they do not jeopardise the peace of the frontier, or lead to the formation of engagements with other powers dangerous to the independence of Afghanistan, which it long has been and still is the main object of our policy in that part of the world to maintain. If, however, your Excellency should see reason to believe that either party in the State is endeavouring to strengthen itself against the national feeling by invoking foreign aid, and especially if it should observe any disposition to make territorial sacrifices, or otherwise to compromise the integrity of Afghanistan for the sake of obtaining such aid, it is quite right that you should warn those who may evince such an inclination that by such a course they may compel the British Government to give material support to their rivals.”

With reference to the desirability of communicating with the Government of Russia regarding Russian progress in Central Asia:—

“12. Upon this point Her Majesty’s Government see no reason for any uneasiness or for any jealousy. The conquests which Russia has

made, and apparently is still making in Central Asia, appear to them to be the natural result of the circumstances in which she finds herself placed, and to afford no ground whatever for representations indicative of suspicion or alarm on the part of this country. Friendly communications have at various times passed between the two Governments on the subject, and, should an opportunity offer, Her Majesty's Government will avail themselves of it for the purpose of obviating any possible danger of misunderstanding either with respect to the proceedings of Russia, or to those of England. This is all that it appears desirable to do."

On these extracts we have two remarks to make:—1. That the policy of Sir John Lawrence, which has been so rudely assailed by fanatical Ministerialism, was cordially approved of by the Conservative Government in 1867. 2. That the Conservative Government showed no such feeling of apprehension regarding Russia in 1867 as the Duke of Argyll is blamed for disclaiming in 1873.

The subject of Russian progress, however, was not allowed to drop. In 1868 Sir H. C. Rawlinson prepared a memorandum on the Central Asian question, which was sent in due course to India for opinions. Sir H. C. Rawlinson described the rapid and apparently the systematic extension of Russian frontier towards India, after the barrier of Circassian resistance was swept away in 1859.

Elsewhere we have sketched the cause of Russian conquest—how it crept from the sea of Aral up the sterile banks of the Jaxartes till the fertile valley of Kokand and the flourishing cities of the Upper Jaxartes were annexed; how thence it crossed the steppe to the Samarcand and the rich country of Zarafshan; how each step was ascribed to "imperious necessity," though, to mere observers, the arrangements which made the step necessary appeared designed to do so, until at last it seemed the "manifest destiny" of Russia to extinguish the independent Usbeg Governments of Kokand, Bukhara, and Khiva. It would thus be brought to the Oxus, and would inherit from Bukhara all the old connexions with Cabul. The marauding tribes of the frontier would soon introduce complications between the limits of the States. The Russians—we are giving Sir Henry Rawlinson's views—would organise and consolidate their power in the countries they had conquered; they would connect the Aral with the Caspian by a railway and render the Oxus navigable. Thus Russian power would be brought to the very border of Afghanistan and would soon be dominant there. What would be the results of this on the British power in India? Sir H. Rawlinson dismisses the idea of an actual invasion, for he rightly alleges that that would probably come, if it did come,

by way of Herat and Candahar. Nor does he assume that Russia will at first be unfriendly. Nevertheless the presence of a mission would exercise a disturbing effect. We shall attempt to detail the causes of this more fully than the memorandum does. Cabul has long been historically connected with India, and in popular estimation the ruler of the Punjab ought to be the ruler of India. Every conqueror of India in historic times has come by way of Afghanistan, and none who have gained the plains of India have been repulsed. Therefore the presence of a strong military power in Cabul would unsettle India and make it ripe for change.* Again Russia, even if she never made Afghanistan a basis of invasion, could use her influence to disturb our frontier, and thus create a diversion which would enable her to carry out her schemes in Europe. She might bribe the Afghan ruler with the promise of the spoils of India or with accession of territory at our expense. The achievements of Nadir Shah and Ahmed Shah are still recent enough to make such inducements effective. "Are we then," asks Sir Henry, "to allow Russia to work its way on to Cabul unopposed?" He considers the objections to action. 1. The Power that appears last in the field will be most successful. To this he answers that the Russians will have an advantage because they have never had a feud with the Afghans, have never refused, as we have, to take sides, and have not, like us, withdrawn a subsidy. 2. The country is a hotbed of anarchy and disorder. In supporting one candidate we provoke the enmity of his rivals, and throw them into the arms of Russia whose appearance would thus be rather accelerated than retarded. Sir Henry answers that Russian relations with Bukhara would have compelled her to get a foothold at Cabul. On the other hand, Dost Muhamad's peaceful reign of twenty years shows that disorder is not the normal condition of Afghanistan. The disorders subsequent to his death were possibly due to our not recognising and assisting Shir Ali in deference to his father's nomination. Sir Henry Rawlinson therefore suggests (1) that Shir Ali, who, by this time, had recovered his power, should be subsidised and strengthened at Cabul; (2) that we should recover our diplomatic influence in Persia with a view to securing the safety of Herat; (3) the occupation of Quetta as a *place d'armes*. Quetta, we need hardly remind our readers, is in the territory of the Khan of Khelat, within which we have a treaty-right to post troops. It would cover the frontier, and, in the event of invasion, would delay the enemy sufficiently to allow us to mass our full forces in the rear. Breaking ground at Quetta would cheer our friends in India, who are now dispirited at our inactivity, which seems to natives a sign of weakness.

But Sir H. Rawlinson is careful to say that, if Shir Ali regarded the occupation as a menace or as a preliminary to further hostile advance, we should not be justified for so small an object in *risking the rupture of friendly intercourse*. We give this outline of the views put forth in the famous memoranda for several reasons. Much of the reasoning is applicable to subsequent events. Many of the predictions have been realised. But chiefly we cite it because it is a statement of the policy which is supposed to stand in violent contrast to that of Lord Lawrence. We are persuaded that much of the virulence of present discussions is due to ignorance of the limits of activity on the one hand, and of inactivity on the other. Both parties agreed in Lord Auckland's doctrine that it was our interest to establish a strong and friendly power on our North-Western frontier. Lord Lawrence trusted to a patient policy of friendly abstention. Sir H. Rawlinson feared that Russian influence would intervene before its fruit was ripe. Soldiers like General John Jacob advocated energetic measures—the military occupation of Quetta and readiness for an advance on Herat. A memorandum of the Punjab Government of 1867 shows the result of the border policy that had till then been pursued. The Patan in his native hills was still bigoted, fickle, and treacherous, but the constant and deadly hate of the old Sikh rule has passed away. Raids once chronic were now exceptional. Cultivation under the hills had enormously extended. Frontier clans had settled as cultivators in our territory, and trade over the border had greatly increased. It must be remembered that the Afghan question has always been complicated with the general border question. Ever since we annexed Sind and the Punjab we have had a series of expeditions to punish the tribes living in the hills on our frontier for raids or other offences. These hill men acknowledge hardly a nominal allegiance to the Amir or to the Khan. These rulers never are held responsible for their misbehaviour, and do not attempt to coerce them. This we shall see hereafter is an important point. Lord Lytton's policy towards the Amir was only part of a general scheme for securing the peace of the frontier. For a system of spasmodic subsidies and periodic punitive expeditions was to be substituted a system of personal control and intercourse by experienced English officers. The scheme may yet bear fruit, but in a wider field than was at first contemplated.

Towards the close of 1868 Shir Ali found himself at length master of Cabul. Though he complained to the English agent at Cabul that he had received comparatively no friendship or kindness from the English Government with reference to his success in the miserable civil war, yet he had never wavered in

his allegiance to it, and was now anxious to send a representative to Calcutta to show his sincerity and make known his real wants. In his reply to the Amir's proposal Lord Lawrence congratulated him on his success, which was alone due to his own courage, ability and firmness, and expressed his willingness not only to maintain the bonds of amity which existed with Dost Muhamad, but so far as might be practicable to strengthen those bonds.

It was reserved for Lord Mayo to give effect to this intention. But before he resigned office Lord Lawrence had an opportunity of formulating the policy which in his opinion and that of his colleagues, Sir W. R. Mansfield, Sir H. S. Maine, Sir J. Strachey, Sir R. Temple, it was expedient, under the new circumstances of Afghanistan, to follow. Sir H. Rawlinson's memorandum had been sent to India in order to elicit the opinion of Anglo-Indian authorities. Lord Lawrence's despatch encloses minutes and memoranda by a host of officials, military and civilian, whose duties had given them special experience of frontier relations. It would be impossible to summarise the general results of such a discussion, dealing as it does with so many distinct elements and rival suggestions. Some of the authorities go even farther than Sir H. Rawlinson, proposing an Afghan contingent at Cabul and a military occupation of the Kuram valley. But every paper recognised the danger to India of a hostile Cabul, the general opinion being that an attempt to effect an alliance offensive and defensive with any party in Cabul, to advance our outposts beyond our existing frontier, would put a strain on our finances, would eventually render the Afghan people hostile to us, and would precipitate and facilitate the intervention of Russia. We have stated so fully in our Section on India and the Colonies the arguments against activity, that it is the less necessary to dwell on them here. But one fact is to be remembered, that when these opinions were given Cabul was friendly to us and had no relations to Russia. Sir William Mansfield's authority is often quoted against Lord Lytton. He wrote in 1868:—"I would not allow such an authority as the Akhund of Swat to preserve a hostile attitude; I would tell him on the first opportunity that he must be either a friend or be treated as an enemy." Now if it be true, as alleged, that the Amir in 1877 was not only hostile, but tried to get the Akhund to proclaim a religious war against us, it is clear that Sir W. Mansfield would, if consistent, have considered war justifiable, if not expedient. The despatch No. 1, of 1869, thus sums up the conclusions of the Indian Government:—

"In these Minutes the consequences of any deviation from our established policy have been viewed by us under various aspects, and your Grace will observe that due regard has been paid to the division and

conflict of parties in Afghanistan, and to the peculiar national characteristics of the people; to the difficulties of establishing, supporting, and supplying troops in isolated positions, and at a distance from our own territories; to the financial outlay which any strategic advance beyond our own border, or even the formation of a Native Contingent, would certainly entail; and to the probable effect of such measures on the feelings and wishes of those classes of Her Majesty's subjects in India itself whom it is our object to attach to us by just and kind treatment, or, if necessary, to control by salutary awe. These considerations deserve fully as much attention as the gradual advance of Russia in Central Asia, and her military occupation of the cities and territories of Samarcand and Bokhara, on which many writers have been led too exclusively to dwell.

"5. We venture to sum up the policy which is recommended or supported, in various language and by various arguments in our Minutes, somewhat as follows:—We object to any active interference in the affairs of Afghanistan by the deputation of a high British officer with or without a contingent, or by the forcible or amicable occupation of any post or tract in that country beyond our own frontier, inasmuch as we think such a measure would, under present circumstances, engender irritation, defiance, and hatred in the minds of the Afghans, without in the least strengthening our power either for attack or defence. We think it impolitic and unwise to decrease any of the difficulties which would be entailed on Russia, if that Power seriously thought of invading India, as we should certainly decrease them if we left our own frontier, and met her half-way in a difficult country, and, possibly, in the midst of a hostile or exasperated population. We foresee no limits to the expenditure which such a move might require, and we protest against the necessity of having to impose additional taxation on the people of India, who are unwilling, as it is, to bear such pressure for measures which they can both understand and appreciate. And we think that the objects which we have at heart, in common with all interested in India, may be attained by an attitude of readiness and firmness on our frontier, and by giving all our care and expending all our resources for the attainment of practical and sound ends over which we can exercise an effective and immediate control.

"6. Should a foreign Power, such as Russia, ever seriously think of invading India from without, or, what is more probable, of stirring up the elements of disaffection or anarchy within it, our true policy, our strongest security, would then, we conceive, be found to lie in previous abstinence from entanglements at either Cabul, Candahar, or any similar outpost; in full reliance on a compact, highly equipped, and disciplined army stationed within our own territories, or on our own border; in the contentment, if not in the attachment, of the masses; in the sense of security of title and possession, with which our whole policy is gradually imbuing the minds of the principal Chief and the Native aristocracy; in the construction of material works within British India, which enhance the comfort of the people, while they add to our political and military strength; in husbanding our finances and con-

solidating and multiplying our resources; in quiet preparation for all contingencies, which no Indian statesman should disregard; and in a trust in the rectitude and honesty of our intentions, coupled with the avoidance of all sources of complaint which either invite foreign aggression or stir up restless spirits to domestic revolt."

The only fresh measures recommended are—

That an understanding should be come to with Russia as to its projects and designs in Central Asia, and that it should be given to understand in firm but courteous language that it *cannot be permitted to interfere in the affairs of Afghanistan*, or in those of any State contiguous to our frontier.

That relations with Persia should be placed under the Government of India.

That the Indian Government should be empowered to give to *any de facto ruler* of Cabul assistance in money and arms.

In his Memorandum, Sir J. Lawrence expresses his doubts as to whether the plan of subsidising Shir Ali would work well, but thinks it may be tried.

The history of opinion regarding the measures incumbent on us with reference to Russia does not, we think, disclose, as is often assumed, a perpetual conflict of two sharply distinguished policies. If Russia were not in Asia, the state of Afghanistan would be a matter of as little concern to us as the state of Birmah. Each change in the position of Russia, in our relations with Russia, in the state of Afghanistan, led to new discussions and new developments of policy. Thus when, as we have seen, Shir Ali's power seemed established, Lord John Lawrence decided to help him to consolidate it. The Cabul Treasury was exhausted—fresh demands on the people would have caused discontent, and yet outlay was necessary to stamp out the remnants of resistance. In December, 1868, the Viceroy presented him with 60,000*l.*, and Shir Ali acknowledged that this kindness had laid him under great obligation. In the January following a *kharita* was addressed to the Amir, informing him that 60,000*l.* more was placed at his disposal, and explaining the position of the British Government with regard to him. It was the wish of that Government to see his authority established on a basis of solidity and permanency, and to cement the bonds of friendship* with him as an independent ruler. The gift of money was a proof of the desire of the British Government, which feared no aggression and wished for no conquest, to see a *strong and just and a merciful Government* established by Shir Ali. As long as he continued *by his actions to evince a real desire* for the

* In justice to the reader and ourselves we must remind him that we adhere as closely as we can to the words of our authorities.

alliance of the British Government, he had nothing to apprehend in the way of a change of policy or of interference in the internal affairs and administration of his kingdom. Further aid in money or arms would probably be given, from time to time, as a testimony of goodwill—for the furtherance of his legitimate authority and influence.

The next stage in the development of relations with Afghanistan is the understanding arrived at between the Amir and Lord Mayo, at the Ambala Darbar, in 1869. The object of the conference was not only to make relations more cordial, but to impress the Amir with the power of England and to strengthen both India and Afghanistan, by a public demonstration of the friendship existing between them. We know, independently of the official documents, that Shir Ali, before the meeting, felt much aggrieved by the policy the Indian Government had adopted towards him—a policy which, as he alleged, put a premium on sedition, by recognising *de facto* rulers instead of supporting him as the heir named by Dost Muhamad. But the splendour of his reception, and the genial bearing and personal influence of Lord Mayo, for a time removed the bitterness from his brooding, morose spirit. From Lord Mayo's despatch (No. 19), we learn that the Amir desired a treaty supplementary to the "one-sided" treaty of 1857 (1855?), which would declare that we should be the friend of his friends, and the enemy of his enemies. He wished us further to declare publicly that we should never acknowledge any friend in the whole of Afghanistan save the Amir *and his descendants*, and he evidently expected a promise of a fixed subsidy. He also asked that the British Government should not be the sole judges of when and how future assistance was to be given, and desired that in the written undertaking the words "as his (the Amir's) welfare may require," should be used instead of the words "as circumstances may require." He further begged with great earnestness and emphasis that the Government should recognise, not only himself, but his successors in blood. If they would but recognise his dynasty, there was nothing he would not do to show his gratitude. The Viceroy, on obvious grounds, declined full compliance with his requests. The result is thus briefly stated:—

"1stly. What the Ameer is not to have—

"No treaty, no fixed subsidy, no European troops, officers, or residents, no dynastic pledges.

"2ndly. What he is to have—

"Warm countenance and support, discouragement of his rivals, such material assistance as we may consider absolutely necessary for his immediate wants, constant and friendly communication through our Commissioner at Peshawur, and our native agents in Afghanistan; he, on

his part, undertaking to do all he can to maintain peace on our frontier, and to comply with all our wishes on matters connected with trade."

It was a matter of great delicacy to prevent the Amir from feeling disappointed at the results without committing ourselves to entangling engagements, and to give him a public assurance of support without alluding to matters positive and negative, the mention of which would lead to awkward comment. The terms of the letter given to the Amir in lieu of a formal agreement were therefore most carefully considered. Its essential parts are—

"I earnestly trust that on your Highness' return to your own country you may be enabled speedily to establish your legitimate rule over your entire kingdom; to consolidate your power; to create a firm and a *merciful* administration in every province of Afghanistan; to promote the interests of commerce; and to secure peace and tranquillity within all your borders.

"Although, as already intimated to you, the British Government does not desire to interfere in the internal affairs of Afghanistan, yet, considering that the bonds of friendship between that Government and your Highness have lately been more closely drawn than heretofore, it will view with severe displeasure any attempts on the part of your rivals to disturb your position as Ruler of Cabul and rekindle civil war, and it will further endeavour, from time to time, by such means as circumstances may require to strengthen the Government of your Highness, to enable you to exercise with *equity and with justice* your rightful rule, and to transmit to your descendants all the dignities and honours of which you are the lawful possessor."

We cannot enter into the controversy between Mr. Seton Karr (who was then Secretary to the Government of India) and Captain Grey, who acted as interpreter, as to whether the Amir expressed his willingness to receive European officers. The despatch indicates that the provision that there should be no European troops, officers or residents, was a refusal rather than a concession to the Amir. The Duke of Argyll, however, says he has private letters of Lord Mayo to show that the engagement that European officers should not be forced upon him was earnestly sought by him and greatly prized—that it was indeed the "salient" feature of the Conference. The point is of the greatest importance, as if he was willing to receive them in 1869, his refusal in 1877 must have arisen from a change of sentiment. We are safe, we think, in adopting the conclusions of Lord Northbrook's Government (No. 32; No. 19 of 1875, p. 19) that the Amir or his Minister did in confidential communications with Captain Grey express a readiness to accept at a future time not far distant the presence of British officers at places in Afghanistan other than Cabul itself. But the concession was to be dependent upon the receipt of far

more substantial assistance than was promised at Amhala, or on the conclusion of a dynastic treaty. If this be so—and Lord Northbrook, it must be remembered, was resisting the proposal to send an Envoy—it is clear that Lord Lytton had good reason to suppose that his proposals would be acceptable to the Amir.

Subsequent statements of Lord Mayo show that the subject of danger from Russia was hardly discussed at Amhala. The despatch in which the Duke of Argyll conveys his approval of what was done bases British policy on the need of securing peace to Afghanistan and promoting trade with it. The Duke shows himself nervously anxious lest the understanding as to the impossibility of military intervention was not clear enough, lest the recognition of Shir Ali's *right* was too unreserved, and the condition of *just government* not made clear enough. No doubt it is often well in politics to be silent as to ultimate objects. Those who think that the steps proposed by Lord Lytton in 1877 to secure Afghanistan against Russia were necessary, will rightly complain that they might with frank foresight have been successfully taken in 1869. Such criticisms are easy, just as it is easy to say we ought to have actively assisted Shir Ali in 1863. Had we in 1869 thus openly made preparations against Russia, and had Russian attack followed, it would have been said that it was precipitated by our hostile preparation. On the whole—assuming, as in the present state of opinion we are entitled to assume, that Russia ought to be met in Afghanistan and not on the Indus—we still think that it would have been premature to have taken steps for securing a military foothold there in 1869. True, the Amir has since become hostile. But in 1869 there was every reason to hope that he would become more friendly and repose greater confidence in us year by year.

The Amir has always set the greatest value on the assurances conveyed in Lord Mayo's letter. The Peshawar conference of 1876 showed that he exaggerated the nature of the pledges we gave, and that he either felt, or pretended to feel or had persuaded himself into something like feeling, that the refusal of a guarantee in 1873 was a violation of our promise. In his copy, too, it appeared the words "severe punishment" occurred instead of "severe displeasure." We have Lord Mayo's assurance that the precise limits of our assistance and countenance were explained to the Amir and were thoroughly understood by him.

The Afghanistan Blue Book, in the arbitrary fashion of such compilations, leaves a gap in correspondence from 1869 to 1873. It must not be inferred from this that nothing of importance occurred in the interval. Much that is significant occurred, and we can happily supply the omission, in part, from what we know from other sources and from Appendix 2 to the Asiatic Papers

published by the Foreign Office. On his return to Cabul, the Amir was asked how he had succeeded in what appeared to be one of the main objects of his visit to India—the reception of Abdula Jan and the dynastic guarantee. He had to acknowledge his failure, and thus his first feeling of satisfaction gave way to one of disappointment. The Amir, like greater men, fears the frowns of his womankind, and Cabul gossip reported that Abdula Jan's mother used language anything but complimentary to the Amir and his English friends. While Sir W. V. Harcourt is busy comparing dates of letters to discover the cause of the Amir's anger against us, our more diffident intelligence suggests that its true origin is perhaps to be sought within the curtains of the Zenana. Every one knows what the influence of the harem is in Turkey, and even the monogamic Englishman can imagine how powerfully the complaints of a favourite wife may stir the memory of old grievances. The Amir, we must repeat, is of a morose and brooding temper. Eager, as a rule, in action, and circumspect in policy, great sorrows have induced in him such fits of gloom and torpor, that his subjects hardly deemed him sane. The lamented death of Lord Mayo severed the slight bond of personal influence which rendered relations cordial. There were other causes, too, to disquiet him. The ablest of his competitors, his nephew, Abdurrahman, was a refugee in Turkestan, and thence continued his attempts to win over the Amir's officers and stir up disaffection. The Amir's son, Yakub Khan, whose genius and whose services rendered him first an object of apprehension, then of suspicion, and lastly of undisguised distrust, was driven, by repeated wrongs, into rebellion. The sympathies of a considerable section of the Afghans followed him. Meanwhile the Russian Governor of Turkestan, General Kaufmann, persisted in sending letters to the Amir assuring him of friendship and safety, informing him of his doings in Central Asia, and referring in reassuring language to the presence of Abdurrahman in territory under Russian control. We will not say that these letters were meant to be alarming, but their tendency was to increase the worth of Russian friendship by hinting to the Amir how easily they could injure him by availing themselves of old disputes between Bukhara and Afghanistan, or by giving license to or championing the cause of his rivals: They did, in fact, alarm him, as his letters to the Viceroy and his remarks show. But his feeling was still one of entire reliance on the English power and alarmed distrust of the advances of the Turkestan authorities. The question of the boundary between his dominions and Bukhara was not yet settled, and this caused him uneasiness, and possibly fears, regarding the power or good faith of the

British Government, which had in 1870 informed him that it had effected a satisfactory settlement with Russia. But to understand the position of this question we must go back a little.

The Government of India in 1869 declared that it did not share in the exaggerated apprehensions expressed in many quarters as to the danger to India from the extension of Russian influence, and wished to assist in establishing a frank and clear understanding as to the relative position of British and Russian interests. Negotiations between the Governments of England and Russia directed to the establishment of a "neutral zone" ensued. In the course of these, Prince Gortchakow gave a positive assurance that Russia regarded Afghanistan as completely outside the sphere within which Russia might be called on to exercise her influence. No intervention or interference whatever, opposed to the independence of that State, entered into the Czar's intentions. Lord Clarendon after a time proposed that the Upper Oxus should be the boundary line which neither Power should permit its forces to cross. In the autumn of 1869 took place the interview between Lord Clarendon and Prince Gortchakow at Heidelberg. The Prince declared that both he and his master considered that extension of territory was extension of weakness, and that Russia had no intention of going further south—that it was not intended to retain Samarcand. Lord Clarendon, on the other hand, declared that the relations entered into with Afghanistan had no reference to the advances of Russia in Asia, and were not indicative of a hostile feeling to Russia. Lest there should be any doubt as to the sincerity of our Foreign Office, we ought perhaps to explain that Russian opinion is as sensitive as regards English advance as Anglo-Indian opinion is regarding Russian. Whatever the Russian Government may assert, the organs of Russian opinion and the soldiers of Central Asia make no secret of their conviction that there *is* danger to India from their advance. Naturally they are ever ready to suspect that we are intriguing to check it, and they honestly believe that we were likely to aid Khiva and Bukhara. If the assurance as regards Afghanistan simply meant that we did not wish to make it a basis of intrigue or operations against Russia, it was honest. But if it meant more, we find a difficulty in reconciling it with the probabilities of the case, or with Lord Northbrook's assertion in 1873 (Afghanistan Papers, No. 20A; No. 33 of 1873, p. 4) that certain assurances then given were evidence that the Czar would approve no course of conduct calculated to revive *the uneasiness in regard to Central Asia affairs* which the discussions of the past three years had done so much to allay. In 1869, Mr. Douglas Forsyth (who had gone as Envoy to Yarkand) visited

St. Petersburg, and discussed the proposals then under consideration. The results were thus formulated by Prince Gortchakow in November, 1871 :—

“(a)—That the territory in the actual possession at the present moment of Shere Ali Khan should be considered to constitute the limits of Afghanistan.

“(b)—That beyond these limits the Ameer should make no attempt to exercise any influence or interference, and that the English Government should do all in their power to restrain him from any attempts at aggression.

“(c)—That for their part the Imperial Government should use all their influence to prevent any attack by the Ameer of Bokhara upon Afghan territory.

“These principles had been unreservedly accepted both by the Cabinet of London and the Governor-General of India.”

There was a difference of opinion as to whether Badakshan and Wakhan belonged to Afghanistan ; but in 1873 the Russian Government accepted the views of England, and since then the Amir's sovereignty has been recognised. (One of the Amir's grievances against us is that we outraged diplomatic etiquette in regard to Wakhan which our diplomacy then won for him). Bukhara and Afghanistan were no longer spoken of as a neutral zone, but as a “zone destinée a preserver les possessions des deux Empires en Asie de tout contact.”

In respect to Afghanistan, we beg to draw the attention of the fiery enthusiasts who denounce the present war as an attack on a neutral, independent State to their trusted Lord Northbrook's expression :—“ Our relations with Afghanistan are of a kind quite inconsistent with neutrality in its strict sense” (No. 22 ; No. 60 of 1873, para. 15). But the unwillingness of the Indian Government to assume any responsibility which might entail interference in Afghanistan is shown by their declaration—a declaration addressed to Russia—that even to restrain the Amir from aggression they would only undertake to press upon him, in case of need, in the strongest manner their friendly advice, and to govern relations towards him in accordance with the action he might take (para. 17). But in the following paragraph, they give still further evidence that their interest in Afghanistan is not merely to prevent it from civil war or aggression. They say boldly that the complete independence of Afghanistan is of such importance to the interests of India that they could not look upon an attack on it from without with indifference—and that circumstances might occur under which they should give material assistance to the Amir.

Thus we have the Government of India definitely abandoning the doctrine of Sir John Lawrence—which Sir J. Lawrence him-

self, we say with deference, never ventured consistently to act on—that India is best defended on the Indus. If Russia would only surround itself with difficulties by attacking Afghanistan—why warn her that she must not do so? Because, we will suppose him to answer, though she cannot establish herself there permanently, nor even if established there could do no serious harm, yet the disturbance of the peace which would ensue would be an evil. Granted. But if there be an atom of truth in Lord Lawrence's assertions, would not the evil of entangling ourselves in engagements with Afghanistan against Russia be far greater? The Duke of Argyll was clearly of opinion that Afghanistan must be defended as an outpost of India. He thought that its defence was best left to the Afghans. He did not probably feel confident that the St. Petersburg Government had either the will or the power to compel, under all circumstances, its officials in Central Asia from following courses which might lead to the breach of the engagement that had just been entered into. But in accordance with the methods of European diplomacy, he thought it at least convenient to affect confidence. He knew, too, that if a defensive alliance were concluded with the Amir, his expectations would be indefinite, and we should be called on to save him from the results of his own foolish ambition or misgovernment. The Duke probably, too, took into consideration the instability of Afghan power and wished to remain free to act as circumstances might require. He seems not to have contemplated the possibility of Russia's using her power of threatening Afghanistan to facilitate her European policy, or of the Amir's abandoning his vague understanding with us for a specific engagement with Russia. Nor does he seem to have considered that the Amir might probably regard our hesitation as due to consciousness of weakness, and might prefer the friendship of the Power from whom he had everything to fear to the friendship of a Power from whom he had little to fear and little to hope. We can only guess as to the motives which influenced his Grace, for all that the India Office contributes to the Blue Book for this critical chapter of the history of relations with Cabul is two telegrams, the importance of which entitles them to full quotation. (Nos. 23, 24, 25.)

“ Secretary of State to Viceroy, Simla.

“ July 1, 1878.

“ Your telegram of the 27th June. I do not object to the general sense of the paragraph, which you quote as a communication to Russia from the Foreign Office, but great caution is necessary in assuring Ameer of material assistance which may raise undue and unfounded expectation. He already shows symptoms of claiming more than we may wish to give.”

" Viceroy to Secretary of State.

" July 24, 1873.

" Ameer of Cabool alarmed at Russian progress, dissatisfied with general assurance, and anxious to know definitely how far he may rely on our help if invaded. I propose assuring him that if he unreservedly accepts and acts on our advice in all external relations we will help him with money, arms, and troops, if necessary, to expel unprovoked invasion. We to be the judge of the necessity. Answer by telegraph quickly."

" Secretary of State to the Viceroy.

" India Office, dated 26th July, 1873.

" Cabinet thinks you should inform Ameer that we do not at all share his alarm, and consider there is no cause for it: but you may assure him we shall maintain our settled policy in favour of Afghanistan, if he abides by our advice in external affairs."

To understand these telegrams, it is necessary to remember that the Government of India had kept the Amir informed of the negotiations with Russia to secure what we venture to term a "peaceful zone," and of the assurances the Russian Government had given. They had also, to prevent complications with Persia, which would have retarded the orderly progress of Afghanistan and rendered the due discharge of our treaty obligations difficult, determined as arbitrators a long standing dispute as to the boundary on the south-western corner of Afghanistan. This Seistan arbitration gave great offence to the Amir, both as regards the results and the spirit and method by which he conceived it was conducted. The justice of the award is a vexed question. There were no settled principles to go by, and it had at least the merit of displeasing both claimants. In March, 1873, the Government of India decided to send one of its officers to give full explanations to the Amir regarding the negotiations with Russia and the Seistan arbitration. General Kaufmann, we may explain, had already on his part written to tell the Amir of the friendship between England and Russia, and the inaggressive intentions of the latter regarding Afghanistan. These communications, though they were couched in terms which from a European point of view seemed designed to give effect to the arrangement arrived at, seemed to the Amir and his advisers to be rather minatory than reassuring. He could not understand why General Kaufmann should venture to address a Power which wholly depended on the friendship of England. The letters were duly forwarded to the Viceroy and were approved of by him. The replies of the Amir, written with the sanction of the Viceroy, echoed in a cold and somewhat sarcastic spirit the wishes and assurances of the Russian Governor. The interview with the English official was not destined to take

place. In April, 1873, we find the Amir expressing his opinion that the 5000 Enfield rifles offered by the Viceroy were not sufficient. Fifteen thousand three-grooved rifles and 5000 Snider guns ought, he said, to be procured at any price. Again, in May we find from the letter of our native agent at Cabul that the Amir was troubled in mind about his northern frontier. He had told Lord Mayo, he said, that he could not understand why, after the specific assurances he had received, there had been so much delay in fixing the boundary. It was impossible that Russians should remain always true to their engagements. His anxiety could not be removed till the British Government "adorned" the Afghan Government with great assistance for keeping troops and building forts. If it were necessary to oppose Russia, *British troops would be required*. Preparations must be made betimes, they could not be improvised. In a strain of exaggerated dependency, he begs at least that provision may be made for a place of retreat in India, should he have to leave Afghanistan. (Princes or pretenders in retreat, we may explain, are personages so numerous in Asia as to be commonplace. They live generally on pensions given by more fortunate monarchs, either from pity or with the hope that they may be useful some day as tools.) After this reassurance, says the Amir, I will work with zeal night and day for the security of Afghanistan, which is in truth the border of India. He indicates how the occasion for Russian interference will arise. They will occupy Merv. The Turkomans will thus have to take refuge in the Herat province of Afghanistan, whence they will harass the Russians. The Russians will hold the Amir responsible for this, or will enter his territory to punish the Turkomans themselves. He points out how by the Seistan decision the British have in fact thrown open to Russia the way to India *via* Merv and Seistan. Until the British Government considers his views, he says, he will have no peace of mind. The agent, summing up the views of the Cabul Darbar, says that the British should at once *commence to organise the Afghan troops*. We cannot see how they could do this without deputing English officers.

Finally, Saiad Nur Muhamad Shah, the trusted adviser of the Amir, who had accompanied him to Ambala in 1869, and who subsequently represented him in the fruitless negotiations of 1877, came to Simla to discuss affairs with Lord Northbrook. The Viceroy tried to show how greatly Afghanistan was benefited by the assurances given by Russia and the definition of the frontier—

"The Ameer," continued His Excellency, "must be well aware that, occupying as Afghanistan does an intervening position between

the British and Russian dominions, it was important for the interests of India that she should be both a strong and an independent State."

[Our readers will observe here what progress has been made in political science since 1869]. He also pointed out that the British Government did not intend to interfere in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. The Envoy said this was well understood. But—

"The rapid advances made by the Russians in Central Asia had," he said, "aroused the gravest apprehensions in the minds of the people of Afghanistan. Whatever specific assurances the Russians might give, and however often these might be repeated, the people of Afghanistan could place no confidence in them, and would never rest satisfied unless they were assured of the aid of the British Government."

This, indeed, is the keynote of the Amir's case. In the conversations which followed some points are to be noted:—1. The extreme jealousy shown by the Envoy regarding interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. 2. The idea apparently existing in the Amir's mind that Lord Mayo's assurances that any "representation he might make would always be treated with consideration and respect," bound the British Government to comply with *any* request preferred by him.

With respect to Russia, the Viceroy, echoing his telegraphic instructions, replied that the Government did not share the Amir's apprehensions. If the Amir were threatened with aggression from without he was to refer the question to the British Government, who would then endeavour by negotiation, &c., to avert hostilities. If they failed to do so they would give him aid in money and arms, and, if necessary, troops. But there were three conditions:—1. The British Government should decide when assistance was necessary, its nature and extent. 2. The Amir should himself abstain from aggression. 3. He should unreservedly accept the advice of the British Government regarding his external relations. The Envoy mentioned some objections (not stated in the Memorandum) but reserved the subject for the Amir's consideration. He also urged strongly two points:—1. That the British Government should distinctly state that in the event of any aggression on the Amir's territories, they would consider the aggressor an enemy. Lord Northbrook replied that the assurance given was sufficient. In diplomatic correspondence such expressions were always avoided as caused needless irritation. 2. That the contingency of aggression should be specifically mentioned in the written assurance to be given to the Amir. The Viceroy declined on two grounds. Such mention would cause needless irritation to a friendly Power. It

would imply an admission of the probability of such a contingency arising, which, in the face of the repeated assurances of Russia, the British Government could not admit. In conclusion, the Viceroy counselled the Amir not to countenance the lawless proceedings of the Turkomans or any opposition on their part to the march of Russian troops.

A Memorandum was prepared of certain points to be laid before the Amir by the Envoy. It recapitulates the points discussed—says the contingency of aggression is so remote that the Amir ought not to launch into any large expenditure to guard against it, but repeating the old formula that the British Government desires to see the Amir strong and his rule firmly established, and to maintain their policy in regard to strengthening him (against whom ?) they declare they are willing to give him any reasonable assistance. They place at his disposal the arms he has requested, and 100,000*l.*, including 50,000*l.* as a contribution to the compensation to be paid to the subjects of the Amir who had suffered by raids in Seistan. The representation of the Amir that the Russians would call upon him for political objects to enter into arrangements for the establishment of a Russian mission and agents in various parts, or to comply with other demands, is referred to. In reply he is to be told that Prince Gortchakow had promised not to send his agents to Afghanistan. If any requirement were made the British Government would deal with it. A most important suggestion follows. Looking to the responsibilities we have assumed regarding the Northern and North-Western boundary, and our ignorance regarding it, it seemed desirable that a British officer of rank with a competent staff should examine it, and confer personally with the Amir regarding the measures necessary to place it in a state of defence. The explanation of this solicitude is awkward. The Government did not anticipate any danger from without. Still, cases might arise in which from imperfect information the interests of Afghanistan might suffer. Such are the contents of the secret Memorandum. The *kharita* to the Amir dealt only in a complacent tone with the results of the arrangements with Russia. We naturally look to the Despatch to the Secretary of State for even a more candid exposition of policy than the Memorandum affords. We are not disappointed (No. 26. No. 75 of 1873, p. 6 *et seq.*)—

“ But as the subject (of the policy to be pursued in case of actual or threatened aggression) is one of great importance, and the Envoy appeared to doubt how far his instructions justified him in committing himself to any definite arrangement, we considered it advisable to postpone the settlement of it to a more favourable opportunity, when we trust the matter may be discussed with the Ameer in person. . . .

Though we think that the presence of accredited British officers at Cabul, Herat, and possibly also Candahar, would for many reasons be desirable, we are fully alive to the difficulties in the way of such a measure until the objects and policy of the British Government are more clearly understood and appreciated in Afghanistan. It is with the view of removing some of these difficulties that we have proposed the deputation of an officer to examine the boundaries. Independently of the valuable information, both geographical and political, that might be collected, a judicious officer would have it in his power to do much towards allaying any feelings of mistrust that may still linger in the minds of some classes of the people in Afghanistan, and towards preparing the way for the eventual location of permanent British representatives in that country, if such a measure should at any time be considered desirable or necessary."

Had phrases such as these been found in Lord Lytton's Despatches, they would be regarded as distinct evidence of Imperialistic plotting. The business of the India Office in the Duke of Argyll's time was, we believe, conducted in great part by private letters. A future generation will no doubt learn much from those which passed at this time.

It would be unfair at this stage of our argument to assume that the Amir's estrangement dates from the time of this discussion. But we cannot help saying that the course adopted was peculiarly calculated to cause distrust in a mind so suspicious and brooding as the Amir's. The Duke of Argyll has, we think, suggested that the fear of Russia was affected in the hope that we might be induced to concede his unreasonable demands for support to himself and his descendants in domestic matters. No doubt this suspicion strongly biassed his Grace's judgment at the time. But we are unable to find any evidence in favour of his view in the records or the general probabilities of the case. We are rather inclined to believe that the Amir of Cabul's apprehensions were more reasonable than the Duke of Argyll's confidence. And we think his declarations more honest. He had seen that Russia had, in spite of her general and special assurances, taken measures with regard to Khiva which practically annexed it to the Russian dominions. He knew that the same series of relations with the Nomad tribes that intervened which led the 'Russians on from Orenburg to Tashkent, and from Tashkent to Khiva, would ultimately bring her to the border of Afghanistan. We will not do English statesmen of that time the injustice to suppose that they were blind to this. We see that while they kept up a pretence of not having changed their policy, they had in effect changed it—and changed it solely with reference to Russian progress. Had they only given the Amir the distinct pledges he asked for, we believe their altered policy would have succeeded in its ends.

But the habits of European diplomacy were too strong for them ; they clung to the hope that the compact with Russia would be honourably observed, and they feared to jeopardise its amicable fulfilment by any written or spoken expressions of distrust. It is easy to blame them now, to say that the best way to prevent aggression is both to be ready to meet it, and to profess to be ready. But it was a time of orange blossoms and peaceful illusions. It is of no avail to say that our assurances to the Amir bound us to him as firmly as the more explicit pledges he demanded. He did not feel it to be so. To the Oriental a single definite promise is worth more than reams of argument that self-interest will lead us to do what he wants, and vague assurances that we shall probably do it. We have seen how highly the Amir valued the letter of Lord Mayo, and now he is only told by Lord Northbrook that he has misunderstood its terms ! If it appear hereafter that his attitude to us has changed, we may safely infer that it has changed because he believes we are either afraid of Russia or confederate with her to his hurt. And knowing what we do of his temper and his grievances, we shall not wonder that his brooding spirit misinterprets our most well-meant acts, and while the old sorrows rankle, invents new wrongs, and day by day finds his anger grow in contemplating the causes which at first he had but feigned to justify it. We have all had personal experience of the course of estrangement between friends. The Amir was but a man dealing with men.

We have still, in our dull judicial way, to follow facts as they are disclosed to us in the correspondence. In November, 1873, the Amir answers the Viceroy's letters in a strain which entitles him to a high place among the masters of sarcastic irony. He thanks God that peace and tranquillity have been established among all States in perpetuity—that doubts and disputes have been removed—that such security has been established that henceforth no aggressions will take place, nor will any power raise discussions or disputes with another—that the use of inimical expressions has been discontinued in diplomatic correspondence, and that peace and tranquillity have been secured to the whole world. The assurance that the policy of Lord Lawrence was to be continued has caused him pleasure. "My friend," he says, "this being so, it was not necessary to hold all those conversations with Saiad Nur Muhamad at Simla. The understanding arrived at in Ambala is quite sufficient." He promises to remain firm in friendship to the English Government while the British Government remains firm in friendship to him.

Colonel Valentine Baker at this time wished to proceed from Persia *via* Cabul to India. The Amir, referring to his application, says he has already explained the many objections to men

like Colonel Baker and others travelling in Afghanistan, and need not therefore reply further. He refers also to the Seistan arbitration in an aggrieved tone. This document, when interpreted in the light of the fuller statement of grievances subsequently made by the Amir, seems to us to be susceptible of only one interpretation. He was deeply mortified by his failure; he saw clearly that the English Government desired fuller securities than they thought necessary in 1869, but that they were unwilling or afraid to undertake fuller responsibilities, and he decided in future to avail himself to the full of the independence of action their affected indifference permitted him, but at the same time to hold them bound by the engagements which his interpretation of Lord Mayo's and Lord Lawrence's letters assumed them to have contracted. Sir Henry Rawlinson suggests that he had decided previously, if his demands were not conceded, to prefer the friendship of Russia; but we think it more likely that he hoped to keep the balance between the two Powers, and play one off against the other. His offensive attitude may have been adopted with a view of alarming us, or irritating us into compliance; or it may have been dictated by imperious ill-humour. We shall see hereafter that from this time his relations with General Kauffmann became more intimate, if not more cordial. Lord Northbrook at once recognised the altered tone—explained (by letter) that his letters were designed to give the Amir assurances of support even more explicit than those of Lords Mayo and Lawrence, and gently rebukes him for his brusque reference to Colonel Baker's request.

About this time Shir Ali publicly nominated Abdulah Jan as heir apparent. Yakub Khan was reported to have sent no congratulations, and to be strengthening himself for rebellion at his Government of Herat.

Soon after the Amir had another opportunity of showing his disposition. Sir Douglas Forsyth, Envoy to the Court of the Atalik Ghazi, wished to return to India *viâ* Cabul. His advanced guard had crossed the dreary Pamir plateau, and reached the comparatively hospitable Wakhán, when the Amir refused him permission to continue his march. Several explanations are possible. The one the Amir gave is, that the country was disturbed, owing to the prospect of an outbreak at Herat, and he feared the English party might be attacked. But it may also have been an intentional act of discourtesy; or he may have had a genuine suspicion that Sir Douglas Forsyth was coming to spy out the land, or intrigue with his enemies, or prepare the way for the dreaded mission. It is impossible to doubt that, had relations been cordial, permission would not have been withheld. We may in this place, perhaps, most conveniently explain that

in order to estimate the Amir's motives, the atmosphere of suspicion and unrest in which he lived must be kept in mind. He feared the Russians, the English, his son, the parties of his rivals, the factions of his Court. He was perpetually embarrassed for money, and had to overcome at once the recalcitrance of his subjects and the corruption of his governors. And his advisers were either the women of his household, or a Durbar consisting of men for the most part of the narrowest intelligence, the most selfish aims, and of absolutely no experience of the field of politics on which it had been his fate to enter.

In November, 1874, Yakub Khan came to Cabul under a safe conduct from the Amir, and after his arrival was thrown into prison. From that prison, we may add, he did not emerge till his father's recent flight left him for the time head of the Afghan State. Lord Northbrook, having regard to our relations with the Amir, and our declared desire to see a "merciful" administration established, and "peace and tranquillity secured;" considering, too, the help we had given, and the fact that we had in 1871 effected a reconciliation between father and son, deemed it right to instruct its agent to deliver a message to the Amir. The agent—not very willingly, we are sure—went, like a Hebrew prophet, to the King's presence, and there, before all his mighty men, spoke as he was told to speak :—

"The Viceroy hopes the report is untrue, and desires strongly to urge His Highness to observe the conditions on which the Sirdar came to Cabul. By so doing the Amir will maintain his good name and the friendship of the British Government. The Viceroy would be glad to receive early assurances to this effect, and to be correctly informed of what has taken place."

We are far from condemning the action of Lord Northbrook. In the present state of affairs it may even prove useful to have established a claim upon the gratitude of Yakub Khan. But the language used was of a distinctly minatory character. It caused the greatest dismay to the Durbar, who saw nothing in the Amir's conduct opposed to Afghan ethics—"It is not heard that there is any room for claim for the fulfilment of stipulations between father and son"—and whose experience of Afghan affairs satisfied them that it was necessary to the safety of the State. And it was undoubtedly a violation of the pledge that we should not interfere in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. Lord Northbrook's friends may think that his threat of a rupture of relations was made for a nobler and more useful object than Lord Lytton's, but they cannot deny that it was as distinct and peremptory. Lord Northbrook said the Amir would lose the friendship of England if his government was not "just"; Lord

Lytton said he would lose it if it was not "friendly." The Amir remarked on Lord Northbrook's message in terms of indignant remonstrance. While our Viceroy thus intensified his anger by threats and reproach on a subject as to which his feelings were wrought to the highest pitch of sensitiveness, General Kaufmann sent a message condoling with him on Yakub's ingratitude, and congratulating him on his escape from the danger it threatened. The English, said the Amir, support the son against the father : the Russians, the father against the son.

It is true that in his remarks to the English agent the Amir speaks of the friendship between the two Governments as increasing and likely to increase, and says his Excellency's recommendation is based on friendship and well wishing. But we may give a caution here which may be useful to the confident critics of the London press. To judge of the general character of a Persian letter or discourse, the nicest experience of Persian etiquette and phraseology is necessary. An insult is all the more effective as an insult (in the estimation of Orientals) if conveyed in honeyed words. When Lord Beaconsfield subscribes himself Mr. Gladstone's most obedient servant, no one supposes he is prepared to follow Mr. Gladstone's policy. Yet such an inference would be far less absurd than the inferences drawn in many cases from the language of the Amir's recent letters to Lord Lytton. Similarly a few conventional expressions of cordiality do not make a reply cordial. The Persian language more than others has been given to man to conceal his thoughts, and those who use it avail themselves to the utmost of its advantages. The Amir at this time seems to have thought it well to say in a contemptuous kind of way that the friendship formed at Umbala was all he required. Such a tone would enable him when desirable to say consistently that it imposed little on him and entitled him to much.

We may here briefly note other instances in which Shir Ali is said to have shown his unfriendly or distrustful disposition. He did not accept for some time the arms offered by Lord Northbrook, and he absolutely declined to take the money—"avowing his determination," says Sir H. Rawlinson, "to receive no favours from the British Government," or perhaps to incur no further obligations. He refused to allow an agent of the Punjab Government to proceed with presents to his feudatory, the Mir of Wakhan. Our native agent at Cabul was at any rate in some instances surrounded by inconvenient, though honourable restraints, was not allowed to write matter which had not been approved of by the Amir, and was not permitted to have free communication with the Afghans.

We have several reasons for stating thus in detail the incidents

of our relations with Cabul previous to the initiation of what is called Lord Salisbury's new policy. They have been treated as comparatively unimportant and are little understood compared with subsequent occurrences. We are persuaded, however, that in them is to be found the root of recent difficulties, and that no just judgment can be formed till they are duly appreciated. It will be found, we think, that Lord Lytton's policy in its general aims was but a consistent development of that of his predecessors, and that the immediate measures which he has been most blamed for urging were recognised as expedient, though inopportune, by his cautious predecessor. Those who are still neutral in the great controversy will remember how many reckless charges are thus proved to be false, and will, with reference to points on which evidence cannot be had, be able to say whether it is safer to assume that the methods of Government have been honest and moderate, or that the remaining charges of their opponents are true.

In 1874 the accidents of English politics brought the Tory party into power. Assumptions as to the general bent of the new Cabinet regarding foreign policy, and as to the personal character of its members, have so prejudiced the discussion of the question with which we are dealing that we think it necessary to offer an estimate based, not on assumptions, but on the acts and declarations of Ministers.

Many Liberals, we hope, are proud of Empire, and would be reluctant to relinquish it. But the Conservative party, as a party, makes the maintenance of Imperial interests, as contrasted with those which are purely domestic, a more prominent part of policy than the Liberal party does. They are more sensitive to the dangers that beset them. They believe that they are to be guarded against, not by understandings and professions, which they regard as illusory, but by material guarantees, and by making, not only their intention to defend Imperial interests from aggression clearly understood, but their power to repel it. A policy of timely precaution such as this leads to steps the issues of which no one can certainly foresee, and in this sense it may with justice be called "adventurous." But the policy of temporising and waiting on events, though cheaper for the time and less likely to offer food for criticism, leads to a certain issue of disaster. As in these days political discussion cannot dispense with catchwords, we may call this policy the "infatuated," as contrasted with the "adventurous." In a sense it is peaceful, but to characterise the policy adopted by Ministers as "war-like" is a piece of stupid malignity. They either formed or blundered into a clear conception of what Imperial interests required. They were prepared to avert danger by war if necessary,

but preferably by counter expedients. To avoid war they allowed Russia to take Kars and Batoum, and thus rendered an English protectorate of Asia Minor essential. To avoid war they allowed Russia to take Bessarabia, and thus exposed themselves to the taunts of those consistent friends of peace who now say we ought not to have gone to war with Afghanistan, but with Russia instead. Whether amid all the shifting elements of the political situation they steered the safest course, we have no inclination to discuss here. Elsewhere* we have attempted to sketch the temper of English parties and the effect of the partial solution arrived at on our Imperial interests in Asia. Of that question, we repeat, the questions of Constantinople and of Afghanistan are alike but incidents. Here we must confine our attention to the aspects affairs in Afghanistan presented to the new Secretary of State. That Afghanistan should be kept strong and friendly, that Russian interference in its affairs should not be permitted, was now a cardinal point of Indian policy. Russia, it is true, had pledged herself not to interfere, but we had had painful experience of the worthlessness of such pledges. Whether the St. Petersburg Government was sincere in giving them is a point not worth discussing. Tendencies were too strong for stipulations. The Central Government could not control its officers in Central Asia. It was hardly denied that these entertained the ambitious schemes which were repudiated by the diplomatists. As soldiers they were eager for action, and the circumstances in which they were placed rendered action and the extension of Russian power all but inevitable. The Central Government disavowed the aggression, but retained (not without plausible excuse) the fruits of it. If such was the state of things when peaceful and friendly councils prevailed at St. Petersburg, what would it be if the ambitious military party obtained control? Officials in Central Asia would be encouraged to intrigue. If we made representations at St. Petersburg, the Foreign Minister would first deny that the acts alleged had not been committed; then say he had no knowledge of them; then that they had been done without his knowledge; and, finally, when further pressed, would say, as Prince Gortchakow under the circumstances we have supposed, did really say: "When I have a whale on my hands, I cannot trouble myself about little fishes." Or the denials would continue till irresistible evidence would be produced, and then the Minister or Ambassador would admit with a grin that he was found out. The alleged distrust of Russia, so far as it exists, is due to the fact that the Government cannot control its own officials, and that it adopts or disavows their acts

* WESTMINSTER REVIEW, October, 1878, p. 589, *et seq.*

as it finds it convenient. The English Ministry knew all this. They had no reason to suppose that the Russian Government had proved unfaithful to its pledges, but they knew that the Governor of Tashkent had sent letters to the Amir explaining, indeed, the cordial relations existing with England, but giving such details of Russian power and progress that even anti-alarmist Lord Northbrook draws the attention of the English Government to the tone of one* ; they knew that, contrary to explicit assurances, military preparations had been made against the Turkomans and the all-important post of Merv ; that General Llamakin had issued a proclamation claiming authority over the country between the Atrek and Gurgan, the tract through which the road from the Caspian to Herat lies ; they heard, too, of Russian explorations of the Oxus valley, and of a Russian alliance with Persia against the Turkomans. Reassuring explanations were of course forthcoming. But later on (in 1875) we find that the Russians have subdued some Turkoman tribes, and that both Russian and English diplomatists are agreed that the idea of maintaining a neutral zone is impracticable. Prince Gortchakow says Russia meditates no conquest southward, and the English Government accepting this statement in a friendly spirit, points out that a Russian occupation of Merv would render it impossible for England to maintain its policy of abstention and to prevent the Amir from being embroiled with the Turkomans. Baron Jomini, in conversation, remarks that as Russia would not object to England's annexing Afghanistan, he cannot understand why England should object to Russia's absorbing Bokhara and Khiva. In this year, too (1875), the Russians advance in Khokand and depose its ruler. The Amir of Cabul is duly informed of this, and no doubt meditates on the intelligence.

We have slightly anticipated ; preferring to give the actual to the probable course of events. Turning to Afghanistan, English Ministers saw that in some degree they were responsible to Russia for preventing the Amir from adopting aggressive measures against Bokhara, and that the presence of the turbulent Turkoman tribes on the frontier rendered a dispute always possible. They were pledged, too, in their own estimation and for their own interests to defend the Amir's northern frontier against all aggression. But they were wholly without means of obtaining the information necessary for the due discharge of these responsibilities. Our agent at Meshed (in Persia) gave us information as to the movements of the Turkomans and Russians in that direction, but we had no definite intelligence as to what was occurring along the line of the Oxus where the great routes

* "Central Asia Papers," pp. 9, 14, 15.

from Central Asia enter Cabul territory. The temper of the Amir was at the best ambiguous. Sir H. Rawlinson says that after the abortive conference of 1873 commenced the interchange of friendly communications, both by letter and agents, between Tashkent and Cabul. We have seen that letters had passed before, and the first mention of an envoy we can find is in November, 1875. The Russian letters seemed to have caused the Amir simply disquiet, and he hands them to the English agent for perusal. But instead of referring them, as in early days, to the Viceroy for suggestions as to the proper reply, he sends a reply at once. Our representations regarding Turkoman affairs are treated with loyal deference, but Lord Northbrook himself admits that the Amir's reply in 1873 was unsatisfactory, and that his bearing had become cold. The statement of his Envoy at the Conference in 1876 shows that he felt aggrieved, and we have already referred to instances in which he showed his sullen resentment. We had no means of removing from his mind the grounds of his distrust, or indeed of ascertaining what they were—no means of showing him how much he risked by abandoning our friendship. We had indeed an agent at his court, a native gentleman of intelligence and respectability, but his reports were meagre, and by many believed to be not in all respects trustworthy. The Amir allowed him neither to learn everything, nor report all he knew. Further, as an Asiatic, he did not understand the nature of the information required, nor could he exercise the necessary influence over the Amir. He writes with care all incidents that seem significant, but, as he naïvely confesses, did not understand that he was expected to remark on tendencies and influences. Lord Salisbury feared that, in spite of the good intentions of the Czar, Russia might be betrayed into establishing its influence in Afghanistan either by bribes or threats to the Amir, or by detaching from him by intrigue his powerful subjects, or by taking advantage of the Amir's own indiscreet aggression. To thwart such plans, Lord Salisbury desired to have English officers stationed for observation at points on the frontier. Lord Northbrook and his Government opposed the proposal, urging that the Amir would certainly refuse to allow European officers to reside within his territory, that his refusal would injure our influence, that even if he gave an unwilling assent, the movements of the officers would be so restricted and watched that their observations would be worthless. They contended that the native agent's reports, though not perfectly free, were on the whole satisfactory, that the Amir, though out of temper with us, would never be seduced by Russian promises or frightened by Russian threats, that if the Russians intrigued against him he would at once come to us for aid. But they admitted with the

usual inconsistency that it would be highly desirable to post officers *with* the Amir's cordial consent, and that in any case it would be necessary to do so if Russia occupied Merv. They believed that the Amir's refusal would be due, not to hostile feeling, but to the danger to himself and to the officers which the concession would involve. He himself probably believed that the British meant no aggressive interference, but his chiefs and people would regard the presence of residents as a mark of subjection, and religious fanaticism would be aroused. Lord Salisbury was not satisfied by these arguments. He thought that the harm the Amir's refusal would do us was less than the harm done by the general knowledge of the relations between the Amir and us, and that when the Russians had once occupied Merv the time for action would have passed. He instructed Lord Northbrook therefore (19 November, 1875) without delay to "find an occasion" for sending a temporary mission to Cabul, the real, but not ostensible object of which should be, by friendly argument, to persuade the Amir of the advantage and necessity of the proposed step and the danger to him of impeding the course of action which the British Government thought necessary for securing his independence. Lord Northbrook protested, and requested further instructions. Soon after, he left India.

The ideas of the new Viceroy, Lord Lytton, were known to be entirely in accord with those of the Cabinet, and he went to India pledged to give effect to the more vigorous policy to be initiated, not with reference to Afghan affairs only, but to those of our north-western frontier generally. In the Blue Book and public discussions the Afghan question has been isolated. But to judge Lord Lytton's dealings with the Amir fairly, it is necessary to remember that they were but part of the whole question of border policy. Between our territories and those really subject to the Amir, the mountains are held by fierce tribes who are practically independent of his control. Since the conquest of the Punjab made them our neighbours, a long series of punitive expeditions have been necessary. We have already* sketched the state of border affairs when Lord Lytton assumed power, and we now urge those readers who wish to judge of Lord Lytton's real objects from his acts and declarations, and not from the assumptions of his opponents, to refer to what we have there said. The policy of interference, we may note, had been initiated by Lord Northbrook, who sent a mission to the Khan of Khelat, with a view to putting a stop to the civil strife in Beluchistan, and opening the Bolan Pass once more to commerce. The instructions given by Government to Lord

* WESTMINSTER REVIEW, January, 1878, p. 231.

Lytton, in February, 1876, with reference to Afghanistan, suggests that he should endeavour to invite the confidence of the Amir, either by means of a special mission, charged with the duty of announcing to the Amir and the Khan of Kbelat the assumption by the Queen of her new title; or by directing the Commissioner of Peshawur to inform the Amir privately that the Viceroy intended to send a complimentary letter to him. In either case it would be the duty of the agent to ascertain from the Amir his hopes and his fears, whether reasonable or otherwise. The Amir would be informed that the reception of a British agent would not afford to Russia any pretext for demanding the reception of a Russian agent similarly accredited—such a demand being inconsistent with the spontaneous assurances of Russia. [This, of course, is meant to answer by anticipation an objection the Amir would probably make]. Demands on the part of the Amir which the British Government could not comply with were to be met by a firm negative and were not to be even discussed. If his language and demeanour promised no satisfactory result, he was to be distinctly reminded that he was isolating himself at his own peril from the friendship and protection it was his interest to seek and deserve. His requests would probably be:—

- 1st. A fixed and augmented subsidy.
- 2nd. A more decided recognition than has yet been accorded by the Government of India to the order of succession established by him in favour of his younger son, Abdullah Jan.
- 3rd. An explicit pledge, by treaty or otherwise, of material support in case of foreign aggression.

A decision on the first was left to the Viceroy's discretion. As to the second, he was told that a frank recognition of the *de facto* order in the succession, established by a *de facto* government would not imply or necessitate any intervention in the internal affairs of the state. As to the third, whether an assurance were given or not, England would be compelled by her own interests to assist in repelling invasion. If then Shir Ali renewed his old requests, and if he were willing to afford every reasonable facility for such precautionary measures as the British Government deemed requisite, they would sanction any more definite declaration on our part which would secure to our unaltered policy the advantages of which it had hitherto been deprived by a doubt as to its sincerity. The precautionary measures would not involve British garrisons, but they must have for their own agents undisputed access to frontier positions.

“ They must also have adequate means of confidentially conferring with the Amir upon all matters as to which the proposed declaration would recognise a community of interests. They must be entitled to expect becoming attention to their friendly counsels; and the Amir must be made to understand that, subject to all fair allowance for the condition of the country, and the character of the population, territories ultimately dependent upon British power for their defence must not be closed to those of the Queen's officers or subjects who may be duly authorised to enter them.”

Further the Government reserves to itself entire freedom of judgment as to the character of circumstances involving the obligation of material support to the Amir, and it was to be understood that only in some clear case of unprovoked aggression would such an obligation arise.

“ Subject to these general conditions, Her Majesty's Government can see no objection to your compliance with any reasonable demand on the part of Shere Ali for more assured support and protection, such as pecuniary assistance, the advice of British officers in the improvement of his military organisation, or a promise, not vague, but strictly guarded and clearly circumscribed, of adequate aid against actual and unprovoked attack by any foreign Power.”

Should the result show that the Amir's confidence was wholly alienated, no time should be lost in reconsidering, from a new point of view, the policy to be pursued.

The authors of a policy may with justice say that its merits can most fairly be discussed before its fruits are disclosed. We think that controversy as to that of Lord Salisbury has gone on entirely wrong issues. The question seems to us to be, not whether the rejection of our demands by the Amir would necessarily show that his temper had become hostile to us and friendly to Russia, but simply whether compliance with our demands was essential to enable us to secure his territory from aggression. Whatever might be the motive of the Amir—whether he feared that our demands were but a preface to annexation, or feared that compliance would lead to trouble with us or his subjects or Russia, or thought that he could best sustain himself by holding aloof from the two Great Powers between whom it was his unique destiny to be placed—if he refused, we could no longer feel that our position was secure. We do not think we could safely have postponed putting an end to the uncertainty that existed. The motives which operated on the Amir would gain strength by the progress of events. Russia, working in the dark, would gain all that we lost. We could not, as we had so often done before, benefit by the chapter of accidents. Granted that the Amir would come to us when attacked by Russia. But how if his own

aggression had provoked the attack? If the Russians had already gained a position from which we could not dislodge them? If they had established themselves in Afghanistan as friends and not as foes? Among the many misrepresentations with which the government policy has been attacked is the assertion that the alternative submitted to the Amir was compliance with impossible demands or our hostility. This was certainly not part of the original policy. We still desired his friendship, and contemplated no aggression. But as we could not take the necessary precautions within Afghanistan with the Amir's consent, we would be forced to take alternative precautions in other territories without his consent, to guard not only against the hostility of other Powers, but against the contingency that the Amir himself would prove hostile. It was right to warn him of the risk he ran. If our preparations, defensive as they would be, seemed likely to be useful too in attacking him or lessening his aggressive Power, this was no doubt to be regretted, but it could not be helped. On the other hand, we must remind intemperate ministerialists that the inducements offered by Lord Salisbury were not really much greater or more definite than those sanctioned by the Duke of Argyll, and that if, as is generally alleged, the Amir was estranged in 1873, because his preposterous demands of protection from domestic as well as foreign intrigue were not complied with, Lord Salisbury's offers had not the slightest chance of overcoming his repugnance to more intimate relations. Probably Lord Salisbury relied more on the fear of isolation than the hope of adequate assistance. Had both he and Lord Lytton been better acquainted with the maxims of oriental diplomacy, and relied less on such aptitude as they possessed for that of European courts, they would, we think, have proved it expedient to assume a less peremptory tone. General Kaufmann could have given them some hints. But by the general consent of English parties, intelligence unsophisticated by special experience, is the proper qualification for Viceroys and Secretaries of State.

We may notice as a matter of interest, though of no importance, that Lord Salisbury adopts the belief that the writings of Russophobic Englishmen were read by the Amir, and communicated to him the fears that inspired them.

Of the steps taken by Lord Lytton we can speak but briefly. In an elaborate despatch, May 10, 1877, he reviews, not in the most complimentary terms, the policy of his predecessors. He states—we presume on the authority of official documents—that in 1873 the Afghan Envoy expressed his general concurrence in the principle of locating British agents in Afghanistan, and suggested as a practical step that a British officer should

make a tour of inspection of the western and northern boundaries.

Lord Lytton decided to send to Cabul a special mission, ostensibly to announce the Queen's assumption of a new title, but secretly authorised to renew the negotiations of 1873. A native officer was sent with a letter from the Commissioner of Peshawar to prepare the way.

The despatch gives a somewhat coloured account of what followed, and we are glad to follow the authority of the original documents sent with it. The Amir, in a flowery Persian epistle, declines to receive the Mission, alleging that the results of the discussion at Simla had been considered sufficient, and had been embodied in two letters. If there was anything new to be proposed, he suggested that his envoy should go to the viceroy to hear what it was. From the report of the Cabul agent it seems that the reasons which the Durbar urged against the reception of the mission were: 1. Difficulty of securing the officers deputed from the attacks of religious fanatics or of persons anxious to embroil the Amir. 2. The troubles that would arise if the Mission proposed what the Amir could not grant. 3. The opportunity it would afford the Russians for pressing a mission.

This report, like most of those prepared by our agents, was probably submitted for approval to the Amir. Thus the Indian government heard only the reasons and the facts which the Amir thought it expedient they should hear. The following extract is suggestive in two ways, to which we draw the reader's attention by italics. It purports to be the observations of the members of the Durbar: "The coming and going of the sahibs cannot be kept concealed anyhow from the Russian Government, which on *my* northern border is conterminous *with the frontier of the English Government.*"

Ultimately, after a letter of remonstrance from the Commissioner of Peshawar had been received, it was arranged that the Amir should send an agent to the Viceroy. We wish we had space to quote the memorandum of a conversation between Sir Lewis Pelly and our Cabul agent, held at Simla in October, 1876. His account of the Amir's grievances anticipates those urged subsequently by the Amir's Envoy. He affirms, what the Envoy stoutly denied, that the Amir was thoroughly dissatisfied with the existing relations, and that, should we grant him what he asked, he would accede to our terms. But he had grown wholly to distrust our professions, and his advisers sought hidden meanings in all our communications. His terms were almost indefinite help, recognition, and honour. He had an intense dread of English interference in internal matters, and feared that receiving a mission would lead to further inter-

ference.* He knew that Russia broke treaties at pleasure and that we were impotent to prevent them from doing so. He did not think that we coveted any part of his territory.

It is no exaggeration to say that this memorandum contains more important information regarding the affairs of Cabul than all the diaries the agent had previously sent. This, of course, is due to skilful questioning, and illustrates, we think, the advantage that would accrue from having an English instead of a native representative at Cabul. The Viceroy learned with interest that the Cabul Treasury was empty—the troops unpaid and discontented; that no communication passed between the courts of Teheran and Cabul; that the Amir regarded the agents from Russia as sources of embarrassment; that quiet prevailed along the Herat frontier; that the frontiers of Maimenah, Shibbergan, Andakhoe, &c., were tranquil; that the principal Usbeg and Eimak chiefs were at Cabul; that the Amir had no relations with the Turkomans, but would be prepared to afford them asylum when Russia drove them from Merv, and that, as to the British Government, His Highness entertained no hope of support from it, either for himself or his dynasty, unless as against Russia; that our policy seems to be dictated by the convenience of the moment; that at Umballa we had engaged to regard with severe displeasure all attempts to impair his power and rule, and yet, that we had subsequently rather encouraged Mahomed Yakooob.

The Agent's opinion that the Amir was keen upon having a *pied-d-terre* in British territory, whither to send his family and property when he cleared for action with the Russians, ought, we think, to be conclusive as to his disposition then towards that nation. The Calcutta Foreign Office would seem to be in great part to blame for not having previously obtained information such as this from the Agent. But we do not know with what instructions it furnished him, and his remark that it was not safe to send very confidential matter from Cabul is significant. We think the attitude of the Amir, as thus revealed, was one of sullen distrust as regards us and apprehension as regards Russia—of unwillingness to commit himself to closer relations with us unless we conceded all he wanted—and of an intention to hold us to the fulfilment of the pledges given at Umballa, as *he* interpreted them, in case of need.

It is clear from the arguments used by the Viceroy, and his subsequent policy, that he did not feel that there was any immediate danger to English interests in Afghanistan from the

* The Envoy becoming, like Residents in India, a referee for discontented Afghan subjects.

temporary postponement of the full realization of our wishes. The explanations of our Agent and the fact that in confidential conversation with Captain Grey he qualified his assertion that the Amir objected to the residence of Englishmen in Afghanistan—by adding, “at any rate at Cabul”—afforded us, we think, a reasonable hope that by patient and judicious means a satisfactory compromise could be arrived at. Had some good-humoured young resident at one of the native courts, who spoke Persian well and knew native character and ways, been allowed a few months’ holiday and furnished with funds for presents—had he been allowed ample discretion as to time and method and agents—we cannot help thinking that before very long English common sense clothed, it might be, in the “soul-pleasing, ear-entrancing, confidence-producing” forms of Persian speech, and pointed with the homely wit which Persian genius loves, would have been heard with pleasure in the Bala Hissar. But Lord Lytton was oppressed by a sense of the greatness of his mission. The poor results of the policy which had till then been pursued produced in his mind a natural reaction. It was a case for resolute diplomacy. Lord Lytton knew that he was a diplomatist and felt that he was resolute. Therefore, he communicates to the Agent for further communication to the Amir his views on the situation. As a literary effort the memorandum of the interview may worthily take its place in the long series with which Lord Lytton has adorned the archives of the India Office; but the effect of his vigorous rhetoric on the honest gentleman who heard it must have been bewildering. The Amir was reminded of the impossibility of maintaining himself in a position of independence isolated from the protection, or “exposed”—an expression of sinister ambiguity—“to the mistrust” of the British Government. And isolated he would be if he did not prove the cordiality of his friendship by acceding to our demands. If we had reason to question the practical benefit of his alliance, our interests might lead us possibly to support his rivals at home or to league with his foreign foes. Our only interest was to provide for the security of our frontier. Why not do so by an understanding with Russia, which might have the effect of wiping Afghanistan out of the map altogether? “If the Amir does not desire to come to a speedy understanding with us, Russia does; and she desires it at his expense.” Then the Viceroy shows that we could anticipate Russia in occupying Cabul. Our military power could crush the Amir like a reed. And lest language such as this should not be suggestive enough, he adds that our relations with Afghanistan must become worse or better. It was his desire that they should become better. The difficulty of protecting him against Russia without having

Agents in his country is then temperately pointed out, and he is reminded—with reference to his objections—how much the deputation of such officers would, as a public declaration of support by the British Government, strengthen him at home. Then his position is sketched in words of humiliating truth. His imprisoned son had many partisans among the people—his people were discontented on account of the conscription—his treasury was empty. “This is the man who pretends to hold the balance between England and Russia, independent of either! His position is rather that of an earthen pipkin between two iron pots.” The letter given him by Lord Mayo is declared to be not in the nature of a treaty engagement, and was, no doubt, vague and general in its terms. While his wretched plight in case of refusal is thus depicted in insulting terms, he is reminded that he has an opportunity of concluding arrangements which will make him the strongest sovereign that has ever sat on the throne of Cabul. If he wishes to have like honours with the Shah of Persia he must follow that monarch’s example and allow Englishmen to travel to all parts of his country. Then follow the concessions and conditions proposed:—

CONCESSIONS.—(1). That the friends and enemies of either State should be those of the other. (2). That, in the event of unprovoked aggression upon Afghanistan from without, assistance shall be afforded in men, money, and arms; and also, to strengthen him against such aggression, the British Government is willing, if he wishes, to fortify Herat and other points on the frontier, and, if desired, will lend officers to discipline the army. But these would be matters entirely for the Amir’s consideration, the British Government having no desire to urge them. (3). That Abdullah Jan shall be recognised as the Amir’s successor. (4). That a yearly subsidy shall be afforded to the Amir.

CONDITIONS.—(1). That the Ameer refrain from external aggression, or provocation of his neighbours, and that he hold no external relations without our knowledge. (2). That he decline all communication with Russia, referring their Agents to us. (3). That British Agents reside at Herat and elsewhere on the frontier. (4). That a mixed Commission of British and Afghan officers shall determine and demarcate the Amir’s frontier. (5). That arrangements be made, by allowances or otherwise, for free circulation of trade on the principal trade routes. In the cost of these arrangements the Ameer will be assisted by the British Government. (6). That similar arrangements, with similar assistance, be made for a line of telegraph, the direction of which shall be subsequently determined. (7). That Afghanistan be freely open to Englishmen, official and non-official, and arrangements be made by the Amir, as far as practicable, for their safety, though, of course, His Highness will not be absolutely held responsible for

isolated accidents. (8). The Viceroy will forego the establishment of a permanent Envoy at Cabul on condition—1. That the Ameer depute an Envoy to the Viceroy's head-quarters. 2. That he receive special missions whenever requisite. The Viceroy further added that, if the Amir required it, he was prepared to undertake the safe custody of Mahomed Yakoob.

We need hardly say that, in our opinion, the powers we thus sought were absolutely necessary to enable us to maintain Afghanistan as an effectual barrier, and the responsibilities incurred were such as we could safely bear. We could not, we think, have safely asked for less or given more. But the tone in which our proposals were urged seems singularly ill-adapted to secure a favourable reception for them. Lord Lytton had probably heard that, in dealing with Orientals, firmness is necessary as well as suavity. But it is their conjoint employment succeeds. The iron hand should never want the velvet glove, and should, on the other hand, be perceptible even in the lightest touch. Lord Lytton has trusted too much to undiluted vinegar and undiluted honey. All the warnings he gave might have been given with the same force in inoffensive ways. He would seem, like the Amir, to have lost his temper—to care less about reclaiming him than proving he was in the wrong. "Intoxicated with the exuberance of his own verbosity," he demolishes his adversaries' position in a strain which, from a literary point of view, was highly effective, and was listened to, we doubt not, with the sincerest admiration and dismay by Sir L. Pelly, Colonel Brown, and Captain Grey.

The Amir held aloof because he doubted our good faith. Were his doubts likely to be removed when he learned that Lord Lytton practically repudiated Lord Mayo's pledge? He feared that we were in league with Russia; were his fears likely to disappear when he heard that Lord Lytton hinted at negotiations with Russia for the dismemberment of his kingdom? He thought we favoured his rivals; would he cease to think so now that Lord Lytton spoke plainly of supporting them? We can imagine what Lord Lytton would say in justification of his course. The remarks were general instructions to his own agent and were not necessarily intended to be communicated to the Amir. The *aide-mémoire* handed to the agent, and the subsequent instructions to Sir Lewis Pelly, are couched in the most moderate terms. But we find the Viceroy (Enclosure 20 in No. 36) telling the Agent that he had stated without reserve all he had in his mind, and that he had no doubt that the Agent would convey it faithfully to the Amir. Next, Lord Lytton would urge that the past attitude of the Amir—his unreasonable objections to the admission of English Agents—left

hardly any doubt that the Amir had made up his mind to abandon our alliance except we granted terms we could not grant; that, in this case, more was to be hoped from a rude shock, from appeals to his fears than from gentle arguments. As regards this, we have to say that the Amir's objections do not seem to us to be, from the Amir's point of view, unreasonable. We may give the most positive assurances—as Lord Lytton, for instance, proposed to do in the *air-de-mémoire*—that any officer interfering in internal affairs would be at once recalled. But he would still feel that, as time passed, the interference would be inevitable. The ways of Afghans are not as our ways, and our officers would have to report to their Government occurrences in Afghanistan as regards which the Government could not refrain from remonstrance. Lord Northbrook's interference on behalf of Yakub Khan was an instance of this. The very help we offered the Amir was conditional on his accepting our advice. This implied the privilege of remonstrance, and this, again, the privilege of hearing complaints. Every member of the Durbar felt that his own dismissal would possibly be demanded as a step to good government, and thus their selfish fears were aroused. From interference such as this the step to practical subjection is very short. We concede that a reasonable appeal to the Amir's fears might have induced him to brave the risk the admission of English officers involved. But a statement like Lord Lytton's did not appeal to his judgment but blinded it by wounding his pride. Lord Lytton assumes that men listen to the voice of interest. They do—when it is not silenced by the voice of passion. And in the Amir, more than in most men, passion ruled the intelligence. If giant A wants the help of a dwarf against giant B, and the dwarf fears both A and B—nay, if he even thinks it better to trust to B than A—A is hardly likely to secure his confidence by shouting to him that he does not want him but can eat him up at pleasure—or leave him to be eaten up by B. It is more likely that the result of such a wooing will be to drive the dwarf in mad terror to see what terms he can make with B. Lord Lytton seems to have lost his temper in contemplating the foolish pride of the Amir. He will not condescend to admit that he wants anything from the Amir. He makes “concessions” on “conditions.” This is one of those flimsy shams (like the mission against which Lord Northbrook protested) which discredit English diplomacy and nourish the suspicions of Orientals. The Amir would have had far more confidence in our good faith and in our firmness of purpose if we had satisfied him that the proposals were made because it was our interest to make them. No doubt in the bargaining we could get better terms if the Amir were made to feel that we had a fair alternative and he had not.

Nevertheless, in spite of the Viceroy's error of tone, we think it possible that self-interest would ultimately have led the Amir to come to terms—had the temper of his trusted adviser, Saiad Nur Muhamad, been less adverse to concession, and had not the rumours of war between England and Russia prejudiced the discussion. Whether the former would have been more favourable, and the latter have operated to our advantage, if the Viceroy's discourse had remained unspoken and unreported, we, to whom inspired insight is denied, cannot speak with the certainty of Liberal critics. The English agent returned to Cabul to invite the Amir to send an envoy to discuss matters with Sir Lewis Pelly—and also to invite him to attend in person the Imperial Assembly at Delhi. It was distinctly intimated that unless he was prepared to treat on the basis laid down—the residence of English agents on the frontier—the deputation of an envoy would be useless. The terms of the letter were cordial, but, we must repeat, that phraseology counts for little. The Amir looked for the feelings hidden behind the words, and found it in the Viceroy's private utterances.

For more than a month after the agent's return, the Amir, on various insufficient pretexts, declined to discuss business with him. An agent from General Kaufmann was then at the Amir's Court, and was believed to be in constant communication with him. "But of all that was passing at Cabul," says Lord Lytton, "we knew less than ever, for the reports of our own agent had become studiously infrequent, vague, and unintelligible." At length the Amir could no longer defer the show of decision.

The proposals of the Viceroy were a subject of long and anxious consideration in the Amir's Durbar. At first the feeling was adverse, but ultimately the solicitations of our agent prevailed, and the Amir decided, "from helplessness," to agree to admit them. But conditions were to be proposed, and Saiad Nur Muhamad and the Mir Akhor—a personage whose active hostility to England has now made his name well known—were to go to discuss them at Peshawar. The reasons urged in Durbar, as reported by our agent, seem consistent with entire friendliness of feeling towards us. But from what we have already said, it will be understood that the diaries are, at best, a very partial statement of Cabul affairs.

In January, 1877, Nur Muhamad, broken in health and spirits, for the third time reached India to confer with English officials. The fatigue of the journey, the anxiety and emotion which his faithful pleading of his master's cause involved, rendered acute a malady from which he had long suffered, and at last his troubled spirit was released. His bearing and his utterances during the conference were in keeping with its melancholy close.

“Matters,” he said to Dr. Bellow, the day after his arrival, “have now come to a crisis, and the situation is a most grave one. This is the last opportunity for settlement, and God only knows the future.” There is something to us most pathetic in this long devotion ending thus, in despairing protestations, broken by intervals of physical pain. The master who had such a servant cannot have been unloveable.

But while we thus recognise the fidelity of one whose fatal counsels marred our plans and ruined the fortunes of the prince he served—while we acknowledge that in his arguments and assertions there was much of natural feeling—it would be childish to believe that the views he expressed regarding the Amir’s relations to us were suggested by anything but diplomatic subtlety seeking means of evasion and delay. For several weeks his illness and his preliminary representations protracted negotiations, and then at last he declared that he was not authorised to admit the *sine quâ non* of the English conditions. He contended that the Amir had never sought concessions from the English. That the English, on the other hand, had sought for advantages from the Amir. How impudently false this assertion is our history of previous transactions shows. He then urged that the Amir was perfectly satisfied with the “friendship” which, in consequence of Lord Mayo’s assurances, existed between the two countries. As this word “friendship” occurring in Shir Ali’s letters is often referred to as an evidence of his disposition, it is important to note that from the course of his Envoy’s arguments, it appears clearly that the word was intended to mean only a relation under which he was to be perfectly independent of us—to be entitled to refuse at his pleasure our most reasonable requests—while we were bound to assist him when he called upon us to do so. The Envoy justifies the objection to the reception of British agents, not only on the general ground that their presence might lead to embarrassment, but by specific doubts as to the good faith of the English. While he denies that the Amir has any apprehension of Russian aggression, against which, forgetting the Amir’s remarks in 1873, or possibly wishing to turn against Englishmen their own diplomatic insincerities, he says, English engagements with Russia, as well as Russian assurances protect him—he cites instances in which the British Government has caused the Amir “anxiety.” The first is that in 1869 the Amir sent to the British Government an application made by certain Beluch chiefs practically acknowledging his supremacy, and that the British Government sent no answer. If this be a genuine grievance, it is very strange that no representation was made before. Probably our occupation of Quettah had suggested to the Amir the idea of making a claim to authority in Beluchistan.

The Russians seem to have taken advantage of his ambitious thoughts, for in General Kaufmann's recent address to the Afghan Envoy—disavowed of course by the Russian Government, but printed nevertheless in the Turkestan (official) Gazette—the Amir is spoken of as ruler of the Beluchis. The other grievances are the ones with which our readers are familiar—the threatening intervention in internal affairs regarding Yakub Khan—the direct presentation of gifts to the ruler of Wakhan, who was a tributary of Badakshan—Badakshan again being a tributary of Cabul—the unfriendliness shown in the Seistan award—the present demands, involving as they did a breach of Lord Mayo's assurances.

In reply (19th February, 1877), Sir Lewis Pelly referred to the instances in which the Amir had infringed the terms of the old treaty—*i.e.*, the refusal of temporary and special missions, the closing of Afghanistan against British subjects and their trade, and asked the Amir to reflect whether, having regard to Russian dealings with Khiva, Bukhara, Khokand, and the Turkoman border, his confidence was well-founded. At the Envoy's request his statements were submitted to the Viceroy, and on the 15th March Sir L. Pelly sent a long letter in reply, which we have little hesitation in ascribing to the fluent pen of the literary Viceroy. It shows that by the treaty of 1855, or the agreement of 1857, the British Government incurred no obligations with reference to the Amir, and that the fulfilment of the assurances given by Lord Mayo were dependent on the fulfilment of the conditions on which they were made. The Amir had not created a firm and merciful administration; he had not promoted the interests of commerce; he had not maintained frank, cordial, and confidential relations with the British Government. As it appeared from what had passed that the Amir no longer desired the alliance and protection of the British Government, the offers made by Lord Lytton were withdrawn. But it was clearly explained that in withdrawing them the British Government harboured no hostile designs. It sincerely desired the permanent independence, prosperity, and peace of the people of Afghanistan. So long as they were not excited by their ruler or others to acts of aggression upon the territories or friends of the British Government, no British soldier would enter Afghanistan uninvited. As regards the Amir, the Government repudiated all liabilities on his behalf. It would respect his independence and authority, and would abstain from all interference, so long as he on his part abstained from interference with tribes or territories not his own—*i.e.*, while he remained faithful to the treaty stipulations which his envoy had invoked.

On the 2th March the Envoy died, without having expressly

accepted or rejected the basis of negotiations. On the 30th the Viceroy telegraphs:—

“Close Conference immediately, on ground that basis on which we agreed to negotiate has not been acknowledged by Amir; that, Mir Akhor not being authorized to negotiate on that basis, nor you on any other, Conference is terminated *ipso facto*; and that you will leave Peshawar on a stated day. Let your language to Mir Akhor be most friendly. If, in the meanwhile, new envoys or messengers arrive to continue negotiation you will tell them that your powers are terminated. On closing Conference write to Amir friendly letter notifying the fact.”

At this time a fresh Envoy was on his way to Peshawar, authorised, it was reported, to accept eventually all the conditions of the British Government.

We have already expressed our regret that the Amir was approached in ways so ill-adapted to the Oriental temperament. We regret that argument as to the reasonableness of the conditions was not permitted, and that his adherence to terms the necessity of which the influences by which he had so long been surrounded had possibly prevented him from seeing, and the nature of which he seems—perversely it may be—to have misunderstood, was made a peremptory condition of further countenance and aid. Wise after the event, we regret that negotiations were not continued when the Amir, as the Viceroy himself declares, found that the ground on which he had hoped to stand firm after rejecting the English proposals was slipping away beneath his feet. And we regret still more that in declaring to him that we could no longer be responsible for his defence, we emphasised our desertion—not in words, but in practical suggestiveness—into a declaration of hostile expectancy. But having regard to the circumstances of the time, we see that much is to be said in apology for, and even in vindication of, the course pursued by Lord Lytton. Before the Conference the Amir's attitude was ambiguous and cold; while it was still proceeding it became openly inimical. It was known that

“the Amir was straining every effort to increase his military force; that he was massing troops on various points of his British frontier; that he was publicly exhorting all his subjects and neighbours to make immediate preparation for a religious war, apparently directed against his English, rather than his Russian neighbours; both of whom he denounced, however, as the traditional enemies of Islam; that, on behalf of this jihad, he was urgently soliciting the authoritative support of the Akhoond of Swat, and the armed co-operation of the chiefs of Dhir, Bajour, and other neighbouring Khanates; that, in violation of his engagements with the British Government, he was, by means of bribes, promises, and menaces, endeavouring to bring those chiefs and

territories under personal allegiance to himself; that he was tampering with the tribes immediately on our frontier, and inciting them to acts of hostility against us; and that, for the prosecution of these objects, he was in correspondence with Mahomedan border chiefs openly subsidised by ourselves."

If all this were so—and readers of this *REVIEW* will not hear now for the first time that it was so—we had to treat him, not as a lukewarm friend, but as a declared foe. The preparations for war may be interpreted as defensive precautions, but the intrigues with the Akhoond of Swat and the border tribes could only be regarded as an attempt to frustrate the scheme of frontier pacification which the Government of India had then at heart. We know from the declarations of the defeated Afridis that the Amir instigated them to their revolt. We have seen that before Nur Muhamad was despatched the Amir had decided to accept our conditions. But, during his absence (as the Saiad admitted), he had fallen under "mischievous influences," which he (Nur Muhamad) deplored. That Nur Muhamad could, had he so willed it, have brought matters to a satisfactory issue, we have little doubt, but the violent disdain with which (as he complained regarding 1873) his objections were met had the natural effect of confirming them.

Again, at the time that the Amir was seeking to prolong negotiations it was known that he had despatched a confidential agent to Tashkent. Honour and policy seemed alike to dissuade us from allowing him thus to spin out negotiations while he was discovering which Power would offer him the best terms. Lord Lytton no doubt failed, like his predecessors, to see that "if we could not satisfy the Amir, Russia could and would do so at our expense." (We venture to paraphrase an expression of Lord Lytton's on which we have already commented.) He trusted that the Amir, terrified at finding himself isolated, would come back, humble and penitent, to the strong friend to whom he had been so distrustful and ungrateful.

Thus, after years of patient effort and liberal outlay, the Amir was finally estranged from us—and all the hopes we had built upon the stability of his power had to be abandoned. Henceforth our policy was to take precautions for the safety of our frontier, without reference to the Amir's interests. The mastery of Afghanistan was still a matter of vital importance. We were prepared, if either his weakness or his policy surrendered it to any Power that could use it to our hurt, to interfere to save ourselves from the danger which would thus threaten. Such an occasion soon came. But we were willing still to receive the Amir's friendship, if by his acts he was prepared to make it cordial and effectual.

The history we have sketched affords the chief actors ample material for recrimination on each other. Had the terms offered to the Amir in 1877 been offered in 1873 he would probably have accepted them. It is useless to assert that the admission of agents would not have affected his status. The case of Persia is not parallel, for our influence is not exclusive in Persia, and we have not the responsibilities in regard to that country that we proposed to assume in regard to Afghanistan. But we think he would have preferred the lessened dignity to the absolute extinction he then feared. In 1877 it is possible he might have been won to our side had gentler methods been used. But much had happened since 1873. The Amir had brooded over his wrongs, and detected, as he thought, our weakness. In September, 1876, General Kaufmann sent his famous letter detailing the measures against Khokand. In October, 1876, there is a Russian Envoy at the Amir's Court said to be more efficient than the preceding one. From May, 1876, to May, 1877, Russian messages had been incessant. The Russian Government denies any intrigues. General Kaufmann, good simple man as he is, explains that he has sent only complimentary letters and no envoys. Messengers from Bukhara have been wrongly regarded as his agents. Lovers of peace and goodwill are charmed, and Bukhara merchants who have had chance-talk with the Governor of Tashkent still amuse the leisure of the Amir with stories of Russian power and goodness. Who knows what tales they may have told at Tashkent on their return? They did not, of course, see General Kaufmann, for we have his word that he employs no agents. But if he did, we can easily understand how great an advantage he would have as the servant of a despot in dealing with a despot, and we can see, too, how much more trust the Amir would repose in the engagements of men like Llamakin or Abramoff or Kaufmann, whose names are household words in Central Asiatic politics, than in the refined dissertations of a perpetually changing series of English Viceroy.

Certain assertions that have been made may, we think, be confidently denied:—1. The Blue Book affords no evidence that the occupation of Quetta alarmed the Amir, or that he feared English aggression. 2. It was not the show of distrust that urged Russia onwards. It was the weakness of policy which a pretence at trust imposed on us that tempted her onwards. 3. The policy of the Government was not aggressive nor over-subtle. It was rather blunt and peremptory. The deceptions practised by Ministers were practised, not on the Amir, but on the public of India and of England. Reticence may be justified in the interests of peace and sound policy, but statements which produce an impression, as regards facts, precisely opposite to

what a true statement of facts would produce, can be characterised in only one way.

These are but negative conclusions. Shall we alone of all who have written or spoken refrain from laying our finger on the fault that has wrought us all our ill?

In a tangled skein which of the threads is out of place?

ART. VI.—NICCOLÒ MACHIAVELLI AND HIS TIMES.

1. *Niccolò Machiavelli and his Times.* By Prof. PASQUALE VILLARI, Author of "Life of Savonarola." Translated by LINDA VILLARI. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1878.
2. *The Civilisation of the Period of the Renaissance in Italy.* By JACOB BURCKHARDT. Authorised Translation, by S. G. C. MIDDLEMORE. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1878.

NO man ever earned for himself by means of the pen a more sinister reputation than Niccolò Machiavelli. It requires a good deal of villainy to secure a man an immortality of obloquy, but that Machiavelli achieved. His name has passed into many languages as a term of reproach. It has been said that we ourselves have derived a familiar name for the devil from his Christian name, and an epithet for a false and faithless schemer from his surname. No man ever did so much for the vocabulary of abuse. But all this was done by the little Florentine with the "gentle disposition," by means of his pen. His works have produced profound sensations in high quarters. They have been condemned by a pope, interdicted by a council of the Church, and refuted by a king. They have come under the gifted hands of great critics and the foul fingers of the common hangman. Never did a few reams of paper, and a few volumes of lucid prose, make such a stir in the over-righteous world. Never were such heaps of abuse piled upon the memory of a mere writer as those which have monumented the infamy of this useful servant of the republic of Florence, who wrote "The Prince."

But venom is apt to overshoot the mark. It has often happened that the Church in its attempts to anathematise has sanctified. Its persecutions mark better saints than its calendar, and in this case the bad name which was given to the long dead secretary of the Ten of Florence, excited inklings of pity which were the beginnings of justice. Burns, in his large-hearted sympathy with

nature, has shown that he can feel for the "silly sheep" and "ourie cattle" which are exposed to the grim war of a winter's night, but has also an obscure sympathy with and a hope for the regeneration of the author of evil himself, "Auld Nicky Ben." So some impartial persons had an idea that the world, when it sets itself to praise or blame, only knows one measure, and that is "too much;" and hence came to the conclusion that possibly even Machiavelli was not really such a terrible person as he was painted, not nearly so diabolical as he had himself induced the world to believe him. There was a sympathy with the man who after centuries, which usually have the mercy of oblivion for the worst men's memories, was still remembered and mentioned as a household word of shame and censure; and this led to some more searching and intelligent criticism than had hitherto been devoted to what was thought so unworthy a subject. One thing at once became clear, and that was that Machiavelli had earned his infamy at the hands of posterity rather than at those of his contemporaries. It appeared that in early life he had been little known; but the first definite information we have of him shows that he had been carefully educated, and that while still a youth he commanded the respect of those who were brought into close contact with his keen intelligence. We know too that at a somewhat early age he entered into the employment of Florence, and held with increasing reputation the office of Secretary to the Ten for fifteen years. During these strangely deformed years, which were made bright by the new risen sun of culture and art, which might have been happy in the possession of far-reaching commerce, but which were blackened by the infamous crimes of the Borgias, and torn by the dissensions of the rival States of Italy which invited the trampling feet of foreign hosts, he was employed upon various missions of importance. He went to Caterina Sforza at Forlì, in 1499; to Louis XII., in France, in 1500; to Valentinois, in Romagna, in 1502; to Rome, in 1503; to France again in 1504, and to Piombino in the same year; to Perugia, in 1505; and to Rome, to Pope Julius II., in 1506. And it further appeared from trustworthy sources, which yielded to more careful research and more candid criticism, that he had discharged most of his duties with consummate ability, and had earned golden opinions. Even his errors did not seem to bring him discredit. He embarked with the Gonfalonier Soderinio in the foolish enterprise of turning the course of the Arno away from Pisa; he it was who advocated the appointment of the strangler and assassin, Don Michelotto, as the captain of the new-formed militia; but in spite of those mistakes he seems to have been much respected.

It is evident, even to a prejudiced eye, that he possessed

many qualities which would make him a useful public servant. He was a man of diligence, although he may also have been a man of pleasure. He had not too much conscience, although it would be wrong to suppose that he was devoid of moral sense. He was gifted with clear intelligence, powers of accurate observation, and wrote a pellucid and vigorous style. His nature was not a commanding one, which is often one which is itself commanded by some overmastering passion or despotic idea. His was rather a mind which was open to receive truth than bound to disseminate it. He was ready to be influenced by others rather than to be a power over them. There could be no more complete contrast between two men than that between Savonarola and Machiavelli. The one was a man of the pulpit, the other of the pen. The one influenced the age by his character and eloquence, the other, while he seems to have gained respect by his graphic despatches and his other works, seems to have exercised little influence upon his age, so little that no one thought it worth his while to write his life or to place a monument over his remains. The one was a great spiritual influence, protesting against the tendencies of his times, mercilessly lashing the crimes which were perpetrated even on the papal throne; the other was in the current of the progress which the age was making, and shared in the refinements, the tastes, the learning, and the vices which were in vogue. The one was a genuine survival of Mediævalism, the other was a genuine product of the Renaissance. The one was an enthusiast whose enthusiasm carried him sometimes to the verge of imposture, sometimes to the debatable ground between sanity and insanity; the other had no enthusiasm, and was veritably one of the sanest men of his time. The one aimed at ruling a spiritual kingdom, the other aimed at creating a science for the government of an earthly one. The one hoped for an immortality beyond the grave, the other for an immortality on this side of it. There could not be a more complete antithesis than these two characters. There was no sympathy possible between them; and Machiavelli, who called Savonarola the "weaponless prophet"—supposing, doubtless, that a Mahomet with a conquering sword was more of a prophet than the Dominican of San Marco—seems to have been incapable of feeling Savonarola's influence, and thought he was answered with a sneer.

We find, then, that there is in this connexion a very curious circumstance, which demands some explanation. We find that Machiavelli, while he was not illustrious amongst his contemporaries, was respected and trusted by them, and that he has only been contemned by posterity, that his cross-grained performances in literature caused no very particular sensation in his own days,

and in his own country; but that they have been loathed and abhorred by succeeding generations and distant nations. Another thing is certain, and that is, that Machiavelli is not the man to be dismissed from notice with a puff of scorn, as some critics have supposed. He has not been relegated to obscurity by the papal interdict. The refutation which Frederick the Great gave to the world, as antidote to that bane, "The Prince," when he was about to wield a sceptre instead of a pen, got little credit for its author, and added nothing to the discredit of its subject. Even now Machiavelli attracts the interest and curiosity of many, and well deserves the careful and useful study even of our own days.

In this aspect, then, Professor Villari's book, which we have before us, in its very clear and forcible English shape, is a welcome contribution to our knowledge. True, so far as Machiavelli is concerned, the present work is very incomplete. It only deals with his career until the time when he ceased to be the Secretary of the Ten, and although it was during these years that he contributed so many graphic despatches, not only to the pigeon-holes of a bureau at Florence, but to the political history of the world, our interest in Machiavelli as a literary man begins when that period comes to an end. While he was prosperous he was the useful official, with more talent for accurate observation and strong and pithy expression than most of his contemporaries. But even that praise is not to be applied without qualification. Many of his despatches are admirable. Those which were written during his mission to Cæsar Borgia, in 1502, have scarcely been equalled in any portfolio. They are dramatic as well as accurate—more dramatic than the pseudo-despatch which he afterwards wrote under the name of "Discrezione." But these were the days of wonderful despatches, and the ambassadors of such States as Florence and Venice were not only making history, but were writing it, at the same time, with most graphic pens. Still, as we said, our real interest in Machiavelli began when his official connexion with Florence for a time ceased. The shade is good for literary men, and it was when fortune turned her back upon Machiavelli that he began to write those enduring works, those heinous books, which have been such a puzzle to posterity, and which have earned for Machiavelli two reputations. For he is not only blamed as one of the worst men of a bad time, but is praised as one of the best and ablest which the prolific and redundant age of the Renaissance produced. It was in this time of obscurity that Machiavelli wrote "The Prince," which is in itself one of the prime curiosities of literature. How Machiavelli, who was a friend of liberty, should write a work with the view of teaching that principalities are to be governed and maintained

by mendacity and fraud, that morality is a consideration altogether apart from statecraft, and that the worst rule is justified by the success of its sway and excused by the treachery of the mob, is a question which has been asked ever since criticism came to be more than a pope's bull, or the interdict of a council. It is a question which will trouble candid people centuries hence. It is an urgent and important question, not because this book teaches these doctrines, for much literary rubbish has before now preached false trash, but because the book was written by a man of unquestionably clear sight, of admitted power and prudence, and a man who had not lost sight of the beauty of liberty or the excellence of virtue.

The main questions, then, which interest us in relation to this remarkable man and his perverse performances, are connected with the portion of his life which is not as yet written by Professor Villari. No doubt this most recent Biographer has given us some important documents which were not before in our possession. He has corrected some errors which had crept into the notes even to such a careful edition of Machiavelli's works as that of Passerini and Milanese, and especially as to the supposed volumes of Machiavelli's private letters which, it was said, had passed into the hands of the English collector, Mr. Phillips. All these matters of assistance must be acknowledged, but as yet we cannot say that Professor Villari has contributed much to our better knowledge of Machiavelli. The pages which concern themselves with his life are lucid and interesting, and every question is treated with calmness and judicial fairness. But when all is weighed, we question if the work, so far, has made any material difference in our understanding of Machiavelli. We have a more accurate knowledge of several events, but we have no better means of comprehending the course of the intricate threads which make up his somewhat twisted character. We know that we are expressing a hasty opinion, for only half the work has been performed; but Professor Villari has invited an opinion on his partial effort, otherwise he would have reserved this literary instalment until he could pay in full. This fragment is the more scanty because so little is known of the early life of Machiavelli. It may be convenient to say what little is to be said of his early life here.

He came of an old Tuscan family, and inherited little but a few barren rights. His father was a juriconsult, and filled at one time the office of treasurer in *Marca*. He married a woman with a scanty, if any, dower, and had four children. How these scrambled through childhood we know not. Although Niccolò, the second of the four, wrote so many volumes, he does not tell us anything about these times, and his pen always traced lines

remote from his own personal and private experiences. We cannot read anything of his own life between the lines of his novel or his comedy. His works are peculiarly reticent as to his private affairs. We know nothing from him of the death of his mother, which seems to have happened in October, 1496, shortly before Niccolò entered upon his public career. His pen was not for these private matters. It wrote the first chapters of a revived history which was to supersede the works of chroniclers: it praised the stupendous ability of rulers who had no scruples, no honour, no fears, and no pity. These were fit themes for his public pen; but such matters as the death of the mother who had given him birth, who had borne with his youth, and hoped and prayed for his manhood, that is too obscure a by-path to invite his pen. Even the wife whom he married shortly before his mission to Valentinois in Romagna, cannot secure his literary attention. He can write graphic despatches to the signoria, but cannot write home. It is true they have only just been married. It is true Machiavelli was unwilling to go upon the mission for which he timidly felt some incapacity, partly because of his new married joys. But although he was absent from Florence for a long time, and owing to his small pay and large ways contracted considerable debts during his absence, neither his thoughts nor his pen turn to his wife. He seldom, if ever, writes to Marietta, and the young wife, who had builded such hopes of happiness upon her clever husband, only hears indirectly of him. He has time to write his dramatic despatches—that, of course, was a primary duty; he has time to write bald letters to Buonacorsi and others in Florence; he has time to bother them by repeated requests for a copy of Plutarch's "Lives," which was not to be had in Florence, but was procured by his entreaties from Venice, and other matters which impose duties, and make his friends grumble a little, but he has no time to write to his wife; she has to hang about the Chancery and has to pester his colleagues for news of him. He has even time, it would seem, for other "not very edifying" affairs besides those nasty letters to Buonacorsi, but Villari passes these over with some "swiftness of narration," which is at least merciful to the private memory of Machiavelli.

But passing these traits—and even Villari has to acknowledge that "as a father, a husband, a son," if "we have found little to blame (*sic*), there has been equally little to admire"—we find him put forward as the spokesman of his family in 1497, when a letter was to be written as to right to the gift of the living of Santa Maria della Fagna in the Mugillo, and the letter was in Latin. That circumstance proves that his friends and relatives had confidence in him, and that he had been somewhat carefully

educated. Still, it seems certain that Machiavelli was not "learned," as the word was then used. He read much, and his memory was usefully retentive, as his books prove. But quotation was a trick of the times, which were a curious amalgam of old-world learning and new-birth intelligence. Machiavelli's quotations were confined to Latin, and he seems only to have read Greek authors in translations. On the whole, Varchi's description of him, that he was "rather not without letters than lettered," seems accurate. This Latin letter was his first public appearance upon any stage, and soon afterwards, in 1497, upon the death of Bartolomeneo Scala, the Secretary of the Republic, who was succeeded by Marcello Virgilio, and upon the dismissal of a secretary to the Signoria, Machiavelli was appointed by the votes of the Great Council. That is almost all we can learn of him until his public life began. Then he writes for a time his own biography in his letters and despatches.

The mere enumeration of a man's qualities seldom gives us an idea of the man. Psychological dissection gives one little real conception of character. So it comes about that many of our best describers of character have told us more of the impressions that the men they wish us to understand have made upon others, than of the actual qualities or sentiments of which they were supposed to be possessed, and from these reflected lights of emotion we gather more knowledge and attain a better insight into the disposition of the man than we could arrive at by any analysis of his mental faculties, or any enumeration of his deeds. We know more of a man after we have heard him abused or praised by some one who is familiar with him, than we should if we had his whole phrenological development quantitatively described. The genuine sympathy that Thackeray has with some men, lets us know more of their characters than we could obtain from hours of reading about their badness or goodness. There is not much of this indirect light of contemporary criticism to be thrown upon Machiavelli. We know what he looked like. He was small and slender. His eyes were always on the alert in his small head. His hair was dark, his lips thin and compressed, his nose aquiline. A dapper man, with a keen mind. That is our impression of him. He does not seem to have had many friends. He was not the kind of man to make friendships, and from mere acquaintances we learn nothing. A friend must be purblind, but Machiavelli was very seeing. He was friendly with Buonacorsi, and they exchanged many letters, some of which were paltry pieces of obscenity, and he seems to have gained that calm form of admiration we call respect from many, by reason of his admirable discharge of his public duties. His writings, too, were such as to command respect in those days of taste

and immorality, but few seem to have cared much for him, and he does not seem to have cared much for any. He respected Valentino when he was powerful, unscrupulous and successful—it mattered not that his ugly success had been attained by hideous crimes, by the worst arts and vices and perfidies that ever discredited human nature and blackened the page of history; but he saw through him when he had fallen, when, after the death of Alexander VI., he was in the power of Julius II., and was now as humble as he had been proud, as grovelling as he had once been soaring. No, Machiavelli had no capacity for loving, no command of others' love. He could command respect and win such praises as are the reward of successful officialism, nothing more. He was not able to "wield much influence over others," and as influence is a measure more of character than cleverness, and has more to do with conscience than with despatch-writing, we may form some conception of this man, whose books have been such a trouble to the world. So far for the story of his life as treated in these volumes. His present biographer felt the scantiness of these details. He knew that Machiavelli's life is written more upon his own papers than it can now be by any other body. No one at the time of his death, as we have said, thought that a life had passed away which was worth recording. No one seems to have thought him the remarkable man he really was. No one thought his grave worthy of a monument, until Earl Cowper, in 1787, thought his increasing memory deserved a stone. It is only when men are remembered by other things that we build a monument to their memory. When there is nothing to know the dead by but their tombs, do not these mock man's forgetfulness, and preach a homily on oblivion? It was, then, for that reason that Professor Villari thought to supply the place of details of Machiavelli's early life by a history of the times. Indeed these two volumes are far more a history of the times than a biography of Machiavelli. The whole, however, is exceedingly interesting and valuable. No doubt the history of Italy during the Renaissance is difficult to write. It is not so much one history as many histories. There was no real national life, but there were important municipal lives—cities with rulers as important as those which have held sway over great countries; with commerce and riches which covered the seas and the markets of the world; with an activity of intellectual life which looked almost like the delirium of fever after the coma of the Middle Ages. Each city was the manufactory of history, and a connected narrative of the history of the Renaissance is most difficult. All these have a look of miscellaneousness which confuses the unfamiliar reader. Even Burckhardt's

excellent book, although admirably full of wisdom, is devoid of that method which is indispensable to history. Professor Villari's method is not altogether good. He first gives short histories of the towns of Italy. He then deals with the great men whose names are associated with these. He subsequently deals generally with the revival of learning; and concludes the introduction with a chapter on the political condition of Italy at the end of the fifteenth century. In this way the reader is conscious that he is often going over the same ground twice, an impression which is strengthened by the fact that in half a dozen instances Professor Villari repeats observations which he has made earlier in the volume. Still, the same thing may be said with even greater force of the hither-and-thither method of Burckhardt, and, as we have said, the history of these times by Professor Villari is exceedingly interesting and admirable. We do not forget that he has had the advantage of reading Burckhardt's books, but even making allowance for that circumstance, we think this work worthy of careful reading, and are certain that it will command sincere admiration.

We cannot doubt that some such introduction as that which is here given us by Professor Villari was required. This puzzle in relation to Machiavelli's writings to which we have referred, had been variously solved. Some have said that "The Prince," with all its terrible lessons in immorality, was not a serious work. It was a haggard joke, that was all! Ugly, but funny. It was said that Machiavelli was so true a republican, so great a lover of liberty, that he desired to bring absolutism into contempt, and that therefore he wrote this book. But that ingenious theory is worthless. The book is written with a purpose quite other than laughter. He had no desire to bring absolute power into contempt by his advocacy of breaches of faith, and his adulation of force and fraud. What he did admire was a directness of purpose which was balked by no scruples, which was marred by no foolish fancies or squeamishness, but which with force and firmness achieved its ends. It was these qualities that he admired in Cæsar Borgia; it was to these means that he looked for the rule of a State, after he had found, from bitter experience, that such a free government as that which failed at Florence, before the return of the Medici, could not govern a State, and preserve its independence amidst the States of Italy. He had seen Soderini fail, he saw Lorenzo to some extent succeed. To him the existence of the State seemed threatened, not so much from without as from within; and the remedy was to secure the firmness, the persistence, the directness in thought and action, which was possible to a prince, but which he despaired of from a republic. Even then his ideal great man was only a confused and incom-

plete conception, for he did not conceive a man capable of great ends, but a man capable of firm and expeditious means. It was the man of action he admired, not the man whose actions were instant and whose aims were high. He only understood a splendid human instrument, not a great human being. In this aspect it is that we find the meaning of his "Prince" and "Discourses on Livy." In this aspect we see that he was, as Burckhardt says, "A patriot in the fullest meaning of the word." It matters not that the Florentines treated him as a criminal. They mistook him, as nations are apt to do their great men, throughout. They misunderstood his patriotism, they did not see his want of a moral principle. That which was worthy of censure they overlooked, that which was above praise they punished.

But those who supposed these serious writings ridicule erred egregiously. The whole tone negatives such a supposition. There is not an indication throughout that he is in other than serious, often in bitter, earnest. Besides, in his earlier writings, as Villari points out, we find indications of the doctrines which he elaborated in those more mature productions. The satire must have been the work of a lifetime if the theory, to which we have alluded, be correct. There is a more probable theory, and that is, that "The Prince" was written when Machiavelli was in disgrace, to secure the favour of the Medici. His letter to Vettori, which was discovered in 1810, is in favour of this view. But even then we do not say that it was a base attempt to gain favour. He did not pretend to opinions in order to flatter Lorenzo; he did not advocate views of which he was not convinced. As we have seen, at one time he had an exaggerated admiration for the murderous and brutal success of Cæsar Borgia. He was with him at the instant of his greatest triumph, and he formed too exalted a notion of this man's ability. He then formulated in his own mind the principles of government. He was only familiar with small States, where the good of the individuals is indissolubly connected with the good of the State. His very knowledge of the history of Greece and Rome taught him the same lesson, that the happiness of the citizens was only to be attained through the prosperity of the city. In his own day that prosperity was to be attained, it seemed to him, through the organising influence of a single will. The State could not be preserved from its external enemies; it could not be cured of its own diseases except by strong measures, and these were only to be wielded by a strong man. He had no conception of a national conscience which could organise a nation, as the forces of nature organise a crystal—he only understood the running of human nature into a mould which would give the State definite and useful shape. He turned his eyes to the past, as all men were

at that time doing. The faces of all were averted from the present. They pushed on to the future with restless activity, but they kept their eyes fixed on Greece and Rome. It is a fact in physiological observation that if a man walks onward while he fixes his eye upon some point behind him, he will find it impossible to walk straight, but will diverge from the path obliquely. It is the same, it seems to us, in national progress. And the Renaissance, which sought its inspiration from the old times of Paganism, with a view to escape from the trammels and superstitions of Mediævalism, and pushed forward into the new times which were opening to humanity, went laterally astray in a very remarkable way. It was because Machiavelli kept his eyes fixed on Rome that he advocated his admirable reform—the creation of a national militia—and it was for the same reason that he saw no medicines for the diseases of the State, but those which had been administered by powerful and ambitious rulers in the old time. Machiavelli understood the State as he saw it, but not as it now exists. The good of that State was the supreme good which he thought ought to be the end and aim of politics; and he did not see that the good of the citizen may be distinguished from, may be antagonistic to, the good of the State. The good of the latter too frequently goes into kings' coffers. It is rulers which win and wear the spoils won by war. It is the people who are enriched by the triumphs of peace. But, as we have pointed out in Machiavelli's time, it was difficult to distinguish these two results. Where the State is small these distinctions are not easy. In Florence these two possible ends of politics could not at that time be in fact separated. The benefit of the Florentines was to be obtained by Florentine arms. The good of the whole was to be obtained by conquests, and the arms were ill-wielded and blunt in the hands of the republic. Machiavelli saw these evils, and thought that the remedy was to be found in kingly rule. He aimed at the greatness of Florence, and to attain that end he would have rased Arezzo to the ground. It was in the same interest that he developed his idea of a militia, and despaired of hiring troops. It is difficult to conceive how, at that time, he could have attained to truer notions of politics; how he could have come to the conclusion that a larger unity than he desired would be better for Italy. The times were inimical to the organisation of a united Italy. The petty tyrants had created petty States, the petty States made petty wars, and these wars were the opportunity of the foreign power, which, as Machiavelli himself said, "was the death of freedom." It was these circumstances, then, which, when the republic had passed away, made him despair of freedom, and look to a prince like Cæsar Borgia, who, by his genius, could organise a State, by his arms could keep it safely.

That the king who was to rule was without moral nature ; that his word was no bond ; that he had no scruples and stopped at no crime, no cruelty in the attainment of his purpose, were matters beside the question. In these times we have our prisons and our hangmen. Then the times were so bad that their needs could only be saved by such violent remedies as fraud, injustice, fear, and the like. He did not know that State nosology is a progressive science, and that the medicines which had cured Rome might kill Florence. It was these considerations that made him believe in the theories he advocated in "the Prince." He honestly thought that virtue was a good thing, that morality was not to be despised, but that they had nothing to do with the science of government. He served a republic, but he felt that a republic could not in those days secure liberty in the same way that a monarch could. He was in favour of the step which was taken when the office of Gonfaloniero was given to Soderini for life. In his army reforms he saw that a leader was a necessity, and he cared not how detestable the man who led might be, how unworthy of respect, how worthy of loathing. What he required was a man who could make himself feared and obeyed—a man whose hand would not be turned from complete conquest, even the conquest of extirpation, by any feelings or sentiments, by any conscience or by any scruples, and when an opportunity occurred for putting these theories in practice he did not shrink from the act. It was through him that Don Michelotto was chosen captain of the Florentine Militia—that Don Michelotto who had been the vile instrument of Valentino's worst crimes, who had been chief strangler and assassin to a murderous duke. We think these circumstances are sufficient to explain the meaning of that literary curiosity, "the Prince." There is another excuse often made for Machiavelli, and that is, that the "times" were bad. No doubt the times were out of joint, and it is not strange if we have few complete and shapely characters emerging from them. They were full of contradictions, and a harmonious nature was scarcely to be expected as a product of such an age. But although this theory might explain Machiavelli's character, it would not explain his works. The times are much to a man. If they are not his guide they are his antagonist, and our enemies make us as much as our preceptor. But we must not suppose that when we have studied the age that we know all the men in it. At one time history was thought to be merely an aggregate of biographies. That was a grave error, for there is a national life quite apart from individual careers. But it would be as grave an error to suppose that if you have sketched the national life you have secured features which are applicable to individual characters. Savonarola was, as we

have seen, in strange contrast to the life of the times, while Machiavelli was a real child of the Renaissance. It therefore becomes important, as Professor Villari saw, to study with some minuteness the circumstances of the times in which Machiavelli lived, and his history of these is, as we have said, in many respects admirable. In this connexion, in dealing with the phenomena of the Renaissance, we have recourse not only to Professor Villari's work but to Burckhardt's most valuable treatise, which has been, on the whole, carefully translated by Mr. Middlemore.

What, then, are we to say of that curious age? If Machiavelli's life is a puzzle the Renaissance is a greater one. In some ways it commands our admiration in a way which few other epochs do, and at the same time it cannot be studied without feelings of contempt and loathing. It produced no such man as Dante, who closed the doors of the Middle Ages; no such man as Luther, who opened the gates of the new times. Yet it was rife with greatness. It set innumerable examples, if its own achievements were comparatively inconsiderable. In literature, Guicciardini and Machiavelli set examples how to write political history. In architecture, Brunelleschi, who combined the products of Pagan and Christian times, created an architecture which was poor in comparison with the works in stone of the Middle Ages, but was great in that it was new, and set an example of original conception, and free treatment of existing designs. Donatello set an example of what sculpture ought to be, and that revival was carried to a magnificent development under the hand of Michael-Angelo. Painting, too, had a new birth, and returned from the cloister to the market-place, from an artistic heaven to a rich and beautiful earth, and examples were set which prepared the way for the achievements of Raphael. But although the Renaissance set these examples which led to such great results, its own accomplishments were somewhat inconsiderable. It was rather an age of revolution than an age of construction. Its duty was to pull down high ideals in order that the world might in time secure higher. Image breaking is necessary, but it is seldom accomplished by an age or an individual capable of replacing the images, when these at which their indignation was levelled have been reduced to disillusioning fragments. An age gets great credit because it ploughs up the world or sows good seed, but it only deserves half the credit if it only ploughs and sows, for the harvest has to be gathered. The Renaissance was the farmer of the spring of modern history, but it never saw the fruition of its hopes. The credit it deserves is that which we give to him who breaks the painted church-windows which stain the light and blanch the soul. No doubt the golden rays of the

sun come in, but the winds and rains beat in too, and the work is not completed until the weather is kept out, while the light, unspotted by the gew-gaw garments of saints, comes in freely. This was the work of the Renaissance. When the world was ready to free itself from the superstitions of the Middle Ages, it looked to something which had been before the Middle Ages were, for salvation. The Middle Ages were to blame, not because they were a part of the great past, but because they were dominated by superstition and religion. There was an inevitable reaction against the unnatural developments of that ascetic time, but in the reaction men were not prepared to trust to their own originality, to walk alone; they had recourse to the past for guidance, but it was the Pagan not the Christian past. They wanted light and they sought it in times when the sky was above men, instead of times when they abridged space by the cloister. These times, from whose clammy darkness men were escaping, had emphasised the soul in man, and had condemned and bruised the nature which was not a less real part of humanity. It was this fatal error which the world had discovered, and in its reaction it fell into the opposite extreme, into an error equally flagrant. Nature was now everything, the soul nothing. It was this sentiment that made the age akin to the antique world. It was because in those early days Nature was understood, its beauty and excellence were perceived and loved as it had never been since. The Renaissance felt itself a Sister of Greece. But there was a fundamental error in this conception of life. Life cannot be a simple worship of Nature, except in its earliest awakening, and it is not much use if later generations play at being children again. We cannot bring back the past, and it is ridiculous for the old to assume the dress of the young, and think they are regenerated. That was what the Renaissance did! The antiquity in which there had been a genuine love for Nature, when art was so exquisite that it seemed to partake of the placid spirit of Nature herself, when literature had been full of the undivided fervour of youth, that past could not be recalled. Hence there was an affectation of antiquity, and that we call the Renaissance. The love for antiquity was shown by a madness. Men became misers of codices, became curators of their own museum-like collections of relics. Writings and speeches were nothing but quotations, and when men ceased to quote they began to drivel. A man to succeed must imitate the ancients, for antiquity was a passion and a fashion. No one was exempt from this mental itch. Even cut-throats and assassins who earned their base livelihood by war and sedition, professed an admiration for literature. The camps of the Condottieri, the courts of Bravo princes, entertained the learned and the literary. Even popes had more secretaries

and abbreviators than "nephews," and even republics like Florence chose men of letters for their servants. These men liked to hear Livy and Cicero read to them, liked to be called Hannibals and what not, in poetry. These men, who made war for money and cut throats for pay, these men, who sold their swords to the highest bidder, and often would prove false to those that paid them, for bribes, favoured the eruditi and literati, and kings would subsidise a hireling pen like that of Filelfo to secure the paltry fame which it could bestow, or to avoid the trivial libel which, when unpaid, it could write. Not only were poets crowned, but poets could crown. To be the subject of verse seemed to the men of that age to be the heirs to immortality. Having lost all hopes of the other, this was something in its stead, as the mere action of the jaws will stave off the pangs of hunger. It was partly upon this account that poets, artists, and the like were petted. Men thirsted for an immortality, if not for good deeds then for bad, as Machiavelli has it. This was all an affectation, associated with a genuine reverence for antiquity. And it was this reverence which gave promise for the future. But when men placed so much store by codices and manuscripts, when a man like Poggio was praised as much for the works of antiquity which he had brought to light as for his own somewhat echo-like performances, it showed almost a superstitious reverence for the medicine which was to cure the disease. No doubt there was a passage by the pagan past by which the world might achieve a reformation altogether independent of religious tenets; but their adulation of the past was almost childish. They were content with the speeches of their orators if they smacked of the old world, and were more indicative of a retentive memory than of original genius. The oration of Manetti upon the death of Bruni is a fair specimen of the stilted erudition which took the place of better speech in those days, and it would be difficult to find a specimen of real eloquence in all the writings of the times, if we except one or two from the pen of Eneas Silvius. Words, and not ideas, were what they desired, and the age showed an altogether exaggerated respect for language. Despatches were written with a literary care which makes them works of art now, as well as documents of business at the time. The predominance of words is shown by a few instances. Thus, Lorenzo di Medici by force of argument persuaded Fernante d'Aragona to put an end to the war between them, and cajoled him into an alliance. Alfonso the Magnanimous had skill of words to persuade Filippo Maria Visconti, a gloomy and cruel tyrant, to liberate him; and the Florentine Podestà, with fine reasoning, persuaded Bernardo Nardi, who had stirred up a revolution at Prato, to spare his life, although

the matter had gone so far that the halter was about his neck, according to Machiavelli. "To a man of learning," says Villari, "words were of greater value than facts." Manetti, by means of a Latin letter to the Condottiere Piccinini, induced him to give up eight horses which had been stolen by some of his soldiers, and Galeazzo Maria Visconti declared himself more afraid of one of Salutati's letters than of one thousand Florentine knights. But with all this artificial reverence for literature, it is not to be denied that the times were full of literary activity. Petrarch was the first of the learned men. Boccaccio almost belongs to this age in time, and entirely in sympathy. But, besides these, we find such names as Leonardo Bruni, Poggio Bracciolini, and Manetti associated with Florence, Valla, Biondo, and Enea Silvio with Rome, Felelfo with Milan. But, besides these, this age can boast the possession of such men as Ficino, Alberti, Poliziano, Lorenzo di Medici, Pontanus, Pulci, and Boiardo. These men were not without their great significance in a revival of literature. It is true that much that some of these men produced is worthless; much might easily have been much more worthy. Some of their invectives are unreadable, and seem to us to have neither wit nor wisdom, and to have but ill supplied the place of these by scurvy jests and scurrilous abuse. Some of the poetry is lacking in anything like high purpose or genuine inspiration, and the philosophy is but a weak revival of that of Porphyry and Plotinus. And beyond all, we find that these men, like most of the men of their time, were wholly without moral principle. "Most of the eruditi were of no moral character," says Villari. Indeed, just as Machiavelli thought that government should be dissociated from morality, so the poets argued that conscience was a thing altogether apart from poetry. Their high calling was not understood. Their grave responsibilities sat lightly on their laughing shoulders. Their lives were gutter lives. They had rid themselves of religion. They hated priests, and they lived in a fine, free immorality, because they had not learned the higher rule of life which ought to regulate conduct, instead of religion, because they had found no confessor and guide within their own natures. But they were not only corrupt in life and morals, but, as Burckhardt has shown, they were corrupt in their intellectual being. They had got rid of some superstitions, to fall the victims of others. In deposing religion they had made room for the silliest beliefs. Even the great men were not exempt. Cristoforo Landino, Battista Mantovano drew horoscopes of religion; Lodovico il Moro never took any step in life without consulting an astrologer; Guicciardini and Machiavelli believed

in spirits of the air, and so on.* One could chronicle many such superstitions if one desired to indict the age. This, then, is a rough-drawn likeness of Italy in these new times, and it is scarcely a matter for wonder that even with these great men, even with their new freedom and their great models, the productions which have been added to the small select library of the world have been of little real value. The intellectual activity was great, and was to be marked in revivals in every department of thought, in every sphere of life; but at the same time that this new splendour of Italy attracted the attention and admiration of the world, it was falling into hideous corruption. Knowledge was increased and loved, culture and refinement were cherished and sought after, and yet there was an immorality, a licence, a superstition, and a cowardice which would make even a greater age contemptible and loathsome in the sight of modern nations. We do not say that all men were bad in that age of respected reprobates. There were some men of culture and ability to set noble examples of probity and virtue. Some few men deserve to be distinguished for their nobility of mind, and amongst these Manetti, Biondo, Vetterino, and Boiardo. Besides these men, who were illustrious as well as noble-minded, who had character as well as talents, there may have been many among the simple who were good men and true. Obscurity is the common cover of infamy and excellence. It is sought by the former, it is endured by the latter. But on the whole, the age, although the mark for the admiration and imitation of many centuries, was hopelessly corrupt.

Hitherto we have concerned ourselves with a description of the men and the times. Men without virtue, times without true greatness. The old virtues had disappeared, the old standards of morality were lost; in cutting free from the trammels of the past the times had loosed their moorings and were drifting. In the middle ages liberty was not, obedience and its sister ignorance were the only rulers of men's minds and consciences. There was no individual thought, no free action. The State ruled men's lives, and the Church ruled men's minds and the State. But freedom was growing even in these ages, as yet, in the Renaissance, individual liberty had not been secured, but the liberty which had been gained by crafts, associations (*arti*), in which the individual interests were lost sight of in the regard for those of the guild, was a step towards it. It has been said that the Renaissance was the age of associations—and we know how much of the history of Italy consists of the struggles of these major and minor "*arti*"—and it is in this fact that we see that the age was

* See, for other instances, Burckhardt, vol. ii. p. 300.

really preparing the way for a complete realisation of individual freedom. It was not until after the Renaissance had passed away, and that new birth of corruption out of the decay of the past—a new birth as of flies from carrion—had become a thing of the past, that we find real individual liberty recognised and achieved. Even a Machiavelli could not at that time understand such a thing. His ideas of democracy were quite old-world ideas. He could not understand the self-rule of the people, and he regarded Venice, the city in which the greatest amount of freedom was granted to the citizens, as the chief enemy of Italian liberty. And Guicciardini thought that a monarchy “which is more impartial to all” than a republic which only gave liberty to its own proper citizens, the best form of government. No doubt, however, the liberty obtained and the power wielded by these associations, were the means by which the power of the State was broken, and by which liberty, which had been the prerogative of the few, was made, in time, the possession of all. Here, as in everything else, we find a state of transition. The morality of the Middle Ages had been a morality of discipline, and partly of superstitions, but it served to draw the family ties closer, it had the effect of making the family a sacred institution. Both law and that presentiment of law, custom, were guardians of the hearth. In some instances marriage into another commune was not allowed, and marriages between family enemies were strictly forbidden. In this way the affections were kept warm and tenacious, the spirit of self-sacrifice was real and heroic. But all this passed away with this new birth. Individual liberty was coming, and men could not distinguish it from individual licence. Just as a youth who is emancipated from strict home rules is apt to use his new come-by freedom recklessly and ill, so is a nation; and the emancipation from the obedience of the middle ages led the Renaissance into abuses, immorality, and corruption. The family was no longer sacred, family ties were no longer respected. Individual liberty was supreme, and the individual was careless whether his exercise of his curtailed the freedom and happiness of others. While the good went, the bad remained. The Middle Ages had been full of revenge, but the vendetta of the Renaissance was not less bloodthirsty. These circumstances account for the curious anomaly that men of undoubted learning and culture could advocate systematic bad faith in a ruler, and think it excused by the treachery of the people; that men who delighted in the society of artists and literati, who had a taste for pictures and sculpture, who could admire Fra Angelico, or Giotto, had no scruple in using the dagger or poisoned cup for the paltriest purposes of their poor ambitions. Courage too, had, it seemed, passed away. It had

become a profession, and was to be bought, and any bought virtue is but a masked vice. The art of war was changing, as everything else was. In the time of the communes war had been carried on by lightly armed foot soldiers. Then came the age of the heavily armed men at arms, who had followers to carry their metal shells, which they donned only when going into actual battle. The very weight of these arms could crush lightly armed troops as a moving mountain would. These ~~timid~~ soldiers won battles by the force of gravity. But to wield such arms was not a matter for untrained inexperience. The spear which was carried was like a weaver's beam, and if the man at arms fell, he could not rise again without assistance, so great was the weight of the arms he bore. The short service which the people of the communes had given to drill was quite useless when men had to be trained in the use of these arms, and arms necessarily became a profession. But the profession required captains. Thus it was that men of influence, of ability, or courage, became the leaders of these heavy hosts, and sold their services to States and cities which were too busy or too rich to defend themselves or punish their enemies. Hence arose the profession of the Condottieri. These men were constantly in the market, seeking the pay of this or that city. They would fight for one to-day and would side with its enemy to-morrow. These wars had gain and not glory for their purpose, and became rather pillages than battles. These hosts were at the service of the highest bidder, and sometimes they received pay from those with whom they fought, as well as from their allies. It was their object to prolong wars, to continue strifes, and not by decisive action to put an end to these. Bloodshed seemed to have been an accident of some of their battles. Although human life was never less sacred, it seemed to be respected in some of these wars, for the policy of these captains was to earn reputation and money, but to preserve their followers, and to avoid decisive victories. Some of these Condottieri secured their reputation and influence by their personal ability and courage. Thus Sforza had been a field labourer, Piccinini a butcher, but ferocity and cunning were the stuff that most of their successes were made of, not real military genius. Even the success of Valentinois was secured more by treachery than by genius. But sometimes the treachery by which these men sought to secure their success, was requited by death. Thus the Florentines put Viletti to death, and Carmagnola met a similar fate at the hands of the Venetians. But such captains as these made war ridiculous, and it became clear that those who paid such mercenary leaders and their mercenary troops were fooled for their pains. It was an experience of these that made Machiavelli think that the time for a new system had arrived,

and that, instead of such hireling chivalry, Florence ought to depend for her defence and her conquests upon a militia of her own citizens. "Hearths and homes" is a better motto in war than "30,000 ducats for the condotta" and "50,000 ducats from the enemies' camp." No doubt Machiavelli deserves credit for this idea, and for the way in which he achieved his end. But even here we must be careful not to praise him unduly. His work on the art of war has much that is valuable in it, because it was written by an acute observer and a man of undoubted literary genius, but it is not the work of a military genius. Nothing could be further from the truth than such a description. Machiavelli was a man of despatches, a diplomatist, but not a great captain. He had no experience of military matters, could not manoeuvre even a handful of troops, and could see such a little way into the future that he had an entire disbelief in the efficacy of firearms as a means of warfare. However, he did see the truth as to hireling soldiery, and instituted the Florentine Militia. He understood, too, that it is only good men who can make good soldiers. "You will learn," he wrote, "even in your time, how great is the difference between fellow-citizens who are soldiers by choice, and such as you have at present by corruption, for now if any man has been a disobedient son, and squandered his substance in dissipation, he it is who becomes a soldier, whereas on the new system, well brought-up men, educated in honest schools, will do honour to themselves and their country." (Villari, App. Doc. xxxvii.), and yet it was he who chose Don Michelotto, the assassin, the strangler, the tool of Valentinois, "a monster of iniquity, an enemy to God and man," as captain of this host of honest, well-conducted citizens. Goodness was valuable in the soldiery, but not in the general. The general must be feared and respected, Don Michelotto's sinister reputation would inspire the necessary awe. He had no soft heart to turn his hand from the necessary severity. He would not spare enemies. These were Machiavelli's reasons for this strange choice, a choice which was, as we have said, in perfect keeping with the doctrine laid down in his literary works. To him statecraft was separate and distinct from morality, and the rule of an army was another name for statecraft. His idea—if he had had any—of the government of the world, would have been the rule of an unyielding devil, and not of a merciful God.

But even in this design to give Florence an army, he was only patriotic on a small scale. True, he was in earnest, and although there is no enthusiasm in the man, he is as enthusiastic in this matter as he could be. Burckhardt says that there is no enthusiasm in any of his works, and he was, even by the admission of Villari, a cold-blooded animal not given to ardours or enthu-

siasms of any sort; but that was not the age of enthusiasms. The Middle Ages had developed many enthusiasms, and hence the Renaissance in its protest against the dark ages of history, contemned the fine frenzies which make a man a genius and a poor people a great nation. It was just because the Middle Ages had condemned art and literature, because these pertained to the pagan world which had been before Christ, that the Renaissance was heart and soul antiquarian, and nothing but artistic and literary. But Machiavelli was in earnest about his army organisation scheme. But it was a scheme for Florence. His patriotism never rose to a conception of national unity, but was content with municipalism. No doubt it was all the patriotism which was called for, but a greater mind would have risen to a higher and larger sense of brotherhood than that which was bounded by the walls of Florence. To that, however, Machiavelli never attained. Still, amidst all these disparagements, we cannot fail to see in this little man, with his deft pen and subtle brain, a meaning and significance which is not to be pooh-poohed by a sneer or an epithet, which is not to be burned out by the actual cautery which was applied to those running sores—his books. We cannot fail to see in him one of the founders of the new science of political history, a man of consummate acuteness, of great literary tact, and a ready wit. We must respect him for recognising the fact that social phenomena are to be studied altogether apart from theological theories, and that there are invariable laws of human action; but he failed to see that there are principles in politics more powerful and more permanent than the wills of princes and potentates. No doubt he was in many ways perverse. Even Guiccardini accused him of an over-preference “for extraordinary deeds and ways;” and he seems to have approved the principle which he himself describes where he says, “Men, if unable to obtain glory by worthy deeds, seek it by vile, since to make their names live after them is their sole desire.” While he was himself of a gentle disposition, he was an ardent admirer of a Cæsar Borgia, a patron of a Don Michelotto. We cannot, however, withhold from him our admiration of his great literary genius. No one wrote better Italian prose at that time, or almost at any other time. His comedy is excellent, his novel, although a trifle, has in it much to amuse, and has merits which some of his graver works—like his *Life of Castruccio Castracani*—lack. Although his works were condemned by Paul IV., and interdicted by the Council of Trent, these anathemas cannot blind us to the fact that in many ways Machiavelli was one of the greatest men of that corrupt transition age of the Renaissance. It is an age which attracts our attention and commands our interest, notwithstanding the purlieus of history

which we find in it; for while the men who went before, even Dante himself, spoke to our ears the strange tongue of the Middle Ages—with which our interest is rather that of students than of kinsmen—these men of the Renaissance, even when they wrote their mixed Italian and Latin, spoke the tongue of the new time of which we are ourselves products. We have a sympathy with all their intellectual life, if we are in antagonism to all their corruption. The pens of that age have been inherited by ourselves. The intellectual life then began is still being lived. We are greater than these men, only because we have added conscience to our possessions, and that we have no longer to lean on the crutches of antiquity in our progress. It is in this way, then, that we feel that our own age is the fellow of that old time in much. We have had attempted revivals of mediævalism in these days. We have had pre-raphaëlitism in art, gothicism in architecture; we have had neo-platonism in literature, and ritualism in the church; but withal we are still more in harmony with the intellectual life of the Renaissance than with that of any other age. Thus it is we are interested in those times, even while we abhor the enormities which they brought forth; that we are in intense sympathy with them, their dainty speech, their wide culture, their refined taste and accurate learning, while we condemn the corruption of thought and manners and the baseness of feelings and actions which were also characteristic of the time. It is because of this interest and sympathy that we feel grateful for these two works which deal so ably with the many interesting problems of that age, and with no more interesting problem than the life and works of Niccolò Machiavelli.

INDIA AND OUR COLONIAL EMPIRE.

IN a separate article we have reviewed the history of our dealings with Afghanistan to the close of the abortive Conference at Peshawar in March, 1877. Our relations then, perhaps, for the first time admitted of being clearly defined. We could no longer rely on having in Afghanistan a bulwark against aggression from Central Asia. The Amir had shown that he was intensely averse to allowing us those facilities for observation which alone would enable us to render it an effectual barrier, and though it seemed probable that he would for his own purposes give a formal consent, yet the information we had gained showed that his temper was so suspicious and unfriendly, that there was no hope of his cordial co-operation. And without his cordial co-operation, it was admitted by both sides, the residence of British officers would be a cause of embarrassment, and not of strength. Our proposals, too, had been made not only for the protection of our own interests, but to enable us to give him that effectual support of which we had given him solemn assurances. As he, on his part, showed no disposition to observe the pledges he had given; as he showed a spirit unfriendly if not hostile, we declared ourselves free from any liabilities with regard to him, and announced that we should, without violating any rights we had ever acknowledged him to possess, take steps, without regard to his interests, for maintaining the peace and security of our frontier. The only measures which the Government of Lord Lytton contemplated were, we presume, the continued occupation of Quetta, and developments of the new system of managing and controlling the border tribes, which the scheme of frontier administration then under consideration was intended to initiate. Regarding both these matters we have given full explanations. Whether it was wise to render the Amir desperate by the peremptory withdrawal of such outward marks of confidence as we had previously shown, and by declaring emphatically that he had placed himself in a position of isolation, and must face all the risks of that position, we need not here discuss. The Blue Book on Afghanistan contains nothing to justify—it does not even allude to—the recall of the British Agent from Cabul. But we think Lord Lytton would allege that his position there was one of such constraint that we could

reap no advantage as regards information or influence, and would certainly suffer in dignity by allowing him to remain. He would urge, too, that the Amir's conduct had been so openly inimical that it was necessary to protest against it by breaking off diplomatic relations. Further, he would be able to say that if there was any hope of reclaiming the Amir from his estrangement by making him feel the helplessness of his position, the best way to bring it home to him was to withdraw the Agent. As he would not, like the ruler of Nipal, receive a Resident, he was placed on the footing of the chiefs of other "neighbouring and friendly countries." But with the exception of this indication of changed relations there was no sign on our part of changed intention. The acts of the Amir before and during the negotiations would, we think, have justified retributive measures. But none were taken or threatened. He was assured, in the most cordial terms, that we would respect his independence. But confidence is a plant of slow growth and quick decline in an Afghan bosom. Home-keeping critics have been quick to infer that because the Amir showed suspicion, therefore the acts of our Government were acts calculated to excite suspicion. We can only say that the only acts which he would not, in the frame of mind in which he seems to have been since 1873, we have regarded with suspicion, were such as would have won for us his contempt, and, far more effectually than acts giving rise to suspicion, induced him to bestow his friendship elsewhere. There was nothing, we say, in our acts which ought to have caused him apprehension had his previous feelings been wholesome. And certainly Government was not bound to neglect necessary precautions to deprive him of possible grievances, and English Liberals of grounds for criticism. If he had nothing to fear from Russia, he had no reason to fear at all.

The Blue Book which has told us so much about the Conference at Peshawar; the discussions in the Amir's Durbar; the Amir's talk with our Agent; the Viceroy's graceful periods; and the long discussions between Sir L. Pelly and Nur Muhamad, becomes suddenly silent once Lord Lytton has embodied his views in a despatch to the India Office. That despatch is dated 10th May, and there is nothing further till we come to the Secretary of State's answer, dated 4th October. We think the most probable explanation is one based on the rumours current at the time. Rumour, we ought to remark, has in many cases proved to be less misleading than the official or semi-official explanations given to correct its mistakes. Lord Lytton it was said, having regard to the possibility of war with Russia, to the progress of Russian intrigue in Afghanistan, if not in India, to the evidence, more open day by day, of the intensity of the Amir's feeling

against us, urged that strong measures should at once be taken. Lord Salisbury was at this time in the "large maps" stage of his development and discountenanced anything like a demonstration against Russia. Correspondence, we have little doubt, passed between Whitehall and Calcutta revealing "dissensions" or "differences of opinion" which Government hardly cares to make public. Nevertheless, as we wrote last January (p. 239), Lord Lytton's views so far prevailed that "a large British force was ready for action and the whole attitude of the frontier was expectant." We are astonished that during the recent debates the spokesmen of Government relied so little on the Amir's hostile preparations and acts as justification of the war. It is, perhaps, excusable that the knowledge of the mass of members began and ended with—perhaps did not even extend very far into—the Blue Book. But Lord Cranbrook has been long enough at the India Office to have acquired some knowledge of the antecedents of a question of such interest. The Blue Book itself affords sufficient evidence that the Amir entered into close relations with Russia with a view to aggression on us. But before this he had "enormously increased the number of his troops. He was stirring up the frontier tribes to attack the British. He had sent to induce the Akhund of Swat to proclaim a Jihad. He had tempted the Khan of Khelat to unite with him in expelling the English from Quetta. Intercourse between India and Afghanistan was entirely suspended, and no mercy was shown to any person discovered sending intelligence from Cabul." "Defensive preparations," say those who presume everything in favour of the Amir, "defensive preparations in consequence of natural suspicions." "Hostile preparations as well," we answer, "in consequence of suspicions we had done nothing to justify." If the Amir's refusal to admit Residents was consistent with friendly intentions, surely our proposal to send them was consistent with friendly intentions also.

Lord Salisbury's despatch of October 4 conveys to the Indian Government his full and cordial approval of their proceedings regarding the Peshawar Conference.

The history of events had shown how erroneous was the opinion expressed in 1875 by Sir R. Pollock, Commissioner of Peshawar, that "no unfavourable change had occurred in the disposition of the Amir." Shir Ali's confidential Envoy stated explicitly that his master had now "a deep-rooted mistrust of the good faith and sincerity of the British Government." The Amir's refusal to receive at Cabul or elsewhere the proposed temporary mission—his obstinate objection to accept the principle of free access of British officers as a preliminary to negotiations plainly declared to have for their object arrangements

which had been pressed for by His Highness in 1869, and again in 1873—and the attitude of positive hostility which he assumed during the discussions at Peshawar, were all evidence confirmatory of the Envoy's assertion. The despatch goes on to say that, though foreign aggression was not probably imminent, yet danger from members of his own family was ever present to the mind of the Amir, and he may before long awake to the fact that, while his interests are bound up with those of the Government, whose alliance he has rejected, the converse proposition is by no means true. He may well be left to reflect on the knowledge he has acquired. Already there are indications of a change for the better in his attitude.

"The independence of Afghanistan is a matter of importance to the British Government, and, as an essential part of arrangements for its protection, Her Majesty's Government would still be glad to station Agents upon whom they could rely at Herat and Candahar. In the event, therefore, of the Ameer, within a reasonable time, spontaneously manifesting a desire to come to a friendly understanding with your Excellency on the basis of the terms lately offered to, but declined by him, his advances should not be rejected. If, on the other hand, he continues to maintain an attitude of isolation and scarcely veiled hostility, the British Government stands unpledged to any obligations, and, in any contingencies which may arise in Afghanistan, will be at liberty to adopt such measures for the protection and permanent tranquility of the north-west frontier of her Majesty's Indian dominions as the circumstances of the moment may render expedient, without regard to the wishes of the Ameer Shere Ali or the interests of his dynasty."

These sanguine hopes were destined not to be realised. Within a year he had accorded to the threats or the bribes of our rivals the favour his suspicions withheld from us, and we were obliged to adopt such measures for the protection and permanent tranquility of our frontier as the circumstances rendered expedient.

Meanwhile our relations with Russia were becoming more strained, In May, 1877, the Governor-General writes to the Secretary of State:—

"There can be no doubt that the communications between General Kaufmann and Shere Ali Khan exceed the requirements of mere exchanges of courtesy; and are regarded as something much more than complimentary by the person to whom they are addressed. The messages from General Kaufmann to the Ameer have not been despatched, as stated by the General (in his letter of the 9th November, 1876, to the Russian Foreign Office), only "once or twice a year." During the past year they have been incessant. The bearers of them are regarded and treated by the Ameer as Agents of the Russian Government, and on one pretext or another some person recognised by the Afghan Government as a Russian Agent is now almost constantly at Cabul.

"We desire to submit to your Lordship's consideration whether our own conduct would be viewed with indifference by the Cabinet of St. Petersburg, were the Government of India to open similarly friendly relations with the Khans of Khiva and Bokhara; and if without actually making to them overtures of alliance, we addressed to those Princes frequent letters containing

assurances of friendship, coupled with explanations of the policy we deem it desirable to pursue toward the States upon our own frontier."

Again, on the 13th of June, Lord Derby writes to our Ambassador at St. Petersburg :—

"On the 15th November last, when your Excellency mentioned to Prince Gortchakow the report then current of a projected Russian expedition to Merv, His Highness authorised you to inform Her Majesty's Government that there was no question of such an expedition, nor any idea of occupying Merv.

"I have now to instruct your Excellency to make a renewed representation to the Government of Russia on the subject of the movements of Russian troops now taking place on the Turkoman steppe, recalling the above observations to their recollection, and clearly, though courteously, pointing out that the occupation of Merv would be held by the general opinion of the inhabitants of the neighbouring regions of Asia to announce a design on the part of His Majesty the Emperor of Russia to extend his influence, if not his dominion, into territories with which Her Majesty's Government have understood from the Government of His Imperial Majesty that it is not His Majesty's intention to interfere.

"Such an impression would impose upon Her Majesty's Government the necessity of making a corresponding advance in order to allay apprehension and to remove misconception from the minds of the people of those countries."

This elicited the usual assurances that the movements of the troops which had given rise to these apprehensions were mere measures of frontier police; that, therefore, there need be no anxiety regarding Merv. We on our part had to assure the Russian Government that we had no reason to believe that the Amir contemplated an expedition against Darwaz, or that the object of the mission of the Turkish Envoy to the Amir was to preach a crusade in Central Asia. In the beginning of the year 1878 we find that the Tekke Turkomans of Merv have submitted to the Persian Government, and the Persian flag has been hoisted there.

At this time it must be remembered we had no representative at Cabul, and were dependent for information on the intelligence which, in spite of the Amir's barbarous measures of intimidation, were sent to us by private news letters. In December, 1877, a confidential news letter from Jelalabad informs us that the Russian Envoy has returned to his country, and was escorted to Turkestan by the Kotwal (chief magistrate) of Cabul. On the road they met the new Envoy, a member of a very high and rich family of Samarcand. He was treated with much consideration at Cabul. Again, in January, 1878, we hear that the Amir, being questioned regarding his intentions as to a Jihad, says that a Russian Envoy was at Cabul and an Afghan Envoy at Samarcand; that he awaited a reply from Turkey, and if it were not favourable to his interests he would, having well prepared himself in the meanwhile, engage himself in Jihad operations. We are forced to

burden our space with these trivial and not very consistent details because we have no material on which to base a general estimate of the Amir's disposition towards us.

All through the spring there were rumours of great military preparations by the Russians in Turkestan. The statements of the Russian press and the Diplomatic papers since published enable us to state with some approach to accuracy what the movements contemplated were. A force of 4000 men was assembled at Krasnovodsk and Chikislar on the Caspian to advance under General Llamakin through the Akhal and Tekke country on Merv. Another column of 1700 men was organised at Petro Alexandrovsk (near Khiva) to advance up the Oxus to Charjui, and thence effect a junction with General Llamakin's troops. The principal column, 12,000 strong, proceeded *vid* Samarcand to Djam, on the frontier of Bukhara, where it awaited the result of the Congress of Berlin, and when its peaceful conclusion was announced was demobilised. The object of this column was to advance on the line of Balkh, subduing and settling the country between the Oxus and the Hindu Kush. The fourth column formed at Marghilan in Kokand, and was intended to advance through the Sub Pamir Khanates—Karategin, Shagnan, Darwaz, Sarikul, and Wakhan. The possession of the latter principality would have given the Russians control of one of the great trade routes between Kashgar and Cabul, and would also have given them command of the passes into the Chitral country. In other words, it would have brought the Russian power to within 365 miles of our frontier. Ultimately, it appears, all the columns were to unite for further operations in the Khanate of Balkh. It must not be supposed that all these plans were prepared in concert with the Amir of Cabul. He had not, we think, at this time quite made up his mind to become the ally of Russia, and as her ally the enemy of England. His enmity to us had hitherto been of a character which we can best call precautionary. The Russian preparations, we have no doubt, caused to him a graver concern than they caused to us. Whether any conceivable danger from the Russians would have induced him to pay the price we asked for our support we dare not say. But we think it possible that had Lord Lytton taken less pains to impress on him the finality of the step he had taken—to make him feel that henceforth he was isolated and suspected—had we at that time any means of hearing his complaints and giving him counsel, he would have appealed to us, and, for the time at any rate, have given us the means of helping him and protecting our own interests. But we had left him to his own devices, and General Kaufmann knew how to avail himself of the opportunity our

action had created. We need not repeat here what we have so often said before as to the general nature of the Russian arguments. But the published correspondence enables us to infer with confidence what some of the specific inducements were. He was reminded that his nephew Abdurrahman was in the hands of the Russians, that he had still a powerful party in Cabul, and that Russian support would soon make it a dominant party. If Shir Ali agreed to further Russian designs he would not only escape the danger which Russian support to Abdurrahman's claims would bring upon him, but he would receive for himself and his dynasty a pledge of support against all rival claims. If he refused, the Russians would make Abdurrahman ruler of Balkh, and would detach from allegiance to Cabul all the provinces north of the Hindu Kush. From these, as dependent States, they could perpetually menace what remained to Shir Ali of dominion. On the other hand, if he became the ally of Russia, besides the more remote advantages he may have from Russian attacks on India, he was promised, no doubt, as the immediate reward of his co-operation the lordship of Kashmir and the old Afghan provinces of the Punjab. His claim of supremacy over Biluchistan was recognised, and as regards Persia and Bukhara, if he was not promised increase or recovery of territory at their expense, he was at least assured of support against their encroachments. The only question then remaining for Shir Ali to settle within his mind was whether it was safe to rely on Russia against England, and the whole scope of our policy and Russian policy since 1873 seemed to him to leave no doubt on this point. As we write, the account of Resaldar Major Ghulam Nakshaband—a retired officer of the Anglo-Indian army who settled in Cabul—reaches us by telegram from the Viceroy. If it be reliable there can no longer be any doubt as to the entire estrangement of the Amir long before Lord Lytton swerved from the policy of his predecessors. "For two years," says the Resaldar, "after the Ambala Conference the Amir would have done anything for the British Government, but after the return of Nur Muhamad from Simla in 1873, his temper quite changed, and he scarcely disguised his hatred of it." This will be sad news for the Duke of Argyll. May we venture to suggest for his consolation that the manner of our refusal may have had as much effect in alienating the Amir as the matter? Of Nur Muhamad and his fidelity to his master we have spoken elsewhere. His influence with the Amir was unbounded; and there can be little doubt that had he been led to see the sincerity and moderation of our wishes, he would have been able to win over Shir Ali and the rest of the Durbar to our views. Yet, though this was so, we seem to have wholly embittered his feeling towards us

by the way we treated him at Simla. All the outward forms of respect were shown to him, but that courtesy of tone to the want of which an Oriental is so sensitive was wanting. Our agent at Cabul says that after Muhamad's return in 1873, he used no longer to counsel the Amir to friendly and close alliance with the British, and used all his influence in an opposite direction. The specific grounds of his complaint were—the pressure put upon him to accede to our views and the scant courtesy shown to him. He remembered with much soreness that an officer provoked at his want of accord had used towards him some angry expression in English. We need say but little by way of comment. We manage our diplomacy as we manage our general administration by trusting to policies and despatches, and neglecting those far more effective agents of success—good manners and personal influence. Those natives who know both the principles of our Government and the habits of its ever-shifting instruments, say, "We love the English Government and dislike the English man." Unfortunately for one who can estimate the Government aright there are thousands who can judge it only from the man.

This is a digression from our immediate subject, the inducements offered to the Amir. There is one which we think General Kaufmann could have used with honesty and effect. England, he may have said, can never allow you real independence for two reasons. First, she is a fussy moral Power of missionary and aggressive tastes. We will wink at what England would howl at. Secondly, while we are on this side of you and England on the other, she will never allow you freedom of action, fearing we may make you our tool. And she is right, for we shall have both opportunities and inducements to do so. But if you help us to India, *we* shall have nothing to fear from you, as you cannot become the tool of any Power we fear. Your country would not be worth the trouble of conquering. Therefore you can rely on the guarantee of independence we give you.

The impartial mind of Mr. Gladstone attributes the Amir's repulse of our Mission to the brusque precipitancy with which we pressed it on him. If he were as zealous in seeking for truth, as vehement in proclaiming what he declares the truth to be, he would hardly have failed to notice a suggestive passage in the Peshawar Diary for June 16, 1878. The Amir alludes to the fearless and unceremonious behaviour of the Russian Agent at Cabul, and to repeatedly recurring news of the approaching arrival of an "empowered" agent. The Mustaufi contrasted the excessive strength and shamelessness of the Russians with "the moderation and exhibition of moderate power" of the English, and begged the Amir to think well regarding the future.

Just before this is a passage which shows how the Amir thought of the future. "Whatever Government," he said, "approached him in a friendly manner he would make similar advances" (meaning, no doubt, if it was entirely on his own terms). This explanation of the sense in which the Amir used the word "friendship" in his conversation and correspondence accords with the interpretation we have given of it elsewhere, based on the remarks of his Envoy at Peshawar. Russian diplomacy for the moment triumphed over ours, not in consequence of its moderation, but because to show of force was added tact—to menace, flattery and bribes. Their magnificent contempt for their engagements at first alarmed, but ultimately won, the Amir. Had his conscience been as the conscience of the Duke of Argyll, it would not have been so. But the Duke's ancestors were reclaimed from barbarism many generations since by a process which is only now about to be applied to the Highlanders of Afghanistan.

The contingency which the advocates of inactivity had refused to contemplate as possible had, in fact, occurred. The Russians were about to gain a foothold in Cabul as friends. The partisans of that dogma cannot reasonably allege as a defence that our mistakes had given them an opportunity. It would be rash indeed to assert that had Lord Lawrence guided our policy instead of Lord Lytton the temper of the Amir would have been less susceptible to Russian advances. But even were this so it would be madness to make the safety of our Empire dependent on the chance that the Calcutta Foreign Office would never mismanage affairs. Even were our statesmen always vigilant and always wise there would still remain the possibility that the infatuation of the Amir or the anarchy in his dominions would invite Russia in.

We have written on the assumption that while Russia was thus busy we were wholly inactive. The silence of the Blue Books justifies such an assumption, but we ought to remark that English emissaries—according to Russian accounts—arrived in Cabul to incite the Amir against Russia. In one of the Diaries there is a passing reference to an "English" Envoy. And we know that Major Butler was very busy in the Turkoman country—made surveys—and entered into relations with the nomad chiefs.

We can only conjecture what General Kaufmann's ultimate objects were. They were not probably very clearly defined. But the immediate advantages he would gain are obvious. He would be able to take advantage of a time when war seemed imminent to take another step in advance, such as even Russian modesty would hesitate about taking while peace enjoined respect for solemn engagements. Russia

would at last become mistress of Merv. Besides the facilities the occupation of the post would give her for ulterior designs on Herat, she would by holding it be able to control the Turkomans, and thus have a safe road to what was before the isolated post of Khiva (Petro-Alexandrovsk). A road from the Caspian to the Oxus is essential to the consolidation of Russian power in Central Asia, and at present none exists. A further advantage Russia would gain would be a footing on the northern slopes of the Hindu Kush, and the possession of Wakhan would bring them at one bound close to India, as we have already described. These gains would be certain and permanent. Not less obvious is the advantage of preventing England from creating a diversion by threatening Central Asia through Cabul. But we do not think an actual invasion of India was contemplated. Russia would probably give the Amir officers and war material, and enable him to organise his forces and fortify the passes. This would paralyse the English power for attack and compel us to keep a large force on the frontier. General Kaufmann trusted, too, that his mere presence in Cabul would raise against us every disturbing element in India. Real as is the harm we should thus suffer, it is far less than Russia supposes. Their journals are even worse informed than ours, and as regards the position and feeling of the native princes, they have peculiarly wild notions. General Kaufmann probably thought that the presence of a company of Russian soldiers in Cabul would not only prevent us from sending Indian troops to Europe, but would compel us to summon English soldiers for the defence of India.

It is vain to speculate what the operations on both sides would have been had war broken out. Undoubtedly had Afghanistan been friendly to us we could with little effort to ourselves have compelled Russia to make serious sacrifices to sustain her position among the disaffected and but half-subdued populations of Turkestan. But with Afghanistan unfriendly, Russia would have had the advantage. It is disingenuous to argue that she would have foregone this advantage if we had not used an Indian force in the Mediterranean. The summons to the Sepoy was, we think, a judicious manifestation of confidence in the security of our position, and it undoubtedly strengthened it by stimulating the loyal ardour of our Indian subjects. We engaged their sympathies by thus early making them take our side. And we showed them that we valued their help as well as their sympathy.

But peace came, and General Kaufmann's expedition ended in a Mission—a Mission which, had war but followed, would have been an admirable stroke of policy, but, under the circumstances, was destined to end disastrously for Russian prestige. The St. Petersburg Govern-

ment deserves, we think, neither extreme condemnation nor any pity. It had given *carte blanche* to its commanders in Asia. When a general peace was concluded it took no effective steps to restrain them from continuing the political measures which the prospect of war may possibly be allowed to have justified. It was, as its fashion is, ready to disavow or to take advantage of their proceedings as might seem convenient, and it cherished an ignorance, very useful for diplomatic purposes, of what was being done. At this time the Russian Government had not acquired that fixed purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Berlin Treaty which subsequent knowledge either of the firmness of our Government or of its own weakness has induced it to show. What may have been in the breast of the Czar we know not; we judge Russia as we judge other nations, from the acts and utterances of her public men. It is impossible not to sympathise with the disappointment General Kaufmann must have felt when he saw himself compelled to relinquish the great game in which he could have started with such advantages. But there was still hope. The Berlin Treaty seemed nowhere to have warm friends. If he could but maintain in Afghanistan the diplomatic advantage he had gained, how great would be the benefit he would reap should war, after all, be the arbiter! And if England took steps to eject him, what an effort it would impose on her, especially if he were able to repeat the policy of the Servian war and give the Amir unofficial assistance! And how much might he thus strengthen the hands of his countrymen in Europe!

From a great variety of sources—Russian reports—Cabul news letters—documents that have come into our hands by the overthrow of the Amir's troops, and statements of Afghans, who were present in Cabul at the time the Mission reached it—we are able to construct a tolerably clear and consistent—though perhaps not in all points accurate—narrative of the Mission.

According to Russian accounts, Major-General Stoletoff, another officer, four interpreters, and twenty-two Cossacks, left Samarcand on the 14th July, and reached Cabul on the 10th August. According to the letters from Cabul, the Envoy crossed the Oxus before the 7th July, and was received at Cabul in full Durbar on the 26th July. The Envoy was General Abramoff, Governor of Samarcand, and his escort was of 200 to 400 horsemen. The Amir had been previously informed of the intention of sending a Mission, and heard at the same time of the march of the Russian forces, and of the preparations being made for crossing the Oxus, and establishing cantonments on its banks. He seems to have been divided between

a feeling of elation at the importance of his position, and of extreme embarrassment and dejection as regards the dangers a decisive step would bring him face to face with. A polite effort to delay the approach of the Mission before it reached the Oxus failed, owing to the firmness of the Envoy, but at the Oxus he was delayed for some days by the illness of the Governor, whose duty it was to escort him.

The Mission advanced but slowly—General Stoletoff taking the opportunity of surveying the country on both sides, as far as he could. This seems to have caused the Amir much anxiety. But when the Envoy reached Cabul he was received with the greatest distinction. There was a grand review of 40,000 troops assembled—we may well suppose as much to impress the visitors with a sense of the Amir's power as to do them honour. The Envoy had private interviews with the Amir. He delivered to him not only a letter from General Kaufmann, but one from the Czar. What passed at these private interviews can only be conjectured. The latest Russian admission as to the character of this purely complimentary Mission is that its objects were to open direct commercial relations with Afghanistan as well as with India, and to express to Shir Ali the Czar's appreciation of his mode of action in regard to Russia during the Russo-Turkish war. This phrase "mode of action" may refer only to the Amir's rejection of the overtures of Turkey—to his attitude of neutrality—but it may also refer to a specific understanding with Russia. If the accounts from Cabul may be trusted, the objects of the Mission were far more important than those acknowledged by Russia. An alliance was to be concluded, which would give Russia the right of establishing commercial stations, making roads, constructing a telegraph to the great strategic points, and, if necessary, moving troops through Afghanistan. We may safely assume that an attempt was made to prepare the way for such an alliance. And here we must offer to Russian diplomatists and the Rev. Malcolm MacColl a dilemma. If the Mission was despatched while war was imminent, it was clearly not of a merely complimentary character. And if it was despatched after peace was secured, it was a clear breach of Russian engagements. We have no doubt the formal instructions given to the Envoy were changed, but ought he not to have been recalled?

When the Russian proposals were made known in Cabul the Amir held a meeting of his chiefs—descanted on the wrongs he had received from the English, and had an elaborate paper read to them on the greatness and glory of Russia. Then he dismissed them to their homes, telling them to have their swords sharp for war against their enemies. Meanwhile Mollahs were engaged at Ghazni, and on our

frontier in preaching a holy war. Whether Shir Ali was *forced* or not into receiving the Russian Mission, it is clear from his language and acts that he felt his reception of it was an open declaration of hostility to the British Government. He knew that one condition was implied in all our previous relations of help and friendship towards him—that he should have no direct relations with Russia. He knew, like Lord Northbrook, that Afghanistan was not in any sense an independent Power. If his apologists in this country were but sensible of an inconsistency, it would be enough to point out how absurd it is to say he did not act wrongly in refusing to receive the Russian Mission because it was forced on him, and yet acted rightly in refusing ours because it was forced on him. He owed a duty to us and none to Russia. It was not our proposal to send a Mission that finally rendered Russian influence supreme. It was because Russian influence was already supreme that our Mission was repulsed.

When accounts of the splendid reception of the Russians reached India there was but one course for the Government to adopt. Unless they were content to see Russian influence consolidate itself at Cabul and all the predictions of injury to our prestige in India verified, they must at once take steps to exclude Russia and restore English influence. It has been urged that we ought to have waited till we could send a Mission at a time which would be less embarrassing to the Amir. But there was no reason to believe that the Russian Mission would not be permanent. Our position in India would grow weaker as the Russian position on our frontier grew stronger. The stronger she felt herself in Asia the more adventurous would Russia be in Europe; and the more adventurous she was in Europe the less willing would she be to relax her hold on Cabul. "But we ought," it has been said by those consistent persons who denounce the Ministerial policy as "warlike," "we ought to have peremptorily called on Russia to fulfil its pledges." And, we answer, we *did* call upon Russia—effectually, if not peremptorily. To have made her interference in Afghanistan a *casus belli* would have kindled anew the flame of war, which, despite the melancholy vaticinations we hear on all sides, we believe the action of the Ministry has for a generation at least quenched. We should have to enter on a contest with Russia on grounds too narrow to give us the sympathy—far less the aid, of the European Powers whose general interests agree with ours—and this at the very time when Russia was in possession of the vantage ground which it was our chief aim to keep her from gaining. But even supposing honour and interest suggested a declaration of war against Russia, Afghanistan was still the quarter in which we should attack her. We did

attack her in attacking the Amir, for she knew the object of the attack. But by giving her an opportunity of keeping aloof from the fray, we converted what would otherwise have been a sanguinary war into a mere expedition. We gave to her, as we gave to her dupe, a *locus penitentia*, and she was glad to avail herself of it. We know, too, what are the arts of Russian diplomacy—how, if we proceeded at once to warlike measures, those who now say the Ministry feared Russia would then have said that its object was to provoke her; while if we simply negotiated she would have gained time—the one thing she wanted—and poured men and arms into Afghanistan. It may be urged that we may have detached the Amir from her, but how if not by at once sending a Mission? Would further hesitation, further show of moderation, have undone the evils that hesitation and show of moderation had done in the past? It was absolutely necessary to show to him and to the princes of India who were looking on, that we were prepared to insist on maintaining our rightful position in regard to Afghanistan. To have waited on the Amir's good pleasure would have meant to him and to them that we had already abandoned it. To General Kaufmann, we have no doubt, our vigour and moderation were as distressing as to Mr. Malcolm MacColl. His *coup* would have been decisive if he only had had men to back it—or if it suited the schemes of the St. Petersburg politicians to support him. But he seems to have foreseen that if he was compelled to withdraw from the position to which he had rashly advanced—if he could fulfil none of the promises by which he had won the Amir—Russian prestige in Asia would, in spite of Kars and Batoum, and glorious contempt of treaties, receive a rude shock, while the vacillating policy of England would be coerced by his act into securing Afghanistan from his approach, and obtaining a position from which they could, if necessary, direct against him the weapons he had hoped to direct against us. Unluckily for General Kaufmann, and happily for the peace of Europe, the Russian Government took a sober view of their country's interests and power.

Here, for the present, we must pause. The controversies of the hour have compelled us to go more into detail than the scope of this summary generally permits. But we have, we hope, cleared the way for a less critical review of the events which followed.

South Africa.—While party rancour rages round every incident of the Afghan question, the aspect of affairs in South Africa, though in essential points strictly analogous to that of our Indian frontier, excites little interest. Not satisfied with annexing the Transvaal on the ground that the weak government of the Boers would involve us in

the native troubles it was bringing on itself, we have, as the result of recent operations against the revolted Kafirs, practically extinguished native rule in the country which, till lately, separated Cape Colony from Natal. We are now threatening the King of the Zulus with war unless he consents to allow us to interfere in his State to an extent far greater than that proposed with regard to Afghanistan. There are some grounds for believing that the revolt of the Kafirs was due to mismanagement on our own part. As regards Katshwayo's hostile intentions, there is hardly more evidence than there was with regard to those of Shir Ali. The only difference between the two cases is that, instead of putting himself at the disposal of a great nation that has the power and the will to injure us, he has himself made preparations that are a constant menace to us. No one alleges that before the occurrences that led to this present war Shir Ali suffered wrong at our hands. But the result of the recent arbitration shows that Katshwayo had a substantial grievance which, according to European notions of international law, would have justified him in having recourse to force. Yet, in spite of all this, the suspicions which have followed nearly every other department of Government policy have as yet left them free in regard to this. For this there are many reasons. The crisis of war has not yet come—there is no substantial danger to the National Exchequer. The public mind cannot occupy itself with more than one question at once, and it treats the early stages of the South African question as it treated the early stages of the Afghan question—with indifference. When the country is irretrievably committed to a particular line of action, then we are justified in assuming from past experience, reckless ignorance will make itself heard again in complaints of Ministerial secrecy and aggressive fraud. But the principal reason for the absence of remonstrance is that the question has not been embittered by preceding controversies. The lives and interests of our kinsmen are too plainly in peril to allow even the most ardent Liberals to apply to South Africa the abstract doctrines by which they contended our relations with the Amir ought to have been regulated. From this general compliment to the inconsistent good sense of the party, we must, of course, except Mr. Courtney.

The process of pacification continues in the districts which were the seat of the war. The Gaikas have been removed to the lands beyond the Kai, from which the Galekas were expelled. Our new settlement on the St. John's River is peaceful. The general disarmament which forms part of the new policy is being submitted to without resistance, or even any great apparent reluctance. In these new settlements lands

are no longer granted to the tribe—but to the individual. English magistrates are appointed to control, and the authority of the chiefs is no longer recognised. It is of course too soon to observe the results of the attempt to destroy old principles of social organisation. Kafirs—in contact with a wages system—have shown themselves singularly tractable by European methods. But it must be remembered that if the power of the chiefs is destroyed for evil, it is also destroyed for good. It is sometimes easier to keep the allegiance of a chief than of a people.

The capital sentences passed on the leaders of the revolt have, as we hoped, been commuted to various periods of penal servitude. Tini Macomo, Edward Sandilli, and the others whose names but a short time since were so familiar in the telegrams, are now either sharing Langa-libalele's exile in Robben's Island, or are at work on the breakwater at Cape Town.

Mr. Molteno, whose dismissal from office was the necessary preface to the measures which led to the suppression of the rebellion, has retired from public life. His action at a critical period was, we think, infatuated, and his influence generally was unfavourable to cordial relations between the mother country and the colony. But there will always be, we suppose, a party with separatist tendencies, and the loss of such a leader as Mr. Molteno is a loss not to the party only, but to the Legislature. Mr. Sprigg, the present premier, has made a number of vacation speeches, dealing chiefly with the question of confederation. This will be a test question apparently at the next election, and will engage the attention of the next Parliament. The elections to the Council have already been held. Those to the Assembly are to be held this month. Government, also, intends to bring forward a scheme for aided immigration. The immense extent and variety of the undeveloped resources of the country renders this question one of the highest importance. Government has been most active in creating the machinery of development—roads, railways, and ports. Labour is wanted and capital. In England we have a population pressing hard on the means of subsistence, and increasing far beyond the ratio of industrial development. There is a universal complaint that small capitals can find no profitable investment. We are a public-spirited and a charitable people. Is it vain to hope that some day a means will be devised by which either State aid or private generosity will succour the distressed of our land by sending them to lands which their labour would make fruitful, but which now are too poor to pay the cost of their coming? The best defence against the raids of African savages would be a frontier thickly-peopled by hardy Europeans.

Some indignation has been roused in this country by the forcible conversion of the frontier police into a force of mounted rifles. Some of the members who refused to serve in the new force were sentenced to hard labour; but the sentences have been remitted, and it seems to be admitted that the men have been treated unjustly.

The native troubles in Griqua Land West have not yet ceased. The inhabitants seem at last to be about to petition for annexation to Cape Colony.

In the Transvaal the operations against Sakakuni have ended in failure. He has taken refuge in his great stronghold—on the top of a mountain—protected by successive barriers of piled stones. To take the place by assault seemed impossible. To starve him into surrender was at first thought of. But the country round was barren—a parched waste of sand in the dry season and a pestiferous marsh in the rainy season. It seemed expedient, too, for the time, to concentrate all our available force against Katshwayo, and therefore operations against Sakakuni seem to have been abandoned. The Dutch delegates who came to Europe to protest against the annexation seem by no means to have been silenced by Lord Carnarvon's acrimonious despatch. To us it seems vain to contend that the country was annexed with the formal consent of the people, or that they now acquiesce in their political extinction. But the measure is justified by its necessity, from the point of view of our interests and its expediency as regards their interests. A feeling of spurious patriotism leads them to protest, but they are not blind to the benefits they have derived from their great wrong. They admit that our administration does the best it can.

The attitude of Katshwayo and his Zulus not only engrosses the interests of the colonists, but gives rise to the gravest apprehension. The native question throughout the various colonies is one; and even a temporary check on the frontier of Zululand would everywhere call into play the dormant elements of unrest. Even a prolongation of the present uncertainty is dangerous. We have already described in detail the resources of Katshwayo and his threatening attitude. Since we wrote it has become more pronounced. It is useless to inquire whether his own temper is for war or whether he is merely compelled to yield to the aspirations of the young chiefs by whom he is surrounded. The Zulu army has for some time been making preparations for immediate war. Outrages have been committed by them on territory occupied by us, and warnings have even been sent to our garrison at Fort Luneberg ordering it to quit, as Katshwayo claimed the country as his. Sir Bartle Frere has shown himself sensible of the gravity of the situation. The Kafir outbreak had hardly been sup-

pressed when he went to Natal. He is now at Pieter-Maritzburg, while General Thesiger, who, since we last wrote, has become Lord Chelmsford, is on the frontier. The most vigorous preparations have been made. Besides the regular Colonial and Imperial forces, volunteers have pushed to the front from all quarters. At Cape Town the volunteers do garrison duty to relieve the regular troops. In November General Lord Chelmsford had 12,000 men under arms on the frontier, but of these 8,000 were natives. The blue-jackets have come on shore, and will, we are sure, rival the heroism of the famous Naval Brigade during the Indian Mutiny. But the crisis is not one to be dealt with from local and ordinary resources, and public feeling at home and at the Cape was relieved and gratified by the decision of the Ministry to send out two regiments as reinforcements. Katshwayo's army, it must be remembered, consists of 42,000 men, drilled in a fashion, well-armed, and provided with efficient artillery.

The business on hand is very different from the previous wars with naked savages in which we have won such easy victories. Lord Chelmsford thinks it expedient to raise native levies, and they would, no doubt, be a valuable accession of strength while our prestige remains. But in the event of disaster or even difficulty, they would be a source of weakness and danger, and public feeling in the colony seems to be nervous as to the result of the experiment. The officer sent to recruit among the Basutos was frankly told that they believed in the power of the Zulus, and would serve us only when we had shown that we could beat them. The chiefs who have promised levies send them in but slowly.

Lord Chelmsford's plan is to defend the entire frontier and prevent invasion at each and every point. Already forces seem to be concentrated at seven distinct places. These preparations have frightened the Zulu king into temporary moderation. He has sent to explain and apologise for the threatening messages delivered to our subjects by his officers. He expresses surprise that his frontier should thus be threatened; and we have no doubt his letter, when published, will appeal to unthinking sentiment as those of the Amir did. Meanwhile the decision in the arbitration as to the territory in dispute—a dispute, it must be remembered, bequeathed to us by the Transvaal Government—assigns it to Katshwayo. It may appear that all cause for war is therefore at an end; but even if Katshwayo accept the decision as a proof of our justice and not of our weakness, and resume a peaceful attitude, it is quite clear that public opinion in the colony will not tolerate that the danger should be postponed instead of being removed. Sir Bartle Frere, as High Commissioner,

has sent to inform Katswayo of the award, and to require him to receive it on terms which practically assume the character of an *ultimatum*. The farmers in the disputed territory who have sustained loss by Zulu menaces are to be allowed, as compensation, to occupy farms in the territory now awarded to the Zulus. Katswayo is to surrender the sons and brothers of Umbeline and Swayo, and to pay a fine of 600 head of cattle. The Zulu army is to be disbanded, freedom of marriage is to be granted to all young men, the missionaries are to be allowed to return, a Resident is to be appointed, before whom and the king all disputes with Europeans are to be heard, and no European is to be expelled from Zululand without the consent of the Resident. These are the conditions according to the published text. But earlier accounts stated that they included a partial disarmament, a rectification of frontier, and the cession of St. Lucia Bay. Public opinion in the colony condemns them as too mild, but their ultimate effect will be to destroy the military organisation of the Zulus. The gross barbarities of which the Zulu king is by popular report guilty, justify, on mere grounds of humanity, the appointment of a Resident. Like his Cabul analogue, he is much harassed by domestic sedition. The cession of St. Lucia Bay is necessary to prevent his obtaining the supplies of arms and ammunition which now make him formidable. The Zulu delegates, we are told, were very reluctant to take the message to their ruler. Meanwhile military preparations on our side continue.

Since the award regarding Delagoa Bay, the Portuguese authorities have honourably attempted to prevent the import of ammunition to Zululand through their territory. For this friendship shown to the English Katswayo has so threatened and harassed the residents that many have fled for refuge to Natal. (We may mention here that the natives of an island ceded by the award to Portugal have, as English subjects, declined to submit. We have sent a war ship to induce them to do so.)

In the event of war, if the Zulus in our own ranks are doubtful, we may at least rely on the alliance of the Swazis—hereditary foes to the Zulus. As is usual in times of unrest, the native servants in Natal have left their employers and gone to their kraals to await events.

Notwithstanding the troubled state of the country, railways throughout the colonies have been extended, and surveys have been executed for lines connecting the Orange Free State and the Transvaal with the coast. There have been frequent "finds" of coal and gold. Both exports and imports have increased in quantity—the latter no doubt in consequence of the wants of the army and the failure of crops from

drought. This long-continued drought has not been the least of the causes of disquiet. Besides the agricultural loss and the suffering, transport became very difficult, and manufactured commodities rose to famine prices in the interior.

The need of united action to deal with the native difficulty has proved a powerful argument for confederation, and has been used with tact and vigour by Sir Bartle Frere.

Canada.—Since the triumph of the Conservative party in the elections there has been a good deal of discussion both in this country and in Canada as to what the “national” policy, of which Sir J. Macdonald is the representative, really is. It is not easy to eliminate from the controversy the wild economical heresies which possibly recommended a change of fiscal policy to the mass of the electors, but we shall endeavour to indicate the grounds upon which the more reasonable and moderate supporters of Sir J. Macdonald defend the adoption of a system of qualified Protection. Free Trade, they admit, insures the most thrifty development of the resources of the country. They do not contend, as American economists do, that Protection is necessary to stimulate and foster young industries. Free Trade, they say, is good; but, for Canada, it does not exist, and, while the United States adheres to its present policy, it cannot exist. The Republic commands within its own borders such an infinite variety of industrial resource and such limitless tracts of fertile soil that, even when it adopts a Protective policy as regards the outer world, its own area admits it to all the advantages of Free Trade. It has used its advantages in this respect mercilessly. In order to develop its own industries it excludes competing Canadian products by a prohibitive tariff. In order to “slaughter” Canadian industries, and secure the markets of Canada for its own, it has adopted a system of bounties which render competition on the part of the Canadian producer impossible. True, the Canadian consumer benefits for the moment. True, the whole body of American taxpayers suffer that a particular American trade may flourish. But when the market is once secured—when the Canadian industry is killed beyond hope of revival—the bounty is withdrawn, and the Canadian consumers have to pay as tribute to America far more than the treacherous gift they received. The sugar trade is cited as an instance of this, just as the corn trade is cited as an instance of the jealous exclusion of Canadian commerce. Now Canada, though rich in mineral wealth and forest tracts, is inferior to America in climate and fertility of soil, and has not reached the stage of development—possibly will never reach it—in which she can be self-sufficing. To exist and to develop she must

find a market for such goods as she can produce in excess of her own requirements. Her natural market is the United States, and there she could, if she were allowed admission, compete on more than equal terms with the native producers. But from the American market she is excluded by the fiscal legislation we have described. When Canada says further that the object of the American policy is to coerce her into a Customs union, and thereby ultimately into Political union, she appeals successfully to our Imperial sympathies. The "national" policy then is a policy of qualified and limited protection. It is not intended to exclude English goods from Canadian markets. American competition, aided by American protection, has to a great extent done that already, and whatever policy Canada may adopt, it is hardly possible that English manufacturers can recover the ground they have lost. The policy is simply one of retaliation as regards the United States. As the Americans have built a wall to keep out Canadian products, the Canadians (under the direction of Sir J. Macdonald) will build one to keep out American products. When America opens its markets to Canadian goods, Canada will open its markets to America—but not before. It is hoped that the West India Islands may be induced to adopt a policy of reciprocity with Canada, and thus the war against American (protected) enterprise will be extended over a wider area.

We ought perhaps to remark that this sketch is based on many isolated expressions of opinion, and that the policy has not been formulated in the sense we describe. It would be obviously impossible for us to discuss here the difficulties to which its adoption will give rise with regard to the general policy and treaty obligations of Great Britain. Nor can we consider its chances of success—the possibility that America will retaliate by destroying such Canadian trade as remains—the possibility that the injury to the Canadian consumer will be greater than the gain to the Canadian producer. But we can easily understand how the proposal became acceptable to a people dispirited by long commercial depression, weary of stories of the depletion of their forests, the smallness of their markets, the scantiness of their resources—eager to see population increase and markets grow, so that development might soon reach the fertile plains of the interior and the mines as yet unworked. Many loyal colonists hope that the mother country may at last consent to a Zollverein with the United States—based, however, not on an American, but on a Canadian tariff.

Meanwhile the Macdonald Cabinet maintains a discreet silence as to its specific intentions. Its opponents and the extreme members of the

Protectionist party interpret its inaction as a sign of hesitation or breach of faith. To us, such reserve seems natural. To revise a tariff is a far more delicate task than to clamour for its revision. Consumers must be heard as well as producers; the industries which fear depression as well as those which are depressed. The arrival of the new Governor-General, too, has for a time put political matters in abeyance. The immediate needs of the Treasury, and the necessity of reassuring the Home Government and English capitalists, have, we doubt not, moderated the extravagant plans with which the fervour of a general election inspired politicians.

Mr. Tilley, the new Minister of Finance, has come on a mission to this country—partly to facilitate the raising of the new loan—partly to confer on the Fisheries dispute with the United States—but chiefly, we are inclined to believe, to give explanations to the Home Government regarding the new fiscal policy. The loan was for three millions at four per cent., half on an Imperial and half on a Colonial guarantee. More than half was to be devoted to redeeming the six per cent. bonds which mature this month. The balance was to be expended on remunerative works, including the Pacific Railway. While the Government organs predicted that Mr. Tilley's task would be rendered difficult by the reckless and corrupt policy of his predecessor, the Opposition papers maintained that, if he failed, his failure would be due to the distrust with which the Protectionist policy of the Ministry inspired in English financial circles. Such fears, we think, are fanciful, if not factious. Capital is heedless of economic heresies, and regards only the general character and stability of the Government to which it lends. However this may be, when the loan was brought out—from causes apparently not connected with Canadian credit—only a little over half the whole sum proposed was well tendered for.

The American Government, reserving all the considerations it had urged regarding its objections to pay the Halifax Award, and declaring that it could not accept the result of the Commission as furnishing any just measure of the value of the American right of participation in the inshore fisheries of the British Provinces, has at length paid 5,500,000 dollars—the amount of the Award. For some time there appeared reason to fear that it would withhold payment—partly as a protest against the decision, and partly as—we hardly know how to describe it—a guarantee for the settlement of a counter-claim arising from the Fortune Bay incident. The features of this new controversy may be briefly sketched. By the Convention of 1818 and the Treaty of Washington, inhabitants of the United States are declared to have liberty to take, dry, and cure fish on certain coasts of the British North

American Colonies, *in common with British subjects.* In January, 1878, certain American boats were fishing in Fortune Bay, Newfoundland, in a manner and at a time forbidden by the municipal law of Newfoundland. The local fishermen compelled them by force and with damage to their boats and gear to desist. The American contention is that no municipal regulation can override Treaty rights, and that even if the Americans were acting illegally they ought to have been restrained by legal process, not by tumultuary violence. If for the common good of all persons resorting to the fisheries some restraining regulations are necessary, these should be matter for a convention between the two Governments. On the other hand, the Newfoundland Government points out that the phrase "in common" means, according to the highest legal authorities, "equalities with another indiscriminately, the one not having greater powers or privileges than the other." It would clearly be as unfair to the Americans to subject their rights to the indefinite limitations of local legislatures as it would be unfair to the Newfoundland fishermen to compel them to submit to restraints from which their rivals are free.

After all the wearying pageants and ceremonies of the reception, the Marquis of Lorne has, we doubt not, with sincere satisfaction settled down to his work as Viceroy. On public occasions he has spoken with tact, discrimination, and enthusiasm. He has spoken to the French Canadians in their own tongue, and paid just tributes to their virtues as British citizens. He dances well and skates well, and, in the opinion of Canadian politicians, "will do." Whatever may be his success as an administrator, his appointment has shown how deep everywhere is the sentiment of Imperial unity. As at present the immediate interests of the mother country and the colony seem to conflict, it is well that this feeling of lasting community of interests should be strong. It is well, too, that the Governor, who has to interpret to English Ministers the mind of Canada, and to Canadian Ministers the feelings of England, should himself share so sincerely in the feeling of loyalty to a common Crown and speak with some of the authority which belongs to it. Amid all the prose and verse which the Canadian papers devote to the praise of M'Callum More and England's Princess, there is evidence that the man and woman who have come among them to fill so high a post have made themselves beloved.

The Governor-General's only important official act has been, we believe, to refuse to sanction the dismissal of the Joly Ministry at Quebec. The story of the dismissal of the Conservative Ministry there by the Liberal Lieutenant-Governor, of the formation of the Joly Cabinet, of its precarious existence since, and of the deadlock which

has resulted in the affairs of the province involves many interesting constitutional points, but is too long to be told here.

The shortest route from Asia to England lies through the British North-American Colonies. At present all the traffic passes by the longer route through the United States. A Canadian Pacific Railway has long been desired and discussed, especially by British Columbia, which by its construction would be relieved from its present position of isolation and would become one of the great highways of the world. As an inducement to British Columbia to enter the Confederation, Canada undertook to construct the railway within a certain period. Owing to causes which we have not space to detail, the work has languished. The new Ministry seems disposed to abandon the route selected by their predecessors, and it is announced that new surveys are to be undertaken which will occupy two years. This naturally has caused much excitement in British Columbia, which has already threatened to withdraw from the Confederation by the 1st of May next if the line be not commenced by that time. It urges that while the survey in the interior is proceeding, lines should be constructed in British Columbia, which subsequently may become part of the main line, or branches of it. The object of these lines would be to enable the rich interior, which at present has no communication with the coast, to send its surplus produce there, and draw supplies in return. Thus trade and profits, which now go to America, would be retained in British Columbia. The necessaries, for instance, for the men employed in the construction of the Pacific Railway—when it is being constructed—would be supplied by the farmers of British Columbia, not as they otherwise would be by those of Oregon. A telegram at the close of last month announced that the Government has determined to complete the Canada Pacific Railway between Lake Superior and the city of Winnipeg “with the utmost speed, in order to prevent the permanent diversion of the North-West traffic through the American lines—a danger now threatening.”

Negotiations are also pending with the Government of Newfoundland for the entry of that province into the Confederation.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

THEOLOGY.

TO notice adequately the Catholic history of Dr. Alzog would require a volume instead of a page, this "Manual of the Universal History of the Church,"¹ translated with praiseworthy industry from the original German, comprising about three thousand pages. We can but indicate, therefore, some of its characteristics. The theme it deals with is unquestionably a grand one. Christian and secular thinkers alike must allow that the growth and development of the religion which presided over or accompanied the civilisation of two thousand years is a subject worthy of the powers of the philosophic historian. It is as such that Dr. Alzog professes to conceive it, though fatally disqualified, as we believe, for the enterprise, since he holds that to limit history to natural causes and explain facts on psychological principles is a superficial philosophy. History in his view implies a systematic development of conduct, not only human but divine. Supernaturalism and dogmatism necessarily pervert all history; the bold awakening of the human mind, the aspiration after civil freedom, after individual liberty, after national existence, the succession of social changes or intellectual beliefs, the transforming influence of new ideas resulting in the abolition of old institutions as they become unsuited to each new stage of human progress are not and cannot be recognised on such a theory, except, in some measure, during those periods in which the strongest social force works in harmony with dogmatic predilection. Without any direct impeachment of Dr. Alzog's "regard for truth and strict impartiality," though he enjoys no immunity from the bias of tyrannising prepossession, we submit that no philosophic exposition of the Reformation, that great revolt against spiritual despotism, that priceless instalment of a renewed human freedom, of a new life for men and nations, can be looked for in his pages, abounding as they do in information, painfully elaborate in statement, arguing as they do diligence and research, and demonstrating as they do an extensive acquaintance with the historical, philosophical, and literary library. In spite of frank acknowledgments of scandals and abuses, of clerical profligacy, papal shamelessness, and documentary fabrication, the history before us is that of an apologist. It is thoroughly forensic in character, being not only a brief for the defendant, the Catholic Church, but a prejudgment against the plaintiff, Protestantism. We are well aware of the inherent weakness

¹ "Manual of Universal Church History." By Rev. Dr. John Alzog, Professor of Theology at the University of Freiburg. Translated, with Additions from the Ninth and last German Edition, by F. J. Fabish and Rev. Thomas S. Byrne. Three vols. Cincinnati, O. : Robert Clarke & Co. 1874.

of Protestant Christianity, in all its phases, and we admit the unreasonableness of its teaching, its excesses, its persecutions, its stultifications; but, for all its faults and shortcomings, it was an advance towards freedom, and light, and justice, and this advance Dr. Alzog does not recognise. How, indeed, could he do so? How could he recognise it, starting as he does with fixed conditions of inquiry, still believing in the old traditionary views of canonical and deuterocanonical books; still directing his criticisms against the phantom hypothesis of collusion among the evangelists, still regarding as authentic and entirely free from interpolation the testimony of Josephus to Christ; still quoting the epistles of Ignatius as genuine; still accepting the prodigies of Constantine's Cross and the Thundering Legion; still interpreting the natural phenomenon which accompanied the attempted rebuilding of the Temple as a divine interference, and accepting the alleged miracles which followed the death of Becket as a divine fact. Such a mental condition may indeed gain for a history the "sanction of the proper ecclesiastical authorities," but is little likely to endow the historian with vision to discern the true significance of the great European movement which commenced long before the Reformation properly so called. But we must say more than this. Dr. Alzog's prepossessions have led him, in some cases, to conclusions which we think untenable. Is he justified in affirming that Luther was "a glutton and a drunkard," or that Zwingli was "the slave of his appetites?" Is it correct to say that the famous "écrazer l'Infame" was directed against Christ, when it was certainly said of the Church of Rome. Granting that the doctrines of the Albigenses were objectionable, did their heresy or the suspicion of the complicity of the Count de Toulouse in the murder of Peter of Castelnau justify an extenuation of the crusades against the Albigenses, ordered by Innocent III., who afterwards acknowledged the groundlessness of the accusation, and prosecuted with the most atrocious barbarity under ecclesiastical guidance. Another point. By the safe conduct granted him by the Emperor Sigismund, John Huss was put under the protection of the empire. This safe conduct, Dr. Alzog contends, did not exempt him from deserved punishment. The Imperial mandate, indeed, was not binding on the Council, but Hallam shows that it was binding on the Emperor; his remonstrance when Huss was arrested proves that he considered it binding, and his acquiescence in the fiery sentence passed on the martyr was, therefore, a violation of his engagement. Dr. Alzog gives the decree of the Council in full, but he construes it in a sense more favourable than we can do. The decree in the Codex Dorrianus on the non-obligation of keeping faith with heretics he pronounces spurious. We should like to have the opinion of historical experts on this subject. Hallam quotes it as genuine. Coming to the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, Dr. Alzog, in common with nearly all historians, declares that it was not premeditated. That it was not promoted by the Court of Rome is, we believe, true, but it has, we think, been shown from the despatches of Ferralz that some such procedure had been urged upon Catherine

by the Duke of Ferrara and other foreign counsellors. Dr. Alzog explains away the circumstances attending the reception of the news at Rome. The details of the massacre were perhaps not known, but that a massacre had taken place was known and approved. There was a solemn procession and a public thanksgiving, and medals were struck to commemorate the event. The postponement of the illuminations, ordered by Gregory, till Ferralz had been officially informed of the fact seems to imply deliberate action, and these proceedings can scarcely rank as ordinary felicitations addressed by European sovereigns to a Royal personage on his preservation from some dire calamity. If the author now stigmatises the massacre as an infamous crime, and if the Pope of that day subsequently disclaimed all sympathy with it, Sorbin, the French king's confessor, it must be remembered, approved of it, and in Spain, Italy, and Switzerland the massacre was welcomed as an act of Christian fortitude. Many Jesuits wrote in its praise, and De Thou's history was put in the Index because he had disapproved of the massacre. But once more. In the account of the Inquisition given in these volumes the historian endeavours to palliate the iniquity of that terrific institution. Its crowning iniquity, scarcely an iniquity in his eyes, however, was its employment as an engine for the suppression of heresy, that is, for the coercion of the human mind, for the extinction of original thought. In Spain he pleads that it was used as an instrument of State policy, in which case the Pope, the Inquisitor-General, and the Crown must share the infamy of introducing and supporting a tribunal which, if Schopenhauer's estimate is correct, in the course of three centuries, doomed to a painful death in Madrid alone three hundred thousand human beings.

The Canon law and the Roman law, it is true, sanctioned the principle on which the Inquisition rests. Protestants have persecuted and defended persecution; but an infallible Pope, the only true Church, the authority which claims our undivided allegiance, ought to be exempt from the intellectual errors and passionate impetuositities of merely human institutions, and it is a poor defence of a power with world-wide pretensions that commonplace kings and fallible sectaries err and persecute as well. In the case of Guileo the conduct of the Holy Office, unsuccessfully palliated by Dr. Alzog, looks worse than it did under the light of those recent investigations, in reviewing which, in his second series of essays, Professor Zeller, following Emil Wohlwill and Gebler, gives strong reasons for concluding that the document of 1616, on which was grounded the accusation against Galileo in 1632, was a forgery. Admitting the existence of many bad Popes Dr. Alzog undertakes to clear the character of Alexander the Sixth, one of the worst of the number; but the testimony of John Burchard, his private secretary, to say nothing of Guicciardini, is fatal to this rehabilitation. The more recent period of Ecclesiastical history is treated in as unsatisfactory a manner as that of the Reformation. The old story of the Pope being a prisoner is repeated, and the concluding portion of the work is little more than a polemical pamphlet.

The greater part of the first two volumes, however, contains less questionable matter. For many centuries the Church was the principal civilising agent, and the many and great services which she rendered to mankind are fairly set forth in their pages. The translation by Dr. Parbush and the Rev. Thomas Byrne may be commended for its perspicuity. The translators have added some original matter of their own, and in some sections have used the text only as an outline for their guidance.

Mr. Ewer and Dr. Alzog would unite in condemning the adulterated presentment of Christianity known as Protestantism, but the author of the manual just noticed would emphatically dissent from the decision of the author of "Catholicism, Protestantism, and Romanism,"² when he applies to the Christianity of the only true Church the disparaging description so unobjectionable in his eyes when applied to the systems of Luther and Calvin. According to the reverend lecturer the theory of the Anglican Church is thoroughly Catholic, the tractarian movement and the ritualistic movement phases of a grand and necessary revolution, the issue being between rationalism and supernaturalism, and all symbolism though not in itself unimportant, yet but an outward expression of the real object which *his* Catholic Church has in view—the assertion of the doctrine of the Incarnation. In six addresses delivered at Newark, N.J., he proposes to show the sceptic why he should be a Christian rather than an infidel, a Catholic rather than a Protestant, and an Anglo-Catholic rather than a Roman Catholic. We submit that it would be difficult to prove that Anglo-Catholicism is the Faith once delivered to the saints; that Episcopacy was just as much an historical development as the Papacy, that Roman supremacy though not destined to be perpetual was a natural and opportune growth. We are further of opinion that Mr. Ewer is in error in refusing to St. Peter the designation of the Rock given him in St. Matthew, ch. xvi., v. 18, though we agree with him that the personal priority of the Apostle was not transmitted or transmissible to supposed successors.

The Christian Catholicity³ of a clergyman who many years ago, finding the dogmatic bed of the sixteenth century uncomfortably short and narrow, retired from the cure of souls in "the central church of no mean city," is widely different from that either of Mr. Ewer or Dr. Alzog. Proposing to forego all stereotyped declarations on the existence, nature, and condition of the Trinity, desiderating relief from the burden of bibliolatry or the yoke of scholasticism from the usurping majesty of Rome and the punier powers of Augsburg and Geneva, affirming that every professional jurist, every practical lawyer trained in the weighing, winnowing, and sifting of evidence would confirm the rapid and impulsive verdict of unsophisticated boyhood, to wit, that

² "Catholicism in its relation to Protestantism and Romanism." Being Six Conferences delivered at Newark, N.J., by Rev. F. C. Ewer, S.T.D. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1878.

³ "Chapters on Christian Catholicity." By a Clergyman. London: Trübner & Co. 1878.

Paley had brought no men into his witness-box but only "Manuscripts" of impeachable authenticity and genuineness, our clergyman trusts for his Confession of Faith to a mood or temper of the soul, taking cognisance only of spiritual principles and in no degree concerned with historic or traditional circumstance.

The bibliolatry⁴ which excites the displeasure of the late sufferer in the Procrustean bed of Theology seems likely ere long to become a thing of the past. Professor Robinson Smith, in his Article on the Bible in the "Encyclopædia Britannica," explains that the longest biblical history is a stratification not an organism, and contends that "all the earliest external evidence points to the conclusion that the synoptic Gospels are non-Apostolic digests of spoken and written Apostolic traditions, and that the arrangement of the earlier material in orderly form took place only gradually, and by many essays. Dr. Vance Smith, a member of the Bible Revision Committee, instructs us that many of its ideas on creation, on the Divine Being and His intercourse with men, and on various other subjects, are simply such as were suited to the infancy of the human race; while Dean Stanley does not hesitate to say it is now clear to all students of the Bible that the first and second chapters of Genesis contain *two narratives* of the creation side by side, differing from each other in almost every particular of time, place, and order. In the spirit of the free criticism represented in these quotations, Mr. Sunderland, from whom we borrow them, attempts to answer the question, "What is the Bible?" in the light of the best scholarship and in a reverend and Catholic spirit. Dissenting here and there from his conclusions or demurring to his conservative hesitations, we heartily commend his little volume as an admirable rationalistic account of the organised growth of our Bible and of the authorship, chronology, and character of the Books of which it is composed. It is concise, clear in statement, respectful in tone, and free from Philistine narrowness save in one instance, where the glorious Eastern love-song erroneously attributed to Solomon is described as an amatory poem which the author of "Don Juan" or of "*Laus Veneris*" might well blush to have written.

If the late Canon Kingsley, a man who strove to think, if ever man did, "whatsoever things are true, honest, just, pure, lovely, and of good report," had studied some of the books catalogued by Mr. Sunderland, he might perhaps have modified such uncritical discourses as those contained in a posthumous collection of unpublished sermons and addresses, entitled "True Words for Brave Men,"⁵ intended as a book for soldiers' and sailors' libraries, made at the request of a Colonel of Artillery, and having the sanction of an Army Chaplain of long experience, who knew the influence of his writings on soldiers and wished that that influence may live though he is no longer here. Plain living

⁴ "What is the Bible?" By J. T. Sunderland. New York; G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1878.

⁵ "True Words for Brave Men." By Charles Kingsley, late Rector of Eversley, Chaplain to the Queen, and to the Prince of Wales. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1878.

and high thinking are, however, beyond criticism, and Kingsley vigorously illustrates and enforces both as far as words can do in this selection of practical Addresses, which are very well suited to their purpose. The lecture on Cortez appears to us to countenance a questionable morality. "One good thing he did" says his adviser, "which was to sweep off the face of the earth as devilish a set of tyrants as ever defiled the face of the earth." Far from agreeing with this verdict, the able author of "The Intellectual Development of Europe" denounces the destruction of the civilisation of Mexico and Peru, as the enormous crime of Spain, contrasting the human sacrifices of the Indians with those of the auto-da-fè, "that gratification of spite, hatred, fear, and vengeance:" and affirming that at the time of the conquest "the moral man in Peru was superior to the European, and I will add the intellectual also."

"A History of the New Testament Times,"⁶ translated from the German of Dr. Hausrath, and included in the series published by Messrs. Williams and Norgate, is an attempt to unite that history to the chronological connexions in which it originally stood, to contemplate it not as a product but as a part of a more general historical process. In prosecution of this plan, Dr. Hausrath, in the first volume of his work, delineates with a picturesque erudition the physiognomy of the Holy Land, the political and social state of the country, the distinctive peculiarities of the parties then existing, the condition and feeling of the times since the commencement of the Roman dominion, and the career and character of Herod. To Dr. Hausrath's conclusion, that the sacred history is in some sense a fragment of universal history we assent, and so we think would Strauss, whom our author opposes, have done; but we cannot follow him when he contends that within a purely historical presentation there is no room for the poetical world of the religious Saga, convinced as we are that both legendary and mythical elements do enter into the evangelical record. While regretting that Strauss should have used the offensive word which our author censures (*humbug*), we cannot but express our surprise that with Strauss's beautiful analysis of the religious consciousness of Jesus before him, he can assert that Strauss was incapable of appreciating the power of religion. The mythical theory as Strauss first propounded it is, no doubt, untenable; but we are firmly convinced of its partial applicability, and though even in his popular "Life of Jesus" he may possibly exaggerate its importance, his main contention that the Gospel-narrative is made up of myth, legend, conscious fiction, and historical incident, is also ours. Nor do we see that Dr. Hausrath can in essential results greatly differ from Strauss since he rejects with flippant scorn the miraculous explanation of Christianity, throwing away what he calls "the crutches of miracle," on which orthodox belief supports itself, no less than the childish

⁶ "A History of the New Testament Times." By Dr. A. Hausrath, Ordinary Professor of Theology in the University of Heidelberg. "The Time of Jesus." Vol. I. Translated by Charles T. Poynting, B.A., and Philip Quenzer. London: Williams and Norgate. 1878.

vehicles used by the sentimental pietist Renan. If Dr. Hausrath concedes to Strauss that Christianity has no supernatural basis, if with Strauss he denies the Divine Incarnation and Resurrection, and rejects as magic the extraordinary power usually claimed for Jesus, then the Christianity of the Churches falls to the ground, and the belief of the Catholic and Protestant world alike rests, not, indeed, on imposture or deception, but on delusion. Nevertheless we are far from denying that there is a certain Christianity—a Christianity of feeling, not of dogma—of the soul, not of the intellect—recognised as we have hinted by Strauss himself, which Dr. Hausrath's learned labours may possibly serve to elucidate.

Dr. Hausrath atones in our opinion for his disparagement of Strauss by his eulogium on the splendid treatment of the internal criticism of historical sources evidenced by Dr. F. C. Baur in his "Church History of the First Three Centuries."⁷ His decisive verdict contrasts agreeably with the preposterous judgment passed on Baur's writings by the Catholic historian whose Manual we have already noticed. The epithets, silly, superficial, bigoted, as applied to Baur are strangely irrelevant, and it would be difficult to discover any Ecclesiastical history which could be called original if that of Baur can be justly described as wanting in originality. In his great work on the Apostle Paul, a translation of which is in the library of Messrs. Williams and Norgate, the public have already had an opportunity of appreciating the justice of such a critical estimate. In the translated portion of the first volume of Baur's "Church History" now before us they may further test the appropriateness of Dr. Alzog's dyslogistic epithets. Among the subjects illustrated in this instalment of Baur's searching historical survey are comprised the conflict of Paulinism and Judaism, their reconciliation; Gnosticism, Montanism, and Johannine Christianity. Baur's most masterly treatise, perhaps, is that in which he argues, convincingly to our mind, that the Fourth Gospel is not the production of the Apostle John, but a result of the religious life and thought of the second century. This once startling argument was sustained in an Article of some length in the *Westminster Review* for April, 1865. Since that time thirteen years have elapsed and in the interval the number of competent critics both at home and abroad who have adopted Baur's view has greatly increased.

In the catalogue of these competent critics we may place the name of Philip Desprez, a beneficed clergyman in Wiltshire, who, in a brief, but telling appendix to an able Dissertation on Daniel and John,⁸ adduces evidence to justify the opinion that the Fourth Gospel is not so much a record of the actual life of Jesus as a development of

⁷ "The Church History of the First Three Centuries." By Dr. Ferdinand Christian Baur, some time Professor of Theology in the University of Tübingen. Third Edition. The Translation from the German, edited by the Rev. Allan Menzies, B.D., Minister of Abernethy. London: Williams & Norgate. 1878.

⁸ "Daniel and John: or, the Apocalypse of the Old and that of the New Testament." By Philip S. Desprez, B.D., Vicar of Alvediston, Wilts. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1878.

mystical theology belonging to the latter part of the second century—a chronological determination which we think requires correction. The work in which this courageous admission of the non-genuineness of the so-called Gospel of St. John occurs, displays great ingenuity, considerable erudition, and a generally sound exegesis, and well deserves the commendation bestowed on it by Dr. Rowland Williams, when in his admirable introduction he describes it as a popular and lucid exposition. The peculiarities of the Book of Daniel long since awakened suspicion, even in this conservative country. Collins, who was deficient in learning, though not wanting in acuteness, gave very good reasons for questioning its genuineness. Bentley, a giant of erudition, was at least inclined to side with Porphyry, who held that it was written in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. Dr. Arnold daringly assigned it to the same period. Dr. Rowland Williams argues forcibly in favour of this view, and Mr. Desprez develops the theory with an almost exhaustive amplification. We believe that the time is not far distant when the opinion expressed by these three clergymen will become that of all candid inquirers. Into the merits of Mr. Desprez's Dissertation—a recast by the way of an earlier essay—we cannot now enter, but we invite attention to his substantially correct interpretation of the contents of the pseudo-Daniel; to the argument in favour of late date based on the variation of the texture of its Chaldee, detailed with so much force in the *Introduction*, and to the remarks on the Persian and Greek words detected in that mysterious book. Mr. Desprez happily connects this Apocalypse of the Old Testament with that of the New, the author of the latter having derived some of his imagery from that work. Here, again, we are glad to find ourselves in general accord with our enterprising expositor, who rightly seeks a basis for the marvellous superstructure of the Seer of Patmos in the contemporary history of the first century, appealing to the testimony of Tacitus, Suetonius, Dio Chrysostom, &c. In the wild intoxication of hope and fear, the early Christians looked for the immediate Advent of Christ to be preceded, however, by the return of Nero, who was supposed not to be really dead, but to be living beyond the Euphrates among the Parthians, with whose aid he intended to enter and destroy Rome. In identifying the self-slain Nero with "the Beast that was, and is not, and yet is," as also in his interpretation of "the number of the Beast" (the numerical value of the Imperial name, Nero Cæsar, being equal to 666), we think Mr. Desprez perfectly right. On some points, however, as is only natural in theological hieroglyphics, we dissent from him. Regarding the authority of Tacitus as decisive we should reject Julius Cæsar from the Apocalyptical list of the seven kings, among whom Nero paradoxically figures, as at once the fifth and the eighth, and commence with Augustus, the first undoubted Imperial sovereign or "King." Neither can we accept Mr. Desprez's ingenious attempt to identify the Beast of the Earth with the pseudo-Nero. The terrestrial monster is evidently an imaginary creation, an embodiment of pagan idolatry and false anti-Christian prophecy, and we see no sufficient reason for in-

vesting with these appalling attributes any of the impostors who after Nero's death personated the Imperial suicide.

A startling contrast to the Vicar of Alvediston's exposition is presented by the Apocalypse of the Rev. C. B. Waller,⁹ who is also a benefited clergyman. This gentleman is evidently "no witch at a riddle," for he gives up the number of the Beast. His dissertation, which is altogether pious and practical, displays little learning and less history. He talks much of the unfolding of the ages and of the grand process of universal restitution. In his view, the seven kings, or heads of the Beast, prefigure the seven blaspheming nations who persecuted the Jewish people. The Egyptian, Assyrian, Chaldean, Medo-Persian, and Grecian, are the five described as fallen; the Roman Empire is the one "that is;" and the other, who "is not yet come," is the Mahommedan power. These seven nations, after a painful but not eternal relegation to the Lake of Fire, are to be saved by a redemptive process discoverable in the Apocalypse and other Books of the New Testament. Nor will this redemption be confined to them alone. Seven other nations, after a temporary sojourn in Nirvana; the fallen angels, including Satan; in fact, all spirits whether of men or angels, will participate in this desirable consummation; for all punishment is remedial.

The Rev. R. B. Kennard¹⁰ is less explicitly Catholic in his inclusions. He appears to lean to the opinion expressed by the Rev. H. B. Wilson, in his speech before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, to content himself with the suggestion of a hope that the punishment awarded at the last day may prove to be remedial in its design and in its effect.

The religion of which Dr. Congreve¹¹ is the exponent is not embarrassed with speculations on the theological future of mankind. In a sermon commemorative of the services of Auguste Comte, he censures a prevailing neglect of the terrestrial past, the want of reverence to the dead benefactors of our race, and the deficiency of discipline and moral culture which mark the age.

Mr. Haweis is a somewhat illogical rhapsodist, who substitutes Eclecticism for Catholicism and paradoxically regards the scientific utterances of Darwin, Tindall, Huxley, and Herbert Spencer, as spiritual harmonies of the many souls which make up the living Church. His new volume,¹² however, contains much noble thinking and some good advice. In dealing with such questions as the Ethical end, the Drama, Alms-giving, and Sunday recreation, he shows both

⁹ "The Apocalypse viewed under the light of the Doctrines of the Unfolding Ages and the Restitution of all Things." By Charles B. Waller, M.A., Vicar of Woodford Bridge, Essex. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1878.

¹⁰ "Eternal Hope." A Sermon, by Rev. R. B. Kennard, A.M. Oxford and London: James Parker and Co. 1878.

¹¹ "Commemoration of Auguste Comte." By Richard Congreve. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1878.

¹² "Arrows in the Air." By Rev. H. R. Haweis, M.A. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1878.

courage and discrimination. "Not to admire" is evidently no part of Mr. Haweis's philosophy. The admiration of Mr. Whistler and his peacock feathers is almost boundless, but it is exceeded by that which he professes for the Beaconsfield policy and for the genius of Benjamin Disraeli, in which he discovers "the tenacity of the Hebrew" combined with "the far-seeing wisdom of the Christian Ruler."

"Genesis, with Notes"¹³ is a critical and philological study of the original accompanied by the Hebrew text without the vowel points; it contains a very elaborate analytical vocabulary which may prove serviceable to young students. Its exegesis, however, is prejudiced by an undue traditional bias and discoloured by a quasi-scientific affectation in the interest of orthodoxy.

Equally well-suited to readers of the old school will be found "The Annotated Bible," by J. H. Blunt.¹⁴

PHILOSOPHY.

DR. MORELL has given new proof of the historical insight and philosophical ability which he originally displayed in his "Speculative Philosophy of Europe" and his "Introduction to Mental Philosophy," by publishing a number of papers which he has written during the last fifteen years, to relieve the work of school inspection.¹ Some of these papers refer to the history of philosophy; and the "general reader" who wishes a howing acquaintance with the speculations of Leibnitz and Kant cannot do better than turn to Dr. Morell's pages. There is an attractive sketch of the different currents in recent German philosophy; and by the help of the diagram on page 89, the student will find no difficulty in tracing out the affinity between Kant and the thinkers whose work followed out the main results of the "Critique of Reason." It is, however, the second section of the volume that deserves to meet with most attention. The writer there discusses the question of Epistemology, and particularly asks, "What is the ground on which our knowledge of an external world rests, and where are we to find the sufficient reason for holding our conviction of it to be perfectly valid?" Dr. Morell's answer is that it is a spontaneously working hypothesis, which at last, by its agreement with all

¹³ "Genesis, with Notes." By Rev. G. V. Garland, M.A. London: Rivingtons'. 1878.

¹⁴ "The Annotated Bible. Being a Household Commentary upon the Holy Scriptures, comprehending the results of Modern Discovery and Criticism." By Rev. John Henry Blunt, M.A. "Genesis to Esther," with the General Introduction. Rivingtons': London, Oxford, and Cambridge. 1878.

¹ "Philosophical Fragments, written during Intervals of Business." By J. D. Morell, LL.D. London: Longmans. 1878.

experience, becomes a fixed and settled conviction. Just in fact, he explains, as the perpetual recurrence of the sensation of a mountain could only be satisfactorily accounted for by the hypothesis that the mountain is an external reality independent of the mind; so similarly, under the constant recurrence of a number of impressions, "the spontaneous logic of the nascent reason forms for itself the dim hypothesis of an external object, which subsequently, by innumerable trials, is confirmed, verified, and at length completely established as a fact." The third part of the work is an attempt to show the application of some of the doctrines of modern psychology to the principles of education. This part of Dr. Morell's work will be found particularly worthy of perusal; indeed, we have not often seen the relation of psychology to education so clearly traced; and these chapters (or rather lectures) on education are not unworthy to be placed side by side with anything Plato or Locke has written on the subject. Dr. Morell is vividly aware of the significance of accumulations of experience, mental residua, as he calls them, in education, and he connects the psychological phenomena of memory, association, habit, &c., in an admirable manner with the work of the teacher. Altogether Dr. Morell's "fragments" are marked by a greater combination of clear statement and stimulating thought than is commonly found in a writer on philosophy.

Signor Barzellotti, Professor of Philosophy at Florence, has published in an English dress, "principally through the kind initiative and intelligent co-operation of Miss Ida Lilian Olcott," a work which originally appeared in Italy in 1871.² It is to be regretted that the author has not availed himself of the occasion offered by this republication to amend the title of his essay. The reader who comes expecting a criticism of the moral and social philosophy of Comte in the "Ethics of Positivism" will undoubtedly be disappointed. It is, in fact, not the Ethics of Positivism but the Ethics of Empiricism, and moreover of English Empiricism, which Professor Barzellotti discusses. Title apart, however, the work is not without a number of valuable criticisms on English Thought. Psychology, Barzellotti insists, is to Bain and Mill merely a natural history of the mind; and "judgment, reason, inductive science, are all regarded under the new system as associations of facts and their concomitants." The real question in the free-will controversy is grasped by the writer more precisely than with many thinkers. The question, he sees, is not whether the mental struggle (in deciding on action) is the effect of law or not.

"The point at issue is, whether the individual contributes to the establishment of the law of necessity which it is contended determines mental facts. We ask whether the individual puts himself under the influence of that law through his own mental power. The question really is whether what the fatalist and determinist call vaguely *motives of action*, are such for the individual in so far as he makes and wishes them to be."

Nor does Signor Barzellotti content himself with maintaining in this

² "The Ethics of Positivism: A Critical Study." By Giacomo Barzellotti. New York: C. P. Somerby. 1878.

way the freedom of the will; he holds further that the positivist account of volition "implies by final analysis a denial of conscience." Stuart Mill is, therefore, he holds, inconsistent in postulating a real difference between right and wrong, and meanwhile asserting the determined character of will. Mill's "Utilitarianism" is itself the subject of frequent criticisms in the work.

"Mill," says Signor Barzellotti, "is mistaken, when from the mere fact that man is prompted to aid his fellow-creatures by sympathetic impulses he claims to scientifically deduce that such aid is for us a true moral obligation. For it is impossible to deduct or induct the most remote idea of the obligation to do or not something from the fact alone, from the fact not considered by the light of a superior principle" (p. 145).

A true science of morality cannot, therefore, Signor Barzellotti concludes, be built upon the psychological analysis of the English positivists.

"The perception of consciousness to which their analytical inquiry into the elements of volition, and of the idea of the moral end or the basis of association leads, compels us to substantially deny that we are responsible for our actions. It leads also to the denial of the reflective element, in reducing that element to appetite and desire, while it mistakes the spontaneous *succession* of internal facts for their causal nexus, their *quantitative* for their *formal* differences, and thus prevents the framing of a theory of responsibility and law" (p. 258).

Signor Barzellotti's work is evidently one which should be read by all those interested in English philosophy. It is always an advantage to see ourselves as others see us, and the exponents of "positive" psychology in England will do well to weigh the arguments which Professor Barzellotti has brought against the foundations of their moral science. It is matter for regret that the work is written in such English as is at times barely intelligible; and is disfigured by a want of learning which makes Democritus "speak of love and hatred," and refers the critical philosophy to *Edmund Kant*.

"The Devil's Advocate"³ is a work of more sterling qualities than its unnecessarily sensational title at first sight promises the reader. The title, notwithstanding, carries a real meaning with it. "The function of the Devil's Advocate in the spiritual courts of Rome is," the preface reminds us, "to contest the posthumous pretensions of new candidates for canonisation," and Mr. Percy Greg has assumed the place of this *diabolos* against the cherished ideas of the nineteenth century. The work, in short, is a free criticism of the leading characteristics of our age—an easy discussion of the social, political, and religious questions of the day. The framework of this criticism is a series of conversations between various *dramatis personæ*, who display and retain a greater amount of individuality than is usual in such compositions. Foremost among them is a Mr. Cleveland, who has retired from a life of journalism to the seclusion of the Cambrian Lakes,

³ "The Devil's Advocate." By Percy Greg, Author of "Interleaves." Two vols. London: Trübner & Co. 1878.

and, finding a wife in "a young girl, the orphan child of one of the most distinguished soldiers of the Southern Confederacy," provides the country house at which the conversations here reported are supposed to have taken place. Besides, we have Mr. and Mrs. Dalway, half-educated people from Manchester, Mr. Vere, the loyally-minded truth-following clergyman of the village, Mr. Gerard, a distinguished engineer, who has been the subject of several domestic afflictions, and the secularist and freethinker, Francis Sterne. The contents of the volumes are as varied as the characters by whom they are discussed. The advantages and disadvantages of anonymous journalism, of machinery and modern mechanical appliances, of party government, and similar topics, are examined side by side with questions which relate to the supernatural and the eternal. The tendency of democracy to put numbers in the place of brains is an *idol* which is frequently examined in Mr. Greg's two volumes. "Democracy," remarks Mr. Cleveland, "means in rich countries and ancient States, simply the surrender of all the conservative powers, all the stored energies and resources, all the organised strength of civilisation into the hands of domestic barbarism." Pessimism and cynicism, it need scarcely now be remarked, are not unrepresented in Mr. Greg's discussions. Modern humanity is "sheer effeminacy;" local government is the "disgrace of our legislation;" and female equality would be future slavery. With this last topic and its cognate questions considerable part of Mr. Greg's volumes are concerned. The subjection of woman is a subject which meets with little sympathy at Mr. Cleveland's hands. Among the educated classes, he maintains, nineteen-twentieths of the work is done by man, and fifteen-twentieths is done for women—a fact he thinks proved by the very arrangements of the household. Altogether the costliness of marriage is a subject on which Mr. Greg's *personæ* have much to say: and the questions of hereditary transmission, over-population, celibacy, &c., are discussed with a great deal of sound common-sense. But it is not merely to problems of social science that Mr. Greg's work is confined. The question of the relation of soul and body, of immortality and future life, are discussed with a methodical absence of method which may at times almost conceal the importance of the argument. Seldom, for instance, have we seen the argument for immortality as based upon the sense of compensating justice and perfection, put more clearly than in the following passage which we may be allowed to quote:—

"The longer we live, the more closely we examine our own motives and acts, and the consequences they entail, the more clearly do we discern an overruling power guiding most of our loyally meant unselfish actions—even when they seem to involve great and permanent sacrifices—to ends whereof we had not dreamt, and making every cowardly, vicious, selfish action, the cause of ultimate punishment. We feel that our lives are in very truth, from the cradle to extreme old age, an educational process. What use is this education if, when it ends, we end also? We are kept in school till nightfall, and our lessons are never completed till we pass out into the utter darkness. We have no opportunity here of putting to use a tithe of the experience bought with so much suffering; can see no possible earthly result adequate to the

misery we have undergone while grappling with tasks too heavy for our strength." (ii. 146).

And Mr. Greg does undoubtedly make a point in his remark (p. 148): "The argument for immortality is moral and religious: the argument against it is physical and practical: and it is exceedingly difficult to bring the two into relation so far as to balance the one against the other." "The Devil's Advocate" does not advance much that is new, still less much that is true, but it is at least free from the vulgar personal caricatures which blot a book to which it bears some superficial similarity—the "New Republic."

What Mr. Greg secures by a series of conversations, Mr. Aubrey de Vere seeks to attain by publishing a correspondence,⁴ and a correspondence, the preface further informs us, "which has arisen out of actual circumstances." The correspondents are known under the fictitious names of Proteus and Amadeus: and the object of the letters which pass between them is to discuss the validity of Materialistic explanations of the world. Proteus, whose "first deliberate sin" lay in reading Darwin's "Origin of Species" and similar books, has found the argument of design in the organic world annulled by the doctrine of evolution, and has come to regard matter as the only deity. His materialism, however, is decidedly against his feelings, and in his distress he appeals to his old tutor, Amadeus, to resolve the difficulties into which his intellect has brought him. The interest of the book centres, therefore, in the objections Amadeus brings against the evolution theory of creation. Some of those objections are not remarkable, either for their novelty or their conclusiveness: but there are others which will be found worthy of attention. Especially is this the case with the paragraph in which Amadeus shows that "selection" is not really able to explain a number of the phenomena to which it is commonly applied. Selection, he points out (p. 105) does not really explain the song of birds; and the beautiful cannot be resolved into its Darwinian equivalents. Evolution further, it is pointed out by Amadeus, does not itself oppose man's recognition of a divine purpose in creation, since mere natural selection "explains not the *origin* of a species, but simply its preservation." Proteus, however, remains unconverted; he sees the impossibilities of materialism; but he is "impotent to conceive the thought of God:" and the volume closes in a manner which bears out the genuineness of the correspondence. The result will probably surprise none who have understood the mental character of Proteus: and many will wonder whether it is by detailed criticisms of scientific formulæ that faith is to be restored. Far better would it have been if Amadeus had tried to expand and follow out his significant saying—"the book of Nature and the Holy Scriptures are equally the Word of God," and "an obscure passage in the one book is to be interpreted by a clear statement in the other."

⁴ "Proteus and Amadeus: A Correspondence." Edited by Aubrey de Vere. London: C. Kegan Paul. 1878.

The same problem as is discussed by Proteus and Amadeus is also the subject of Principal Dawson's work.⁵ The subject, however, is treated with much greater narrowness of view by Dr. Dawson than by Mr. Aubrey de Vere's correspondents. Dr. Dawson sees, indeed, that "true religion, which consists in practical love to God and to our fellow-men, can have no conflict with science;" but he is mainly anxious to show that the Mosaic account of creation corresponds with geological inductions. The work, therefore, is an instructive commentary on the first chapter of Genesis, and the Christian who is anxious to preserve the biblical theory of creation will be comforted by the concluding "comparisons," in which Dr. Dawson "reconciles" the scriptural and scientific views. Dr. Dawson has evidently acquainted himself with the chief results of modern geology; and his book will no doubt be found to be useful and instructive by a wide class of readers.

Mr. Richard Lowndes has been reading Kuno Fischer's "History of Modern Philosophy," and has been seized with an overpowering desire to communicate the facts he has found within it to the English public. More particularly he has been impressed with a sense of the importance of Descartes in modern philosophy; and he has accordingly translated the "Meditations" into English.⁶ To this he has prefixed a life of the philosopher himself; but not content with such an introduction to the "Meditations," he takes us previously through the whole course of Greek philosophy from Thales onwards. His sketch is not likely to give much new information to most readers, but younger students may find it of considerable service. The translation, so far as we have compared it with the original, seems fair enough work, but we should require to be more assured of the scarcity of Professor Veitch's version before we could regard Mr. Lowndes' labours as altogether laudable.

Dr. Waldstein has also been reading Kuno Fischer, and has thought it his duty to counteract the false antithesis of emotion and intellect, and other oppositions equally unfounded.⁷ But this object was, he implies, identical with the creation of a proper philosophical spirit, and the best means of producing this mental attribute was, he found, to give a short history of philosophy. And this is practically what "The Balance of Emotion and Intellect" turns out to be. As such a short sketch of the history of philosophy, the volume is entitled to the praise due to clearness and simplicity, but there will be differences of view as to the need of such a work, and as to the propriety of intro-

⁵ "The Origin of the World according to Revelation and Science." By J. W. Dawson, LL.D., Principal of McGill University, Montreal. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1877.

⁶ "René Descartes: His Life and Meditations. A New Translation of the 'Meditations,' with Introduction, Memoir, and Commentary." By Richard Lowndes, author of "An Introduction to the Philosophy of Primary Beliefs." London: F. Norgate. 1878.

⁷ "The Balance of Emotion and Intellect: An Essay Introductory to the Study of Philosophy." By Charles Waldstein, Ph.D. London: C. Kegan Paul. 1878.

ducing it under such a title. The conclusions which Dr. Waldstein draws from his survey of philosophy are that "though our emotions may be modified, tempered, and elevated through our intellect, still all knowledge, in order to become truly ours, must be *durchlebt* (lived through), must become a mood, must become emotional, and that education should try to harmonise aright the intellectual and emotional side of man."

Dr. George von Gizycki, whose monograph on Shaftesbury we noticed some two years ago, has renewed his studies among English thinkers by a treatise on the moral philosophy of Hume.⁸ He has approached the subject in the only way in which a great philosopher like Hume deserves to be approached—that is, by considering him according to his place in history; and the work accordingly commences with a sketch of the English moralists before the time of Hume, just as it concludes with a statement of the development of Hume's ethics in the hands of Hartley, Darwin, and others. Shaftesbury occupies, as he deserves to occupy, an important place in this preliminary sketch, and in a lengthy footnote we find ourselves reproved for some assertions we have made. Dr. Gizycki, it seems, does not regard Shaftesbury as the philosopher of the future, as we had inferred from his laudation of the "Characteristics," but simply, and we pray our readers to take notice of the fact (which, indeed, they will find already on p. 277, No. CI), as a thinker—or, let us be precise, for Dr. Gizycki says simply, *einen solchen*—"such an one as has provided the elements of a philosophy of religion, and, at the same time of an ethic, adapted to a genuinely scientific conception of the world." At any rate, Shaftesbury's Ethics is, we gather from the present treatise, the chief system among English theories of morals (*das Hauptsystem der englischen Moral*), and we learn also that Shaftesbury's *Inquiry* was composed before Clarke's Boyle Lectures were delivered. But if Dr. Gizycki supposed us to imply that Shaftesbury's writings were a *conscious* reply to the intellectualism of Clarke, he credited us with an interpretation which we did not expect our words to have. Hume's *Morals*, we should equally say, were a protest against the rationalistic school, but we do not know that we could point to many definite passages in support of this assertion. It was, at any rate, "the passions" which were especially discussed by Hume; and Gizycki rightly begins his statement of Hume's Ethics with an account of his analysis of these factors in our moral life. He sees that Hume's recognition of "a natural impulse which is perfectly unaccountable" constitutes a serious defect in his moral theory; but he does not point out the significance of the remark in the way Professor Green has done. He calls attention, however, to the want of "a teleology of the feelings" in Hume's analysis; and he notes the way in which Hume ignored the intellectual process which is the

⁸ "Die Ethik David Hume's in ihrer geschichtlichen Stellung: Nebst einem Anhang über die universelle Glückseligkeit als oberstes Moralprincip." Von Dr. Georg von Gizycki. Breslau: L. Koehler. 1878.

condition of the origin of certain forms of emotion. Generally, however, it is exposition rather than criticism which occupies the author, and he has translated very considerable portions of Hume's writings for the benefit of his readers. Special attention is called to Hume's statement of the disinterested nature of benevolence; and his account of justice is carefully analysed. To the work is appended an essay on universal happiness as the highest principle of morals.

Our space does not allow us to do more than mention a handy edition of Berkeley's "Principles of Human Knowledge,"⁹ to which Dr. Simon, "proposer of the Berkleian prizes in 1848 and 1850," contributes a delightfully polemical introduction; an elegantly printed translation of some of Pascal's "Thoughts;"¹⁰ a somewhat unintelligible criticism of H. Spencer's "Theories;"¹¹ and a short *brochure* from Melbourne,¹² to establish the relativity of rights and duties.

POLITICS, SOCIOLOGY, VOYAGES, AND TRAVELS.

MR. LANG'S¹ account of Cyprus is based upon the solid foundation of ten years' residence in the island, and the knowledge gained by him as a moderately large farmer, as a British Consul, and as a traveller and archæologist. His opinion of the climate must be taken with caution, since the experiences of our troops during the past few months; but there is great probability that he is right in saying that, to persons who live in accordance with its requirements, and inhabit places free from exceptional and removable disadvantages, it is not really unhealthy. This leaves the question open whether we can occupy seaports there, and still more the larger question whether it was worth England's while to spend her labour in doing the necessary repairs to the dilapidated property. There is no need to quote Mr. Lang to confirm the notorious fact that Cyprus may again become prosperous and valuable in the commercial world if a wise Government can do away with the ruinous results of a long slavery to

⁹ "The Principles of Human Knowledge. Being Berkeley's Celebrated Treatise on the Nature of the Material Substance (and its Relation to the Absolute); with a Brief Introduction to the Doctrine and Full Explanations of the Text; followed by an Appendix, with Remarks on Kant and Hume." By Collyns Simon, LL.D. London: W. Tegg & Co. 1878.

¹⁰ "A Selection from Pascal's Thoughts." By H. L. Sydney Lear. London: Rivingtons. 1878.

¹¹ "Free Notes on Herbert Spencer's First Principles, with Suggestions regarding Space, Time, and Force. Also Theories of Life." Edinaburgh: Edinaburgh Publishing Co. 1878.

¹² "Three Essays on Rights, Utility, and Positive Morality. Read before the Eclectic Association of Victoria by the Author." Melbourne: Boner and Watt. 1878.

¹ "Cyprus." By R. Hamilton Lang. London: Macmillan & Co. 1878.

Turkish folly, ignorance, and destructive misgovernment. Should we remain there and make touring possible, the name of the island of Cyprus will become as familiar to our ears as it was to those of our forefathers in crusading times.

The persistent, childlike, sublime faith still reposed in the Turkish Government by a portion of the English public is a most striking phenomenon. The facts of centuries disappear from before their eyes, and, gazing only on the natural productiveness of Turkey, they conceive to themselves what the condition of such provinces would be were they filled by an industrious and enlightened population, well-governed by an upright policy. And then they—for the moment represented by Mr. Austin²—proceed to calculate from these premises what security the holders of Turkish bonds have for their money. No one doubts that that unfortunate class would be a very fortunate one were the provinces of Asia Minor prepared for railway enterprise by “executing the auxiliary works of irrigation, colonisation, and reconstruction of highways and fountains.” Nor do they doubt that such works, followed by railways, would be beneficial for the country, nor that it has hitherto been difficult to dispose capitalists to promote such undertakings, and that therefore “it is the duty of the (Turkish) Government to provide for such deficiency.” What they more than doubt is the capacity of the Turkish Government either to comprehend or to carry out such sensible schemes. And a still larger number of readers will disagree with Mr. Austin’s jaunty assertion that the Osmanli alone are the fit and possible ruling people in Turkey.

The question of the removal of Indian troops to Malta is treated by Mr. R. S. Ross³ from the Government point of view, with a certain courageous and comprehensive grappling with all the arguments on the side of the Opposition, so as at the least to interest his opponents even if he fails altogether to command conviction. Mr. Ross rightly distinguishes between the question as one of constitutional right and one of political expediency. As to the question of expediency, it would be impossible to discuss that within a narrow space without reviewing the whole position of the country at the moment at which a step of such magnitude was decided upon. As to the constitutional question, if it is true, as Mr. Ross says, that the Opposition fail upon all its points, of which he enumerates eleven, then it is obvious that there is no constitutional bulwark whatever against the manufacture and use of just as many soldiers to be employed in Europe or elsewhere as happens to be pleasing to the Government in office for the time being. How far the Constitution, as it really exists, has guarded with punctilious eagerness against all the dangers thereby accruing, as more menacing to public liberty than almost any other imagined

² “Undeveloped Resources of Turkey in Asia, with Notes on the Railway to India.” By C. E. Austin, M. Inst. C.E. London: William Ridgway, 169, Piccadilly, W. 1878.

³ “Removal of the Indian Troops to Malta.” By R. S. Ross. London: Trübner & Co., Ludgate Hill. 1878.

perils, is quite a different question, and was the one to which naturally the chief attention was devoted in the late debate.

Mr. Latham⁴ points out, in the preface to his work on the "Russian and Turk from a Geographical, Ethnological, and Historical point of view," that, as this is chiefly a republication of two earlier books, his readers may rely upon his information and conclusions not being of the hasty kind that might have been suspected from the appropriate time at which they are laid before the public, but being the outcome of laborious study. The large and closely printed volume is a rich mine of information on Turkish history and religion, which many hasty writers on Turkey would do wisely to correct their mistakes by reading; of general central and Eastern European ethnological lore; and a couple of chapters resume shortly the early history and modern progress of the Russian Empire. The style in which Dr. Latham writes is a serious drawback to him. He has a mistaken notion that history is made living and vivacious by constantly using the present tense even in sentences into which the past also finds its way.

Captain Burnaby's⁵ place in literature has been decided by his former book. Those who relied upon his authority will enjoy his adverse comments on Mr. Gladstone, and will believe his report of the attitude of Armenians towards Russia. There are others who will disagree and doubt the unprejudiced impartiality of the account he gives. To those, the whole volume, brightly written as it is, will bear the appearance of a long and laboured assertion of one side of a contested question, or rather of the brief of a specially retained advocate. All roads, with Captain Burnaby, all conversations, all incidents of travel, lead up to the conclusion that the Russians are "unspeakable" and the Turks good fellows. A sick man understands him to be a "Protestant," and says that a Christian would not have given him medicine; and Captain Burnaby's comment is, "Throughout my journey I found Armenians and Greeks equally despised by the Mohammedans. It is a great pity that the votaries of Christianity in the East should have brought the only pure religion into so great disrepute." He appears to think that he has quite discredited the account of impelements by the Turks, because any Turks whom he questioned on the subject said such things were never done. When "the Constitution" was promulgated, Captain Burnaby was the guest of an enlightened Effendi, who said that the parliament was "possible in theory, but impossible in practice." To this sensible remark is appended as a note, "This is refuted by an official Despatch recently received from her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople." At Tokat a battalion was going to join the army, and a number of men were crying because they might not go to fight the Russians, but a muleteer was also weeping because his animals were found necessary for the service of his country, while five thousand

⁴ "Russian and Turk." By R. G. Latham, M.A., M.D., &c. London: W. H. Allen & Co., 18, Waterloo Place, Pall Mall. 1878.

⁵ "On Horseback through Asia Minor." By Captain Fred. Burnaby. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, and Rivington, 188, Fleet Street. 1878.

Circassians in the neighbourhood were prepared to join the Turkish troops. Three American missionaries reported to Captain Burnaby that they had never made a Mohammedan convert. He believes and endorses and illustrates the popular mistake that the Yezeds worship the Spirit of Evil, and indulges *à propos* of them as well as abundantly elsewhere throughout this volume in easy, light, contemptuous scandal against women in all parts of the world. Captain Burnaby's remedies for the present evils of Turkey would be courts of appeal presided over by Europeans, a gendarmerie under British officers, the military commands in Anatolia to be held by Englishmen. He is warmly in favour of the present policy of the present English Cabinet towards Afghanistan, and suggests that "with our money and our power of organisation we could recruit three million soldiers from British India if required. The offer of the loot in Moscow and St. Petersburg might prove attractive to Afghans as well as Sepoys." Captain Burnaby appears to be a sort of antediluvian coprolite surviving from an age in which the offer of "loot" was recognised as a motive to war from which a nation would not shrink back with shame and horror.

Mr. W. H. G. Kingston's ⁶ "With Axe and Rifle," can scarcely be called political or sociological, nor does it strictly fall under the head of travels, but it can be recommended as a very well-written volume of imaginary but possible adventures, and is highly entertaining to young people. It deals with life in the Western States about sixty or seventy years ago.

A short, clear, concise account of Cabul, to which is prefixed a fair map, is very acceptable just now, and there is no reason to doubt the substantial accuracy of Mr. Phil Robinson's ⁷ geography and history, until he comes to late days, as to which his political partisanship may lead him astray.

In a series of papers, some of which are reprinted from the more prominent periodicals, Mr. Arnold ⁸ discusses certain of the topics which form the subject matter of an advanced Liberal political creed. The first paper, which deals with the practical business results of Disestablishment as affecting the position of the Sovereign, and with the pecuniary arrangements of the present Church, will prove useful to many who fail to apprehend the importance of the question in that particular aspect. Mr. Arnold wisely points out how different the problem in England will be from what it was in Ireland; and rests upon very solid bases the conclusion that disestablishment will bring in due time great advantages to all concerned in it. "The abuses of a landed gentry," is an answer to Mr. Froude's vindication of the existing order of things in regard to the soil of the United

⁶ "With Axe and Rifle; or, the Western Pioneers." By W. H. G. Kingston. London: Sampson Low, Marston, & Co. 1878.

⁷ "Cabul, The Ameer, his Country, and his People." By Phil Robinson. London: Sampson Low, Marston, & Co. 1878.

⁸ "Social Politics." By Arthur Arnold. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co., 1, Paternoster Square. 1878.

Kingdom, and "Free trade in land" demonstrates the advantages enjoyed by the Colonies in the easy transfer of land. Mr. Arnold doubts whether the Liberal party and the Catholics can ever be natural allies, or even temporary ones again. He is in favour of the State ownership of Railways, of a more restrictive licensing act, and of many amendments in laws affecting the property and political position of women. We regret to be obliged to confine ourselves to this cursory notice of the mere subjects treated by Mr. Arnold, because there is, running through all he writes, a vein of earnest Liberalism and conscientious desire to further good government, and advance the best considered philanthropic schemes. We believe he is a suitor for parliamentary success at the next general election, and every British reformer ought to wish him well.

The readers of this REVIEW are mostly too well acquainted with the writings of Mr. Herbert Spencer⁹ to require to have their attention strongly directed to a cheap edition of one of the most popular of his works, that on Education. But in this particular case the appearance of the cheap edition is an event of peculiar importance, inasmuch as we believe only one of Mr. Herbert Spencer's works,—that on the study of Sociology, has appeared in a form which is at all likely to be read by any persons who are not plunging deep into the fathomless as well as limitless ocean of Mr. Spencer's general speculations on the universe, and all things contained in it. We doubt very much whether Mr. Spencer can have looked with a kindly eye on the project to republish the present work, and we are reminded in the preface, that the more expensive edition still continues on sale. And yet there is scarcely a work published in the present century which, on account of the common-sense and rational logic it embodies, the numerous and gross fallacies it annihilates, the apt combination of all that is best in the newest and oldest authorities, and yet withal the simple and interesting style in which it is written, better demands an all but universal circulation. Mr. Spencer's views of education as a task and an opportunity are more elevated than any that could readily be found elsewhere. He intimates in one place that it is only through education of the young, and especially that conducted by fathers and mothers, that some of the finest attainments in character, such as personal self-restraint, self-culture, sympathy, just-mindedness, perseverance, and absolute conscientiousness,—can ever be reached. Indeed, Mr. Spencer holds that these culminating merits are designed in the nature of things to be acquired in and through the process of educating the young, and in no other way whatever. In the present rage for expelling all boys from their homes at an early age, and driving them to seats of learning, where their main educators will henceforth be herds of other boys as young, ignorant, and intractable as themselves, it may be well to remind those best acquainted with Mr. Spencer's works of the following passage :—

⁹ "Education: Intellectual, Moral, and Physical." By Herbert Spencer. Cheap edition. Williams and Norgate, London. 1876.

"Whereas domestic and school discipline, though they should not be much better than the discipline of adult life, should be somewhat better; the discipline which boys meet with at Eton, Winchester, Harrow, and the rest is worse than that of adult life—more unjust and cruel. Instead of being an aid to human progress, which all human culture should be, the culture of our public schools, by accustoming boys to a despotic form of government and an intercourse regulated by brute force, tends to fit them for a lower state of society than that which exists. And, chiefly recruited as our Legislature is from among those who are brought up at such schools, this barbarising influence becomes a hindrance to national progress."

Mr. Stedman¹⁰ has given himself a task which is both easy and difficult. It is easy to put in small compass many of the outside facts of Oxford University life, such as the scope of the examinations, the best books to read, and the useful computation of probable expenses. But the endeavour to impart to outsiders the aroma or flavour of University life, and the hope to please insiders with that endeavour, must necessarily be in vain. Still, this volume will be eagerly consulted, and will be solidly useful to many.

A seventh edition of Mr. Spry's¹¹ account of the cruise of H.M.S. *Challenger* round the world is an amended, lengthened, and cheapened one. It is in smaller shape, but in good print, and is welcome as enabling a larger public to learn much that is interesting and valuable. Charm of style is not so much desired by the readers for whom this edition is meant as that which they will certainly find here—reliable various information.

Few persons will fail to be astonished at the bulk of information, the existence or need of which they had not realised, collected by Mr. Parsloe¹² in his volume on the railways of Great Britain. The statistics of railways appear to be complete, and the various systems of signalling and managing the traffic are luminously explained. As was to be expected from one so well and so practically versed in railway lore, Mr. Parsloe is strongly in favour of the control of our railways by the State; pointing out the great advantages, and combating all theories of disadvantage that would result from the carrying out of this idea. He believes that "a thorough measure of railway reform may give new impetus to the industries of Great Britain." The two concluding chapters notice some prominent features of continental, American, and colonial railways.

Three very able and opportune papers by Mr. Forster¹³ discuss "Checks upon Parliamentary Discussion," "Phases of Democracy in Europe," and "The Political Situation." In the first, it is suggested that one way of helping Parliament to get through its work would be always to give Government business precedence, and to give the sole

¹⁰ "Oxford; its Social and Intellectual Life." By Algernon M. M. Stedman, B.A. London: Trübner & Co. 1878.

¹¹ "The Cruise of the Challenger." By W. J. J. Spry, A.M. London: Sampson Low, Marston, & Co. 1878.

¹² "Our Railways." By Joseph Parsloe, London. C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1878.

¹³ "Political Presentments," By William Forster. London: Trübner & Co. 1878.

right of initiation of business to Government, and, at the same time, to refer many matters to committees. In the consideration of phases of democracy in Europe, Mr. Forster gradually comes to the conclusion that England is distinctly declining in power, and that that declension is owing to the growing power of the working classes. The political situation appears to the writer of these pages to be one in which, while Empire is gradually, but slowly and certainly, passing from England, Russia is "mistress of the situation." From these premises it may be inferred that Mr. Forster is an adherent of Lord Beaconsfield, but he refrains from deifying him or reviling Mr. Gladstone.

"*La France Contemporaine*"¹⁴ is a series of studies of French life and character, collected and edited by a German, but written by Frenchmen of various shades of opinion, mostly during the first two or three years after the Franco-German war. The earlier articles, by men of views as widely apart as M. Taine, the Count de Gasparin, and M. Proudhon, are on the general character of Frenchmen, of French institutions, and the state of France under the Empire. These are followed by amusing sketches of life among soldiers and working people. There are also curious peeps into the "unknown industries" of Paris, describing among others the retail dealers in broken meat, called "bijoutiers," the "guardian angels" employed by wine merchants and innkeepers to escort home customers unable to take care of themselves, and, above all, the rag merchants. These form a class, almost a clan, by themselves, some boasting that their families have been in the trade for six generations. Their honesty is proved by the quantity of articles of value that they hand over to the police, and it is a curious fact that for the last fifteen years no rag merchant's name has been found in any prison-list about Paris. There are other peeps behind the scenes that we confess not to have found altogether unmixedly pleasant reading, in papers called "Types of Parisian Life," the Literary Bohemians, the *Café Chantants*, the *Bal Mabille*, and others. One subject not to be overlooked by any unfortunate person who may happen to be ill in Paris is that of Parisian doctors, and the way in which it is asserted in this book that men can manage to pass examinations and take their degree as Bachelors of Medicine without any knowledge of their subject. The latter part of the book is occupied with subjects of the gravest importance, the decrease of population, the French system of baby-farming, the large numbers of idle men who live by gambling, and the excessive number of men and women in the service of the Church, and therefore unmarried, amounting altogether to 150,648 persons. Some of the most interesting papers are those on the Catholic Church in France, especially since its final abnegation of conscience and independence at the *Œcumenical Council*, and on the education given by clerical schoolmasters and mistresses, who, unlike lay teachers, need no other certificate than that of obedi-

¹⁴ "*La France Contemporaine; ou, Les Français peints par Eux-mêmes.*" *Études de Mœurs et de Littérature, recueillies et annotées par J. Baumgarten.* Cassel: Théodore Kay. 1878.

ence. After reading the papers by MM. About, Rénan, Schérer, F. Laurent, Quinet, and the Abbé Michaud, showing the meanness and feebleness of mind, the uninquiring ignorance of the very elements of Christianity, and the bitter hatred of all who are not like-minded, caused by this clerical education, we cannot but agree with the Count de Gasparin, that the greatest misfortune of France is that of calling herself the eldest daughter of the Church. We can but name the articles on Magic, Magnetism, and Somnambulism, and the very interesting one by M. Baumgarten on Spiritualism in Paris. We also recommend a careful reading of papers written in 1873 by M. de Pontmartin, Proudhon, and others, on the social decomposition caused by modern French literature, and on the writings of Victor Hugo, Balzac, and Georges Sand.

Mr. and Mrs. Macquoid¹⁵ publish another of the pleasant volumes in which they with pencil and pen seek to make English people well acquainted with those kin across the narrow sea, whose circumstances have kept them in a condition of mind and of manners so different from that which we have reached, that they seem quite foreign to us. It may well be that this sense of distance is partly owing to the fact that these Breton and Norman images reach us refracted by passing through a very fanciful and artistic medium, and those who, attracted by these volumes, set out for the French coast and hope to transport themselves some centuries back, may well chance to find themselves among a busy, chaffering, everyday folk, bearing no resemblance to these peasants of Mrs. Macquoid's. Not that her peasantry are not there, only they need the magic countersign before they show themselves, and it is not many of us who possess that in the same sense as Mrs. Macquoid. The illustrations, which have necessitated such a pleasant square shape for this volume, are quite worthy of the artist. Not the least lovely of the stories in the volume is the true story of the Lord and Lady of La Garaye, who devoted their lives to the care of the sick.

Miss Yonge¹⁶ continues her useful work for young people in many directions by publishing a short, well-written compilation of Spanish History from the time of the Goths to the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, embellishing it with selections from the romance and poetry with which the idea of Spain is always bound up.

Mr. G. F. Rodwell,¹⁷ Science Master in Marlborough College, was surprised, when preparing an account of Mount Etna for the "Encyclopædia Britannica," to find that there is no history of that mountain in English. He accordingly publishes an enlarged edition of his Encyclopædia article. Unfortunately the proverbial—though by no means invariably real—dryness of an Encyclopædia has haunted his pen, and though apparently it would be difficult to find any more facts about

¹⁵ "Pictures and Legends from Normandy and Brittany." By Thomas and Katherine Macquoid. London: Chatto & Windus, Piccadilly. 1879.

¹⁶ "The Story of the Christians and Moors of Spain." By Charlotte M. Yonge. London: Macmillan & Co. 1878.

¹⁷ "Etna: A History of the Mountain and of its Eruptions." By G. F. Rodwell. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co., 1, Paternoster Square. 1878.

Mount Etna, the volume is not at all amusing reading. Indeed, unless a mountain asserts itself by doing either some great harm, as Vesuvius, or offering perils to pedestrians, as the Matterhorn, it is perhaps difficult to arouse popular interest in it by itself. Now Mount Etna, far from being a terror which repels and attracts different classes of the community, is a fertile, hospitable mountain, so high and so easily accessible as to be likely to be the home of an observatory, and so fertile on its slopes as to be signally thickly populated, while its eastern base has particularly good harbours. Mr. Rodwell does not fail to quote various classical authors, nor to give some idea of the myths and ancient speculations concerning the classical volcano, on whose side the tower of Empedocles is still shown.

Mr. Lockwood¹⁸ has produced a very charming little volume on the "Natural History of India." It occurred to him that though every man is not a White, yet an Indian district officer ought to be able to observe much more widely than an English clergyman in a little country parish, and so he set to work to record his own experiences in Monghyr. He points out one very interesting fact, that whereas song-birds and small birds generally are rarely to be found in the primeval forest or jungle, they increase as civilisation and cultivation advance, profiting by man's industry, and serving in turn to increase his food supplies. Besides the plant and animal lore so cheerfully and lightly imparted by this pleasant book, Mr. Lockwood's incidental information about the people is interesting. He reports that the relations of Englishmen to servants and to natives generally are much improved, at the same time the vices of Europeans are so odious to the natives, that many a man who reads and obeys the Bible and its teaching would fear the evil reputation attaching to the name of a Christian. As to the opium monopoly, the disastrous effects of which do not immediately force themselves on the attention of officials in India, Mr. Lockwood appears only to foresee the temporary distress that would be occasioned by changing the opium grounds into grain-producing land. But he points out how indigo and tobacco are profitable crops in Bengal. For those who wish to gain an idea of the productive capacities of Bengal, a better small book than this could scarcely be recommended to accompany Mr. Grant Duff's "Notes of Indian Travel" published two or three years ago.

Mr. Aylward¹⁹ was, or is, a commandant in the Transvaal Republic, and was captain of those Lydenberg volunteers whose exploits against the Kafirs he lauds as having been self-sacrificing and self-restrained, but who were disbanded in the belief that they had been ferocious beyond all possibility of excuse. It is Mr. Aylward's intention to write as representing no special party, but practically he puts the case of the Boers against the English annexation with great force, while he

¹⁸ "Natural History, Sport, and Travel." By Edward Lockwood. London: W. H. Allen & Co., 13, Waterloo Place, Pall Mall, London, S.W. 1878.

¹⁹ "The Transvaal of To-day." By Alfred Aylward. William Blackwood & Sons: Edinburgh and London. 1878.

indignantly scouts the English answer that the relations between the Boers and their "native" neighbours were such as to imperil the whole European colonies in South Africa, and thus to compel the interference of England in self-defence; nor does he appear aware how convincing evidence has been laid before our Colonial Office, that kidnapping and slavery of Kafirs are so common as to be almost usual among the Boers. But this must be said without adding that the English colonists behave so much as decently well to the native tribes. On all hands the tendency is for colonists and English military men in Africa, both from cowardice and ferocity, to bear hardly upon the tribes, and only a careful and impartial weighing of voluminous evidence can enable any one to unravel, sufficiently for forming a fair judgment, the tangled skein of South African politics.

It is a most encouraging sign of the times, not only that a Church of England clergyman can be found to deliver, but still more that an agricultural congregation can be found to listen to, such discourses as those which Mr. Stubbs²⁰ publishes on the more burning points of the questions between the poor and the moderately rich. It is not so much that he has much to add to what has already been said elsewhere; but it is that to have so free advocacy of the claims of the poor to fair and equal treatment sounds almost like a new revelation from Heaven, because it is surrounded by the conventions which have for generations prescribed a quite different, not to say diverse, order of thought in Church of England pulpits. One quotation will suffice to indicate how Mr. Stubbs surprises his former hearers:—

"But by this time I fancy I hear some one exclaiming, These surely are not principles to which we ought to listen from a Christian pulpit! Christianity teaches obedience to those in authority, teaches meekness and submission, not insubordination and rebellion. My friends, it is true Christianity does preach meekness and submission. But did it ever strike you to ask on whom it is that Christianity enjoins these virtues? Do you suppose it means that the poor are to be meek and submissive towards the rich? It is the rich and great and strong whom the Gospel specially requires to be humble and meek."

He boldly advocates the Labourers' Union, insists on the necessity of better education for agricultural children, and looks to the extension of the County Franchise to work great good throughout the country.

The attention that trades unions have of late paid to the reform and codification of the Criminal Law is both a remarkable phenomenon in itself, and is extremely creditable to the prescience, self-dependence, and general intelligence of the members of those unions and of their leaders. Whether or not the Attorney-General's Criminal Code Bill will pass into law during the present session may be found to depend quite as much on the interest in it manifested by the working class constituency outside, as on the nature and extent of the professional

²⁰ "Village Politics: Addresses and Sermons on the Labour Question." By Charles William Stubbs, M.A., Vicar of Granborough, Bucks. London: Macmillan & Co. 1878.

criticism inside the House. Mr. E. D. Lewis,²¹ in his paper read before deputies of the Trades Union Congress at Bristol last September, has rendered a useful service in pointing out in a way intelligible to everybody, some of the lurking dangers to public liberty, and especially the liberty of the working classes, which are imbedded—no doubt often through mere negligence—in various sections of the Bill. Mr. Dillon himself advocates far greater changes than the Bill in question contemplates, and his recommendations tend to extend the potency and variety of the methods of relief now confined to the Civil Courts and trials to criminal cases. The pamphlet, though small, may be read with benefit by every one.

Dr. Fauconnier²² is right in considering that the social question—or rather one of the most pressing social questions—of the hour is concerned with the future of rent, interest, and the condition of society in general, as estimated by the relation of class to class. But Dr. Fauconnier belongs to the rather numerous class of French writers who—either from being farther off from or nearer to the realisation of their theories than Englishmen are—seem to misunderstand or underrate the true difficulties of their subject. There are very few of the leading thinkers in England who have a shade of doubt as to the real ends which they would wish society some day or other to attain; and it is not from any abstract preference for the existing relations of the landlord, the tenant-farmer, and the labourer, or of the man who lends money and the man who borrows it, and still less of the aristocratical and monarchical constitution of a large part of society in every European State, that English writers write less on such subjects than do foreigners. It is rather that the whole of this class of subjects has been thoroughly thrashed out by an advanced school of thinkers in England who obtained and still obtain a far better hearing in England than the Encyclopædists and their followers have ever met with in France. No part of Mr. Mill's Political Economy is more interesting than that in which he discusses adequately and yet briefly all the schemes which have ever been suggested or, as it would almost seem, could ever have been suggested for reconstituting the social and economical relations prevailing in countries at the existing point of European civilisation. Dr. Fauconnier will doubtless remember the general result of Mr. Mill's inquiries, that the most promising and beneficial schemes for human improvement have mainly failed, and are likely to fail again, from the failure of those who took part in them to attain the amount of personal virtue imperatively exacted by the very nature of the schemes. So far as these schemes have succeeded in a few solitary instances, it has been among a limited number of persons, possessed of a more than ordinary share of the spirit of self-renunciation and public zeal. The defect, when once felt, re-enforces the

²¹ "A Paper on the Codification of the Criminal Law of England." By Edward Dillon Lewis. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co., 1, Paternoster Square. 1878.

²² "La Question Sociale." Par E. Fauconnier. Paris: Germer, Baillière, et Cie., Boulevard Saint-Germain. 1878.

institution of some form of organised government and law, and above all, of education. Thus, in no short time, the old abuses and corruptions, against which Dr. Fauconnier raises his voice, creep in afresh. Inequalities and tyrannies revive; Capital wars with Labour; Interest—the right hand of commerce—becomes the iron rod which strikes the embarrassed poor to the ground; the land of the State becomes absorbed afresh by selfish and everlasting proprietors, and the dreary cycle would recur afresh were not human improvement rendered really possible by a patient philosophic dealing with each giant evil, as in turn it becomes possible to apply a remedy.

A somewhat pertinent question is asked by "Senex,"²³ who describes himself as "a true Conservative," as to whether the British Empire can "be long maintained in all its integrity under the unrestricted and unreciprocated Free Trade (rather Free Imports) policy." We have a good many such questions and treatises laid before us by Colonial and American writers, but only now and then does such a work crop up in England, and it may at once be conceded to the supporters of Protection that Senex's treatise is hardly of the kind in which the strength of their cause is adequately represented. The preface, indeed, of Senex's work is rather alarming, not to say astounding, in some of its utterances. It contains an extract, quoted apparently with strong approval from "a writer of recent date,"—the author of "Physical Science" compared with the Second Beast or False Prophet of Revelation. Part of the extract runs as follows:—

"I think then, that Political Economy may be the 'buying and selling mark.' Now it is said that the Beast 'causes all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond,' to receive the mark. The small may be those of small account; yet there is another way in which (in this case at least) the 'small' may be understood. In England Political Economy is taught in schools. I mention this because, though all know how it is forced upon 'rich and poor, free and bond,' all may not know how some of the 'small' have it stamped upon their helpless little foreheads."

The author adds in a note—as another interpretation, we presume, of the term "small"—that "of seven prizes given this year by the Cobden Club to the most successful students of Political Economy in connexion with the Cambridge University Extension Syndicate for conducting local lectures, five have been awarded to female competitors. The winners are Gertrude Gregson, Sarah Smithson, and so forth." Senex also cites a note from the same author, which says, "Dr. Adam Smith, the father of the modern science of Political Economy, was an avowed infidel. Whose is this image and superscription?"

Mr. R. W. Phipps²⁴ has published a very minutely printed pamphlet, which is alleged, on a slip of paper attached to the back, to have

²³ "The British Empire and the Free Imports System." By Senex. London: William Ridgway, 169, Piccadilly. 1878.

²⁴ "Free Trade and Protection, considered with Relation to Canadian Interests." By R. W. Phipps, Toronto. Toronto: Bell & Co., 13, Adelaide Street East. 1878.

been one of the principal means of influencing the late Canadian elections in favour of protection. The writer brings forward the arguments which are now pretty familiar to the tolerant political economist in this country. We are told that the home demand for farm products in Canada from non-farmers is now four times what is exported. The more factories they get, the greater is said to be their home demand. "People who back up the great trading combination, which, under the name of Free Trade, is draining the land of its strength, insist that Liverpool rules our prices." The path of self-dependence, in respect of food and manufactures, is said to be the path to greatness, to wealth, to national honour, broad, clear, and open. There is another path. We are on it. It leads to our becoming a poor, dependent, and despised portion of the United States. There is no third course."

Mr. Turnbull Thompson³⁵ publishes his lucubrations in all manner of social, moral, physical, and theological themes in a state of mind most foreign to the ordinary one. He endeavours manfully to carry out into infinite detail his theory that all truth is capable of mathematical demonstration and illustration: and he incidentally makes it known to his readers that he much objects to all modern progressive ideas as to the position of women; that he is an admirer of Buddhism and a Scotch Christian, as well as a man who has seen life in several parts of the world, and has contrived in a colony to supply himself fairly well with modern books. But his mathematical diagrams and arguments are "prodigious!"

Mrs. Loftie's³⁶ little yellow book is as bright and vivacious throughout as it is outside, and will pleasantly fill up many an idle few minutes. She deals in a kindly and humorous spirit with the social foibles and difficulties of the day, and drops many a wise word and hint by the way which may bear good fruit where the graver teachers of morals and good manners, and good sense find no admittance; while she aims a shrewd blow now and again at some popular but foolish remedies for our social difficulties.

Mr. Appleton Morgan³⁷ of New York, in his address delivered before the Manhattan Liberal Club, endeavours to point out first, that if there is any argument for copyright at all, that argument is quite as good in favour of International as of National copyright, and that by very slight changes in the existing American law, which secures no copyright to foreigners publishing in the United States, the greatest possible advantage might be reached both for American and British publishers. Mr. Morgan notes also that the one reason why the English author does not come to the American publisher is, that by his own laws, by his own British statutes, a prior publication in

³⁵ "Social Problems: an Inquiry into the Law of Influences." By J. Turnbull Thompson. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1878.

³⁶ "Forty-six Social Twitters." By Mrs. Loftie. London: Macmillan & Co. 1879.

³⁷ "International Copyright," an Address delivered before the Manhattan Liberal Club. By Appleton Morgan, Esq., New York. Cookroft & Co. 1878.

America deprives him of his copyright at home. Mr. Morgan submits that :—

“The reason why English authors cannot have a field for the sale of their literary property in the United States is simply because their own laws refuse it to them, and it is a little hard that our long-suffering people should be characterised as ‘pirates’ and ‘thieves’ and ‘highway robbers’ because our English cousin has been so short-sighted as to pick his own pockets in his own Parliament, and under his own lion and unicorn.”

Of course, over and above the competing interests of publishers and of authors, and the due encouragement to literature, the wider and preliminary question has to be settled as to what are the limits in the interest of society as a whole, which are to be opposed to the claims to copyright of any individual persons whatever.

M. Alfred Fouillée,²⁸ in some articles partly republished from the *Révue des Deux Mondes*, on the modern idea of Law in Germany, England, and France, discusses with considerable ability and with not more, perhaps, than a due spirit of national self-laudation, the leading moral ideas which underlie the conception of abstract law in the leading schools of European thought. The reader will naturally turn first to see what is made of English Utilitarianism, to which M. Fouillée devotes considerable space. Though the writer seems to appreciate fully the true historical development of English Utilitarianism from the days of Hobbes and Adam Smith to those of Mr. Mill's latest essays, still we do not think he really apprehends the position that utility properly understood must hold in every complete theory of morals. M. Fouillée seems to think that the English have an exceptional national *penchant* for narrow and confined modes of ethical thought; that, though for a moment, in an ideal and inconsistent philosophical spirit, they may roam abroad and think of others, persons and nations, than themselves, yet in the very construction of their “common law” they instantly return to the narrowest and most selfish view of society, and build up their legal system on the foundation of personal interests, and not on the broad abstract principles which must, somewhere or other, underlie a code. In proof of this the writer cites Mr. John Austin and Sir H. S. Maine, and it may be conceded at once that M. Fouillée discloses no deficiency in the learning appertaining to the wide topics he handles. In the later part of the work, where modern France comes on the scene, an ideal portrait of a great and reviving nation is drawn with a skilful and loving hand. France pays her debts, re-establishes her emptied treasury, refunds her Government, vindicates her private liberties, and satisfies the personal aspirations of her citizens,—because she thinks little of herself and much of the great world outside. This surely is the peaceful interpretation of the ill-omened boast that France was the only nation that made war for an idea. We need say no more, except that M. Fouillée's work, even so far as it concerns

²⁸ “L'Idée Moderne du Droit en Allemagne, en Angleterre, et en France.” Par Alfred Fouillée. Paris: Hachette et Cie. 1878.

France, is far from foolishness, and that if it does no more than afford a stimulus to a more searching inquiry into the true and lasting points of union between the ethical aspirations of the best men, in some of the most studious and most hopeful portions of European society, the work will prove one of the not least valuable of the present year.

For lovers of war and lovers of peace also, Major-General Upton's "Account of the "Armies of Europe and Asia" will be found to contain many useful lessons. He was sent, with other officers, round the world, to report to the United States Government upon the military condition of the principal nations, and their systems of training for the army and navy, and the task appears to have been thoroughly performed. Major-General Upton notes that armies in Asia are maintained to keep peace within the national borders, while in Europe the vast armaments are rather for purposes of aggression, and are therefore the best military models. It is curious to observe how the military idea has eaten into the heart of the American people. When Major-General Upton thinks that the want of an elaborately organised army is one of the chief reasons why China is behind the age, perhaps he means that China might have successfully resisted our resolve to force opium upon her had she been better armed. He also somewhat fantastically suggests that one of the fruits of her adopting "Christian civilisation," and educating her soldiers and sailors, would be that she would be more respected as a military Power. He takes no note of hospital or sanitary arrangements for the army which are becoming matters of increasing importance from many points of view.

A most useful "Class-book of Geography"⁸⁰ by Mr. C. B. Clarke, has been sent to us by Messrs. Macmillan. It is in fact a handbook of information often needed by readers of newspapers, and given clearly, graphically, and in as compact a form as possible. Besides a description of the extent and general physical conformation of the countries described, there is a short account of the races inhabiting them, their languages, their history and political constitution, and their religions. This information is brought down to the present year. Thus the account of the Turkish Empire comes to the end of the late war. But there seems to be some confusion in still giving the name of Turkey to Roumania and Servia, and we fail to understand how Montenegro ever belonged to Turkey in any way. Our own colonies and the various States of America are carefully described, and a good account is given of the latest discoveries in Africa. Section xxviii. on India will be found very useful. Altogether we can thoroughly recommend this little book, not only to teachers, but to general readers. It is short, and yet strips geography of all the horrors of abstraction, which have long made it so repulsively dull.

⁷⁹ "The Armies of Europe and Asia." By Major-General Upton. Griffin & Co., The Hard, Portsmouth. 1878.

⁸⁰ "A Class Book of Geography." By C. B. Clarke. Macmillan & Co., London. 1878.

Mr. Smith³¹ reissues his "Handy Book of the Law of Husband and Wife," in an enlarged form. It is convenient in size, and might with advantage be more largely read than it is likely to be, for the facts, stated in terse, plain language are surely glaring enough to compel a reform of much that is absurd and unjust in this law. For instance, a man might advantageously be made liable directly to his wife to support her, instead of being, as he now is, only liable to be called upon to refund what the poor-law authorities may have spent upon her when left destitute. The fact that a wife is not held criminally responsible if she steals from her husband, probably results from the other fact that whatever she has (however acquired) is his by the common law, and so she cannot steal from him, although the things she has taken be his, not hers. It is interesting to observe how the law has been notably altered in several respects in favour of men, within the last forty years.

Mr. Hyde Clarke's³² very compressed Paper, read before the Statistical Society, on the Debts of Sovereign and Quasi-Sovereign States owing by foreign countries, has an interest and value far out of proportion to its length. The whole history of the subject, up to its most recent developments and to the discussions based upon them, is brought clearly before the reader; and, apart from the voluminous reports of select Parliamentary Committees, it would be difficult to find anywhere so helpful a résumé of the intrinsic difficulties appertaining to the subject. One question discussed by Mr. Clarke in some detail, is one likely just now to become of increasing importance, that is, the liability under international law of the portions of a divided State for its debt towards home and foreign creditors.

Even a compendium³³ of Acts and Regulations respecting the Public, Separate and High Schools of a British colony, could only be fairly described by transcribing the Acts and Regulations word for word. Still, it is satisfactory to know that such Acts and Regulations, descending to the minutest details, and based on a large-minded view of national education, exist, and are no doubt far better than those in the older countries of Europe. The following regulations are perhaps worthy of particular notice:—to the effect that an application by twelve householders is needed in the case of a desire to establish separate schools either for Protestant or for coloured children, while in the case of a desired Roman Catholic school, a request from five householders only suffices.

³¹ "A Handy Book on the Law of Husband and Wife." 1878. By James Walter Smith, Esq., LL.D. London: Effingham Wilson.

³² "Sovereign States and Quasi-Sovereign States: Their Debts to Foreign Countries." By Hyde Clarke, V.P.S.S. London: Effingham Wilson. 1878.

³³ "Compendium of School Law and Regulations. Education Department, Ontario." 1878. Toronto: Hunter, Rose, & Co.

SCIENCE.

THE art of Scientific Discovery¹ is an attempt rather to record some of the conditions under which discoveries have been made than to lay down laws by which special departments of knowledge may be enlarged. Yet the author believes that in this way direction and encouragement may be given to those in whom a passion for the attainment of new truths has dawned, which will bear fruit in better conceived researches, which will lead a larger number of men to important results, or save them from work which can only end in failure. All through the five parts and sixty chapters the volume is clearly and attractively written, and if the scientific man who is already engaged in research finds little in the book that will modify his labours, it may be safely said that the work is admirably fitted to exercise a great educational influence in the hands of the general reader, by fairly setting forth a survey of the nature of scientific research which is as interesting as it is instructive.

Mr. Proctor of all writers of our time best conforms to Matthew Arnold's conception of a man of culture, in that he strives to humanise knowledge, and divest it of whatever is harsh, crude or technical, and so make it a source of happiness and brightness for all. His latest book, "Pleasant Ways in Science,"² especially has this nature, and covers a wide field. It treats of oxygen in the sun, relations between sun-spots storms and famines, new ways of measuring the sun's distance, marvels of telegraphy, the phonograph, strange sea creatures, the gorilla, use and abuse of food, Babylonian astrognosy, and other subjects, to the number in all of eighteen; being a reprint of papers which for the most part have appeared in periodicals. Some of the essays are brief and inadequate, such as that on Mr. Mallet's theory of volcanoes; but even in this the author contrives to give some idea of the most important contribution to geological science since the days when William Smith proclaimed the identification of strata by fossil remains. And other of the essays, such as those on dew, the levelling power of rain, &c., indicate that Mr. Proctor cannot even acquire old knowledge for his delight without attempting to write about what seem to him its more interesting aspects. But several of the Papers are more ambitious, and full of thought and excellent reasoning.

Mr. Blanford has issued, in the report on the Meteorology of India³ for 1876, a second year's observations. It consists of a summary of

¹ "The Art of Scientific Discovery; or, the General Conditions and Methods of Research in Physics and Chemistry." By G. Gore, LL.D., F.R.S. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1878.

² "Pleasant Ways in Science." By Richard A. Proctor. London: Chatto & Windus. 1879.

³ "Report on the Meteorology of India in 1876." By Henry F. Blanford, Meteorological Reporter to the Government of India. Second year. Calcutta: Office of the Superintendent of Government Printing. 1876.

the various meteorological phenomena observed during the year in different parts of the country, described under the heads of Temperature of Solar radiation, Temperature of Nocturnal radiation, Temperature of the Air, Atmospheric pressure, Winds, Hygrometry, Cloud and Rainfall. All these subjects are treated in a manner which shows how thoroughly the Indian Government is alive to the important influence of meteorological conditions upon the prosperity of our Indian Empire. There are a few useful maps showing temperature, pressure, and wind direction for the several months of the year, but the greater part of the volume consists of appendices, which give the substance of the observations made in various parts of the country by the local observers.

The present instalment of Indian Meteorological Memoirs⁴ comprises three articles. The first, on storms in Bengal during the year 1876 accompanied by increased atmospheric pressure, and the apparent reversal of the normal diurnal oscillation of the barometer, written by J. Elliott. The second Paper is on the rainfall of Benares, considered in relation to the prevailing winds, by S. A. Hill, B.Sc. And the third, on the diurnal variation of the barometer at Indian stations, in particular Calcutta and Hagaribagh, by Mr. Blanford. These Papers are elaborate discussions of the phenomena to which they refer, and are contributions to meteorology of great interest and value. They embrace a large amount of information in a tabular form, and are illustrated with various diagrams.

The report of the Indian Meteorological Department⁵ gives an account of the various meteorological stations in India, with the names of their superintendents and assistants, an account of the apparatus in the different observatories, and indications of the nature of the work done, with a list of donations of books and other additions to the library of the department. There are also extracts from special reports of inspectors. It appears to indicate an unusually large amount of important work done, and speaks of tabulated observations in the Indian seas received from the Marine department of the British Meteorological office as furnishing data of the highest value to navigators.

Kinahan's "Geology of Ireland"⁶ is a worthy exposition of the structure and geological history of the sister island, which, for conscientious labour and faithful exposition of facts, is likely to stand pre-eminent among works of its class for some time to come. It begins with an introduction, which is too brief, and gives a short account of the physical features of Ireland, sets forth the classification of rocks

⁴ "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. Vol. I., part II. Calcutta: Office of the Superintendent of Government Printing. 1878.

⁵ "Report on the Administration of the Meteorological Department of the Government of India in 1876-77."

⁶ "Manual of the Geology of Ireland." By G. Henry Kinahan, M.R.I.A., and of H.M. Geological Survey. With Illustrations and Map. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1878.

which is used, and gives a short account of the geological formations which occur in the island. These are, naturally, the geological surveyor's point of view, for they are the three ideas which are ever present in his daily work; but the student has a right to ask for something more, and some indications of a large grasp of the subject might have been gracefully displayed by showing generally how the rocks of Ireland came to be arranged in the directions which they take, as well as the nature of their relation to the rock masses of Britain, and means by which the two islands became separated. The volume is divided into five parts, which treat of the sedimentary rocks, the eruptive and metamorphic rocks, the drifts, relations of the rocks to the form of the ground, and the economic products of the country and its water supply, to which is added as an appendix a glossary of geological and Celtic terms. It is illustrated by good figures of characteristic fossils supplied by the experienced judgment and pencil of Mr. Baily, a few sections and some sketches of scenery, and an excellent coloured geological map, prepared by Mr. McHenry, which adds a good deal to the value of the book. The weak point in illustration is the absence of a fair number of geological sections, for it is on these that reasoning has to be based in forming ideas about strata, and we think the value of the volume to the student would have been enhanced had the evidence from horizontal sections been more freely exhibited. The manner in which the materials are arranged and the clear style of writing add to the charm of having just those facts selected which have most interest or are best worth knowing. The Cambrian of Sedgwick are described in their geographical areas as the Howth group, Bray Head group, Wexford group, and West Galway group. This, no doubt, is the true scientific method of descriptive geology, for the time has hardly yet come when the exact relations to each other of the rocks in these several areas can be spoken of with certainty. The upper Cambrian rocks are discussed in the same way, though the author prefers to name them Cambro-silurian, while remarking that they are quite distinct from the silurian and have close affinities with the Cambrian series. These rocks occur in the south-east of Ireland, in Wicklow, Wexford, and Waterford, where they are divided into the dark-shale series below and the Ballymoney series, the former containing Llandeilo fossils, and the latter those of the Bala beds. Other Cambro-silurian masses occur at Slievenaman, Galtymore, the mountains at the junction of Connaught, Leinster, and Munster; small masses rise through the carboniferous rocks, such as the Chair of Kildare, and larger masses about Balbriggan, and extending on the coast from the Boyne to Belfast Lough, and reaching inland to Lough Forbes, one of the lakes on the Shannon, an area where the rocks are a good deal folded; while the other masses to the north, in Antrim, Tyrone, and Londonderry, and to the west, in Sligo and Mayo, are crumpled and metamorphosed. The silurian rocks occupy the third chapter, and are known under four local names—Croagh-marlin beds, supposed to be of Ludlow age; Ferriter Cove beds, supposed to represent the Wenlock; Smerwick beds, and Anascaul beds,

regarded as Llandovery. They occur in the Dingle district, about Killary Harbour, in the Culfín valley, on the north shore of Lough Corrib, and in a few other areas; are often slates and sandstones, conglomerates and grits, but sometimes metamorphosed. The rocks of Cork are treated separately. They include coal measures, carboniferous slate, and Coomhoola grits, yellow sandstone, old red sandstone, all of which are grouped as Carboniferous, while the Dingle or Glengariff grits on which they rest are regarded as Silurian, but of more recent date than the Ludlow rocks. These rocks seen in Kerry and Cork, and extending thence eastward into Waterford, are of a different type from the typical carboniferous rocks of Limerick and other parts of Ireland. Although the Glengariff grits are 10,000 feet thick, no fossils belonging to the period in which they were formed have been found in the Dingle promontory, and the obscure remains met with elsewhere are not such as to give any indication of the geological age of the deposits. The lower carboniferous beds which form the great central plain of Ireland are treated in an interesting manner. The old red sandstone is included in this group, because it nowhere in Ireland has a well-defined upper boundary. It is certainly to be regretted that the author has not felt himself justified in making comparisons of these rocks with those of Scotland, Wales, and the West of England, since such a comparison would have demonstrated the conditions of physical geography under which the deposits accumulated, and would have set disputed questions of nomenclature at rest. In Limerick the lower carboniferous series is made up of limestones, calcareous shales, and chert; the typical fossils are remarkably similar to those of England. The coal measures of Ireland appear sometimes to correspond to the lower coal measures of Scotland, and occasionally rest uncomfortably on the lower palæozoic rocks; but generally they differ from the Coal measures of England, because the shells would indicate a lower zone, though the plants are identical. The upper coal measures thicken to the south; the middle and lower coal measures are more constant in thickness, and the latter are the only coals represented in the south-west in Cork. The permian rocks of Ireland are intimately associated with the overlying trias, and are to be identified by their fossils rather than by physical evidence; they occupy but a small area in the north. The trias is found in Ulster, and near Carrickfergus contains thick and important beds of rock salt, divided by clays and overlain by thick red marls with gypsum. The lias only occurs in the south-east of Antrim, and in a small area in Londonderry. Its fossils show that it belongs to the lower part of the formation. It is probable that newer secondary strata were formed in Ireland, but removed by denudation, but the next formations in the upward series are those called Hibernian greensand and white limestone, the former in county Antrim, while the latter, which rests on the greensand in that county and in Tyrone, rests directly on the older rocks. The white limestone is of the age of the upper part of the English chalk. There was a good deal of denudation after the formation of the cretaceous rocks evidenced by the occurrence of flint

gravel beneath the miocene rocks which overlie them. This flint conglomerate is about twenty feet thick in some places, and overlain by the eruptive series of dolerites and local trachytes with interstratified beds of pisolitic iron-ore, which sometimes reach a thickness of 1200 feet. These rocks only occur in the north of Ulster, and are said to have been poured out at Tandree, near Portrush. Yet newer than the beds just mentioned is a series of plastic clays and lignites known as the Lough Neagh series. They occur in various parts of Ireland, but contain no fossils which are conclusive as to their geological age, which is thought to be pliocene. The metamorphic and eruptive rocks are treated of separately, perhaps with some disadvantage to the sense of continuity of the subject. Rocks of both these groups are regarded as having been produced in all the geological periods which are represented in the country, except the permian, lias, cretaceous, and pliocene. Under the head of superficial accumulations are discussed the glacial drifts, æolian or wind-formed drift, the glaciation of the country, erratic blocks, ancient sea margins, and submerged land and forests. The peat bogs, with their prehistoric remains of man and ancient lake dwellings or crannogs naturally receive full attention. Kitchen middens, full of the remains of domestic animals, occur along the coast in Kerry, Dublin, Meath, Donegal, Wexford, and Louth. The caves in Ireland are many, but fossils are found in but few; they are however of interest as containing the remains of man in some abundance, but it may be doubted whether their antiquity is great, since the associated animals are all or nearly all still living. The post-pliocene mammalia of Ireland include *elephas primigenius*, *equus fossilis*, *hippopotamus*, *bos frontosus* and *bos longifrons*, besides some existing species. The author next discusses the formation of escarpments, cliffs, hills, and cooms. Escarpments formed by the outcrop of strata are rather rare in Ireland. The inland sea cliffs of Ulster belong to two periods, the oldest follow the 270 feet contour line, and the others are at the contour line of 110 feet. With regard to valleys, the author holds to the old idea that rivers in Ireland almost always follow lines of fracture; while other river valleys, like the Vale of Avoca and Vale of Clara are considered to have been ancient fiords. All who wish to gain a scholarly knowledge of the Geology of Ireland will find Mr. Kinahan's book a pleasant and excellent guide; but perhaps younger students might have been assisted in grasping details if the author had appended to each of the chapters on the strata a paragraph giving, by way of summary, a statement of its chief distinctive features.

The lectures edited by Professor Thorpe⁷ treat of the relations of coal to the rocks, the fossils which are associated with it, of its chemistry, its influence as a source of warmth and power, and the produce and rate of consumption of the mineral. Although written by the Professors of the Yorkshire College of Science, it indirectly owes its

⁷ "Coal, its History and Uses." By Professors Green, Miall, Thorpe, Rucker, and Marshall of the Yorkshire College. Edited by Prof. Thorpe. London: Macmillan & Co. 1878.

existence to Dr. Carpenter, who, as Secretary to the Gilchrist Educational Trust, desired these gentlemen to deliver lectures in some of the larger towns of the West Riding. Professor Green's first lecture is of the elementary kind, and gives an account of the formation of strata generally before proceeding to describe in general terms the microscopic and other characters which coal presents. The second chapter enters more into detail, and gives some account of the carboniferous formations of the North of England. In the third chapter Professor Miall describes coal plants, founding his work largely on Professor Williamson's "Memoirs." And the same writer follows with a chapter on Animals of the Coal Measures; and this essay is of greater pretension. It gives an excellent account of the fossil labyrinthodonts and fishes. There appear to be a few oversights in the accounts of the former, such as the description and figure of the ventral armour of archegosaurus. This does not consist of rows of abdominal scutes, but of bony plates deeply furrowed; and portions of the ridges of these plates, which usually become detached in the fracture of specimens, have been often erroneously supposed to be independent scutes. Professor Thorpe gives a full account of the chemistry of coal and the materials which it may be made to yield by distillation. Nor are the remaining essays of less interest or value, and the volume may be regarded as a happy example of what may be done by combined labour. It is essentially a book for the general reader, is well illustrated, and is calculated to meet a want among the many who have cause to be interested in the uses and history of coal.

Dr. Andrew Wilson's "Leisure Time Studies"⁸ is an interesting series of fifteen essays, chiefly on natural history subjects. The first, on Place, Method, and Advantages of Biology in Ordinary Education, is a plea that zoology may be taught in schools, and is occupied to some extent with the author's experiences as a teacher. Then succeeds a lecture on Science-Culture for the Masses. This is disappointing, for instead of giving an idea of the daily opportunities for scientific work which come within the reach of the humblest, it is merely a lecture on the claims of zoology to their consideration, backed up, not with familiar experiences, but with plenty of "authority." Next succeeds a Study of Lower Life, expounding the hydra. Some Facts and Fictions of Zoology is an endeavour to remove quaint fables from the scientific conditions with which they are popularly associated, such as crocodiles' tears, the barnacle goose, and live frogs in stones. Similarly the Sea-Serpents of Science serves as a text for a discussion of the scientific explanations which have been given of the phenomena which the unlearned have hastily chronicled as sea-serpents. The next chapter, on Some Animal Architects, describes the foraminifera, corals, and coral reefs. The Genesis of Life is devoted to an explanation of the present position of the question of spontaneous

⁸ "Leisure Time Studies, chiefly Biological. A Series of Essays and Lectures." By Andrew Wilson, Ph.D., F.R.P.S.E., &c., with numerous Illustrations. London: Chatto & Windus. 1879.

generation; and the other chapters on Parasites and their Development, the Law of Likeness and its Working, on some Moot Points in Natural History, of the Origin of Nerves, are good popular expositions of interesting subjects. The volume will, no doubt, be acceptable to those to whom its materials are new, but the style is rather wanting in ease; and there is a manner of display in exposition which deprives the book of the sense of calm which is characteristic of the writings of masters of natural history.

"The Commercial Products of the Sea"⁹ is an instructive and interesting volume in which Mr. Simmonds has brought together a connected series of articles which he had contributed to periodicals of a technical character. The volume is written in the simplest language, is full of statistical information, and deals rather with the technological than with the scientific aspects of the subject. The work itself is preceded by a general introduction, which, however, chiefly sets forth the growing importance of fisheries and fish produce in our own and other countries. The book is divided into three parts, entitled "Food Products Obtained from the Sea," "Marine Contributions to Industry," and "Marine Contributions to Art." A chapter is devoted to each of the principal fisheries — cod, herring, pilchard, mackerel, salmon, sardine, and tunny, while other chapters deal with crustacea, cephalopods used as food, the trepang, flat fish, oysters, and other molluscs.

"Our Woodland Trees,"¹⁰ the author tells us in his preface, has been written lovingly, and put forward because he believes in the existence among English people of an intense and enthusiastic love of Nature. It is divided into four parts; the first, called the "Life of the Tree," gives an account of its early growth, structure, development, and the beauty of its maturity; the second part is called "Some Woodland Rambles, chiefly in the New Forest." The titles of the chapters are here often poetic, such as "Where the Green Leaves Quiver," "Into the Greenwood Shade," and so forth. The third part, called "Trees at Home," is a plea for trees in towns and gardens, and some account of the London trees; while the fourth part, called "British Woodland Trees," constitutes nearly half the volume, and describes sixty-one species. These descriptions are often very brief, and rarely extend to more than a page or two; they mention the chief uses of the woods and the more striking botanical characteristics. It is a sumptuous volume, rich with illustrations of woodland scenery in the earlier part, and with coloured figures, carefully drawn and delicately rendered, of the foliage of the several trees which are described. Like all Mr. Heath's works, it is full of enthusiasm, and we trust it may enable many to share the delight which the author has felt in producing it.

⁹ "The Commercial Products of the Sea; or, Marine Contributions to Food, Industry, and Art." By P. L. Simmonds. With 32 Illustrations. Griffith & Farran. London, 1879.

¹⁰ "Our Woodland Trees." By Francis George Heath. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, & Rivington. 1878.

In "Talks about Plants"¹¹ Mrs. Lankester divides her volume into chapters corresponding to the months, in each of which a few flowers or plants are discussed. In January, yellow gorse, green hellebore, groundsel and chickweed, and so forth, month by month. It is in the form of conversations between Henry, Granny, and Alice, who ask and answer questions and make remarks such as may be expected. There is a good deal of quaint information introduced, and it is not improbable that it may serve the purpose of the writer in interesting young children in plants. There are a number of woodcuts giving details of plant structure, and coloured plates of moderate excellence giving the flowers characteristic of the several periods of the year. As might be expected from Mrs. Lankester's experienced pen, the volume is clearly written and free from technicalities.

Mr. Hulme's handsome little volume on "Familiar Wild Flowers"¹² gives an account of about forty-six plants, which are illustrated with forty coloured plates and many woodcuts. The descriptions are limited to three or four pages, and are essentially popular, though not without some scientific information. It is evidently designed rather for the young and those to whom botany in a more severe form would present no charms. All that was possible has been accomplished towards promoting familiarity with the more beautiful of English wild flowers. The richness of colouring of the illustrations is in excellent accord with Nature, though the leafage is often less successfully rendered than the flowers.

Dr. Gamgee's edition of Hermann's Physiology¹³ is so well known that we need do no more than notify to our readers that the accomplished translator and editor has in this second edition enlarged, and in great part re-cast the work. The great merits of this treatise on Physiology are such that the book has become, despite the faults which make it somewhat unpopular, and not undeservedly so, among students, the recognised standard work in our schools. In the present edition the alterations of the last (sixth) German edition have necessitated corresponding great changes in the English text. Moreover the editor himself has added some illustrative matter, carefully distinguishing his own work from the original text. Diagrams have been added, especially of physiological apparatus, and the references so valuable in all text books have been supplied more abundantly. Altogether the work is far more than a mere translation, and may stand beside Baly's Müller as an able and original rendering of the best German physiological thought of the day into our own tongue.

¹¹ "Talks about Plants; or, early Lessons in Botany." By Mrs. Lankester. With six Coloured Plates and twenty-six Wood Engravings. Griffith & Farran. London. 1879.

¹² "Familiar Wild Flowers. Figured and Described." By F. Edward Hulme, F.L.S., F.S.A. First Series with Coloured Plates. Cassell, Petter, & Galpin. London, Paris, and New York.

¹³ "Hermann's Physiology." Translated by A. Gamgee, M.D. Second Edition. London: Smith Elder. 1878.

In a recent number of this REVIEW, we noticed Dr. Ferrier's epoch making work on *The Functions of the Brain*. We need do little more, then, at present, than welcome the elegant republication of the able author's *Gulstonian Lectures* at the College of Physicians, in which Dr. Ferrier tests his physiological doctrines by a comparison of cases of disease.¹⁴ Dr. Ferrier's views have met with vigorous criticism, and are at this moment undergoing a fire of argument and counter-experiments which probably will modify some parts of the great series of propositions which he has laid down. Such work as his is vulnerable at all points of detail if not of principle. So far, however, as it seems to us, if his conclusions be modified, his grand principle of localisation, supported as it is by Drs. Hughlings Jackson and Charcot, remains unshaken. The only really great siege which has been undertaken against it is by Dr. Brown Sequard, and Dr. Brown Sequard's attacks upon it seem to us and to most readers to be laboured rather than effective, paradoxical rather than rational. We may fairly ask Dr. Brown Sequard to explain how it is that since the publication of the observations of Jackson, Charcot and Ferrier, prediction in cerebral disease has been so greatly extended and assured. Five-and-twenty years ago a great metropolitan teacher held, with a good deal of the robusiter kind of good sense, that all prediction of the site of mischief in eucephalic disease was sheer guesswork and waste of time. To this state of things Dr. Brown Sequard would restore us if his teaching were accepted. It is needless for us to add any words of praise to those with which these lectures were welcomed at the time of their delivery.

Dr. Prosser James published the first edition of the present work¹⁵ so long ago as 1860, and the volume was reprinted, with illustrations, in 1865. We owe to him, therefore, our first instruction on the use of the laryngoscope in England. Seven years ago the author had purposed to revise and re-edit his book, but, to his own misfortune and the regret of his friends, the fulfilment of this purpose was prevented at that time and afterwards by long and painful illness. It is then with something more than ordinary pleasure that we recognise in the volume before us a proof of the restoration to health and activity of its accomplished author. Dr. James has given to his work a title all too modest. Under the head of "*Sore Throat*," a title adequate enough for a pioneer book on throat disease, but almost affectedly simple when given to this completer treatise, Dr. James has fully described the whole field of pharyngeal and laryngeal diseases, not omitting laryngeal anæsthesia, which no stretch of language can include under sore throat. It will be seen then that Dr. James has neither the need nor the desire to claim any points on the score by virtue of his physical incapacity. For we find here no mere demon-

¹⁴ "*The Localisation of Cerebral Disease.*" By David Ferrier, M.D., F.R.S. London: Smith Elder. 1878.

¹⁵ "*Sore Throat.*" By Prosser James, M.D. Third Edition. London: Churchill. 1878.

stration or advertisement of the author's return to practice such as a re-issue alone would have been, but a really new work and—rarer merit still—wholly new illustrations. Dr. James holds certain strong opinions, which he thinks are not shared by the profession at large, as, for instance, in respect of the curability of tubercular laryngitis. It may be remarked that the curability of tubercular disease in other parts, and even in the coverings of the brain, has been recorded by other observers, and we ourselves have heard a physician, skilled in the treatment of consumption, say that he had cured cases of tubercular laryngitis. His receipt was the intelligible and excellent one of perfect cleanliness—two washings per diem of the affected parts with a simple disinfectant and astringent lotion. We think that Dr. James, if we judge his book aright, claims rather to give the results of his long experience in this department of medicine than to enunciate any strikingly new conclusions or to enter into elaborate scientific pathology. In this aim he seems to us to have well succeeded, and the practitioner who buys Dr. James' unpretending little book will provide himself with a wise and practical clinical commentary, and with a well arranged digest of a long and varied experience. We have only to add that Dr. Prosser James's language is at once clear, concise and vigorous.

We do not apologise for noticing the third edition of this work,¹⁶ partly because it has not been noticed already in our pages and partly because it is a work of great importance. So important does it seem to us that we do not hesitate to give to it a somewhat longer notice than we can generally afford in this department of the REVIEW. The volume is badly got up. The illustrations are abundant, more abundant than beautiful. If both abundance and good execution together were impossible, we are glad that abundance was preferred, for their number is most helpful, and sets clearly and at a glance before the reader that which pages of letterpress might have failed to do so well, if at all. Still we think Messrs. Thomas and Parker deserved better paper and printing at the hands of Mr. Dobb of Liverpool. Diseases of the hip, knee, and ankle joints are so terrible, and withal so common, that we feel it our duty to set forth clearly, if briefly, any system which offers a rational hope of dealing with these complaints more effectively. Mr. Thomas takes as the principle from which he starts that successful treatment of these affections must be by enforced, uninterrupted, and prolonged rest. Now it has been said that this principle is not a new one—that in the works of the late Mr. Hilton and others, the principle has been prominently laid down. To this Mr. Thomas makes a twofold reply; first, that the principle though declared was not thoroughly carried out in practice; and secondly, that the principle did not indeed command the full confidence of its own disciples. He says, under the first head, that Andrews, Davis, and many others, of whom Sayre is, perhaps, the chief, have devised

¹⁶ "Diseases of the Joints." By H. O. Thomas. With Introduction by Rushton Parker, F.R.C.S. Third Edition. London: Lewis. 1878.

means for such rest as is obtained by taking the weight of the body off the joint, but that they have neither abolished friction within the joint nor fully realised the duty of wholly abolishing friction. Under the second head he says, that when such rest as may have been given has been tried, no full confidence has been placed in it. For instance, that when rigidity has set in, rest has been thrown to the winds and passive motion practised. Mr. Thomas declares to us that this desertion of the principle of rest is unjustifiable, and that so far from acting himself in this way, he regards rigidity as even an additional evidence of the need of more absolute quiescence in the joint. Like a true observer, he declines to argue about supposititious bands, contractions and adhesions, and contents himself with stating his practice and the results of it, venturing only to suggest that rigidity may consist in some chronic subinflammatory form of malnutrition. Mr. Thomas effectively points out that Dr. Sayre's great experience in the excision of joints, and his able advocacy of these operations is the best comment upon the success of his previous treatment. The methods of treatment of diseased joints by his predecessors are fully criticised by Mr. Thomas and compared with his own. Into this of course we cannot enter; suffice it to say, that his criticisms are very able and acute, and to us seem at least plausible; and in respect of his practice we have his assertion that, for twenty years, he has been on the look out for a joint to excise, and has secured only one (p. 177). Mr. Thomas adds to the treatment by rest the frequent practice of aspiration and of incision into the joints. It is certainly remarkable and a matter full of interest both for physician and surgeon that the muscles about a joint are capable of restoration and activity after terms of inaction of indefinite duration. The book throughout reads to us like the writing of a man who has genius—who has, that is, the clear sight and the unhampered reason which lead him easily into the secrets of nature. What experience will have to say to his teaching remains yet to be seen.

Dr. Balmanno Squire¹⁷ is well known as a most industrious physician in the department of skin disease, and he has greatly aided in the increase and diffusion of knowledge on this subject and on the therapeutics of it. The author has already published photographs of skin diseases which have been very useful to the profession, and he now forwards to us the first number of his forthcoming Atlas. Neevus and psoriasis are the two forms of disease dealt with in this first part. The letterpress on the nature and treatment of these affections is both good and very practical, as we should expect from the author. We see, indeed, with much satisfaction that his great purpose is to cure his patients, and that, for this end, he leaves no stone unturned. We cannot yet give an opinion upon the illustrations. The four in this number are unequal in merit. It is scarcely fair, however, to judge an atlas by one or two plates, and we

¹⁷ "Atlas of the Diseases of the Skin." By Balmanno Squire, M.B. London: Churchill. 1878.

are glad to see, at any rate, that these are certainly free from exaggeration.

Dr. Finlayson¹⁸ has hit upon a real want, and with the assistance of his able coadjutors has met that want admirably. Students have the advantage of excellent treatises on Clinical Medicine, and on the other hand they have useful brief bed-side manuals and such cards or aide-memoires as are in use by Dr. Stewart and other clinical professors. But there is a need for some adequate book upon clinical investigation and method, and it appears to us that Dr. Finlayson has succeeded in hitting upon the very plan required. It is a curious thing how hard it is to get a student to say what he sees before him. The simplest description of hair, eyes and complexion seem difficult even to advanced students who have not been taught to use their observing faculties. We see then a sign of the true teacher when Dr. Finlayson begins with a chapter on Physiognomy. Then follow chapters on the examination and reporting of medical cases; on temperature, pulse and fever—on the surfaces of the body—on the special senses, and on the nervous system, including the means of electrical diagnosis, and insanity. Then the student is taught how to investigate the organs of the chest and abdomen, bringing to bear upon these not the stethoscope only but all his wits and devices. Finally he is taught to make a post-mortem examination, which reminds us of a lay friend who observed after frequent perusals of our Medical Journals, that while in reports of cases a decent attention is given to the symptoms during life, these are regarded as a mere prelude to the invariable autopsy which the reporters evidently take to as the main and most absorbing act of the drama. In the various parts of his work, Dr. Finlayson has received the invaluable assistance of Professor Gairdner and the aid also of Drs. Gemmell, Stephenson, Coats and Robertson, each of whom has special knowledge in the departments of medicine. On turning over the book we find it not only scholastically good but full of practical information, and we are gratified to find in it an excellent tone of humanity and delicacy which is especially noticeable in the sections on the diseases of women: it is impossible to overrate the good influence of such a tone as this upon young students of medicine. If we miss anything it is that familiarity with diathesis and constitutional states which illumines isolated phenomena and which makes the experience of the old practical physician so precious. We have noted this bareness of suggestion in many places, but we may refer for illustration only to the sections on Insomnia, where neither gout nor a still more specific constitutional poison are referred to as causes of this trying complaint. Two great virtues in the eyes of the reviewer are, first that the pages are cut for the reader, and secondly that there is a good index, though we regret by means of this index to be enabled to detect a good many little omissions in the book, as for instance of the now celebrated "tendon reflex" phenomena, which are absent in some chronic spinal diseases.

¹⁸ "Clinical Manual." Edited by James Finlayson, M.D. London: Smith Elder. 1878.

St. Thomas' Hospital¹⁹ issues this year a goodly volume, and one of really high average merit, considering how various must be the contents of such volumes. Dr. Stone adds something to the invaluable help he almost alone brings to the profession in estimation of the physical aspects of function, normal and diseased. Two papers appear by Drs. Sharkey and Jacob on the treatment of acute rheumatism by salicylic acid. Both physicians speak highly of this drug, which has indeed now made good its position in medicine. Dr. Jacob tabulates no less than 150 cases taken from the wards of the Leeds Infirmary. Mr. Acland contributes a very able discussion on the mode of action of the drug. Dr. Payne takes more general ground, and writes upon the classification of medicines in the hope of clearing the way for more precise conceptions. The names of Drs. Ord, Greenfield, Peacock, Mr. McCormac, and others suffice to indicate that the volume containing their articles must be full of interest to the profession.

When a book on the "Laws of Therapeutics"²⁰ is sent to us for review, and when we find on a flyleaf an ostentatious dedication "to the advancement and diffusion of truth," we expect, in the first instance, that the author shall know what is meant by truth and what is meant by law. Dr. Kidd does not seem to us to have the faintest notion of what is meant by truth or law in the language of science. A law, in his view, is a convenient working generalisation, a formula which, as he should be aware, is more correctly called a hypothesis; and truth, he seems to think, is to be advanced and diffused by throwing in a handful of illustrative cases described with as much accuracy and good taste as we look for in the advertising pamphlet of a quack. Indeed Dr. Kidd's notion of the scientific record of a case is well measured by the fact that he gives us, on page 31, a case reported by Hahnemann, a teacher whom he otherwise handles unmercifully, as a "model of accurate description." To any other intelligent reader the record would have seemed rather a model of bald and hasty description. As Dr. Kidd's mental attitude so are the results of his cogitations. A flimsy historical chapter opens the work, and this is followed by chapters equally superficial and at second-hand on physiology and pathology. Then follows a hotch-potch of chapters on therapeutics full of meaningless repetitions and crude reflections. It is almost amazing to us that any physician of experience and capacity should have written such a trumpery work as this, or, having written it, should publish it with an air of self-satisfaction. We have read through it without finding a single fruitful thought or a single accurate observation. If Dr. Kidd, instead of quoting at second-hand, would read the original papers of Crum-Brown and Fraser, or of the gentleman whom he calls Dr. Binns of Bonn, he might in time learn more modesty and gain some qualifications at any rate for the task he has imposed upon himself.

¹⁹ "St. Thomas' Hospital Reports." New Series. Vol. VII. London: Churchill. 1878.

²⁰ "The Laws of Therapeutics. By Joseph Kidd, M.D. London: Kegan Paul & Co. 1878.

Dr. Drysdale²¹ has favoured us with a copy of his opening address delivered to the Liverpool Philosophical Society upon the subject of infectious diseases, the causation of which is now so keenly investigated. The address is an able and thorough one, but highly technical, and not made less so by the phraseology of the author. To discuss it in any measure is quite out of our power, and we can only refer to it as a valuable contribution to the literature rather than to the investigation of this important subject.

If we invariably forebore to review pamphlets, we should sometimes omit to notice some most valuable contributions to medicine. The two lectures here published by Mr. Liebreich²² have opened up a question of the utmost practical importance to the public. The first lecture was delivered six years ago, and since that time the attention of the managers of schools and of parents has been forcibly drawn to the study of the effect of posture upon the figure and upon the vision. There is, indeed, more connexion than may be at first apparent between anomalies of vision and slight curvatures of the spine, as these latter may be, and often are, artificially produced during school-time by the posture of short-sighted children, while, on the other hand, bad posture tends to increase shortsightedness. The author, who has visited schools far and wide, has been surprised to find everywhere arrangements more or less injurious to the organ of sight. Shortness of sight again, in its turn, injures the general health by inducing a habit of stooping. Insufficient or ill-arranged light, desks and seats of improper dimensions and form are active in producing these defects, and yet care or system in these matters is, or has been, unknown in England. One authority—the Education Department—has certainly laid down regulations for the planning and lighting of schools, and has chosen, of all the different methods, the very worst (p. 10). We cannot too strongly urge upon the public and the profession the careful perusal of this invaluable little treatise. It is practical in the highest and best sense of the word, in that it brings the highest and most refined scientific knowledge to bear on a system which is, has been, and will be at work, for good or evil, upon every child in the community. Upon our action in this matter, the health and frames of coming generations of men must depend. Can any words of ours be needed to urge the attention of all concerned to this subject?

This little book²³ is intended for the guidance and information of students and their parents and to make the way clear to all persons seeking to enter the profession of medicine. The guide enters into the questions of the expense of a student's living and fees, the preliminary education required, the qualifications obtainable, the choice of a medical school, and so forth. Such a book cannot but contain much

²¹ "The Germ Theories of Infectious Diseases." By John Drysdale, M.D. London: Baillière. 1878.

²² "School Life in its Influence on Sight and Figure." By R. Liebreich. London: Churchill. 1878.

²³ "The Student's Guide to the Medical Profession." By C. B. Keetley, F.R.C.S. London: Macmillan. 1878.

information useful to those for whom it is intended. Nor is it wanting in sensible advice. On the other hand it is far from adequate, and far from doing anything like justice to its subject. It gives us the impression of being a hasty and even flippant production, and many interesting and important parts of the subject are omitted; as, for instance, a careful comparison of foreign schools, with the relative advantages of each—and the ways and means of entering them, and of living in foreign towns.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

NOTING on a title-page the name of "the Rev. F. G. Lee, D.C.L., Vicar of All Saints', Lambeth, &c. &c.," we are disagreeably reminded of a dull and unpleasant book about a wild Cornish parson which we were once compelled to read. We are scarcely better pleased with the present volume,¹ a fact which we especially regret, because the author, from whose opinions we differ *toto cælo*, has lately been placed in a position of difficulty, if not of injustice, in connexion with the payment of rates on his church. Dr. Lee's book begins with an odd dedication to the "Prelate, Provost, Priests, and Members of the Order of Corporate Re-union, who in days of irreligious strife, ecclesiastical turmoil, and intellectual confusion, are praying for peace, and labouring practically for the restoration of visible unity to a disorganised and distracted Christendom." What this "order" may be we do not know, though we suspect that one of the "et ceteras" which are quoted among Dr. Lee's titles to distinction may point to some office in it. We hope that its chiefs may not bring themselves into conflict, either with the Sovereign as the sole fount of honour, or with the law, of which they stand in some danger if they cease for a moment to abjure that damnable position that any foreign person or prelate ought to have any authority in this realm. Dr. Lee, who, when merely referring to the late pope, speaks of him as "the late Holy Father, Pope Pius IX., with his accustomed beautiful smile," and whose book is a mere tirade against everybody who assisted on the Protestant side in the Reformation, interspersed with fulsome eulogies of everybody on the other side, can doubtless satisfy his conscience in the matter of his ordination vows. His book, however, while it confirms our previous doubts as to the working of the Reformation, convinces us only a point on which the author would not agree—viz, that a Church which allows its paid servants, while wearing its livery, to revile and attack its main principles, must have been reformed in a manner so inadequate as not to deserve the name of organisation. Except as a sign of the

¹ "Historical Sketches of the Reformation." By the Rev. Frederick George Lee, D.C.L., Vicar of All Saints', Lambeth, &c. &c. Griffith & Farran.

times, Dr. Lee's book is unworthy of notice. It is a mere collection, written in the most uncritical and ultra-Romanist tone, of cock-and-bull stories of the martyrdom of Thomas à Becket, and of sundry priests and others who suffered more or less injustice under Henry VIII. and Elizabeth. Added to these are descriptions of the bad ends to which that detestable king and his no less detestable minister came. Dr. Lee favours us with unauthenticated stories of the king's passing his last days in shuddering and shrieking—"The friars! the friars! Blood and the block! Lo! hither come the monks!" and of the licking up of his blood after death by dogs in fulfilment of a prophecy by one Peto. We should like to hear one of these "Catholic" divines cross-examined as to his opinions. Does Dr. Lee, for instance, believe that this Peto, a friar of Greenwich, was a divinely-inspired prophet, as his vows require him to believe Isaiah to have been? If not, what was his prophecy, assuming it to be genuine, more than a coincidence? And why should Dr. Lee imitate a well-known bishop in adding to the web of history a fringe of vain coincidences and explanations which are likely to lead to superstition? We need hardly say that Dr. Lee is most sparing of authorities; and when not sparing he is capricious. His favourite evidence is the "Author's MSS. Notes and Extracts;" and he appears not to see that this is hardly demonstrative proof of the author's statements. In one of these "Author's Extracts" we are told that Cardinal Reginald Pole "asked with sorrow, 'Was there ever before seen, I do not say in England, where the people have ever enjoyed extensive privileges, but in any Christian country, a despot, whose smallest caprice was regarded as a sovereign law?'" To question the genuineness of the "Author's Extract" might look like doubting Dr. Lee's word. We can therefore only express our surprise that the cardinal in the 16th century should have caught so exactly the tone of a 19th century sermon.

Mr. Hamilton has rendered a great service to the student of the home history of England by collecting into a volume² a series of contributions to *Fraser's Magazine*, consisting mainly of extracts from the earliest records of Quarter Sessions, with an excellent connecting text. The county of Devon possesses records from the year 1592. Cheshire, Westmoreland, and Wilts also boast records dating from Elizabeth's reign, which are, however, far from complete. The records of no other county are supposed to date further back than the Civil War. Mr. Hamilton's book is therefore concerned mainly with the Devonshire records. It is not very interesting reading for its own sake; but its odd chronicles of forgotten crimes and forgotten penalties, and the remarkable side-light which it now and then throws on great national events, make it a mine of wealth for the historian of social manners. Mr. Hamilton's extracts are made with great judgment, and his connecting or explanatory narrative is clear and instructive.

² "Quarter Sessions from Queen Elizabeth to Queen Anne; Illustrations of Local Government and History drawn from Original Records." By A. H. A. Hamilton. London: Sampson Low & Co.

To the neighbouring country of Holland we owe two men of distinction in their respective professions, Mr. Alma Tadema in Art, and Mr. Henri van Laun in Literature; and it is not a little singular that (as we believe) each of these gentlemen has chosen our own land as the country of his adoption, after having tried France. If French susceptibility is roused by any appearance of *spretæ injuria formæ* in Mr. Van Laun's choice, he has an excellent answer in the fact that he has done a great deal for the diffusion of a knowledge of France among us. He has written a large number of excellent books of French teaching; he has translated Molière with remarkable success; he has given us a good History of French Literature; and he now supplies us with a History of France from the beginning of the Great Revolution to the fall of Napoleon III. There is room for a good popular book on the last century in France. The too abrupt termination of Carlyle's admirable work has led superficial people to think that the Revolution ended all at once with the death of Robespierre and the revival of clean linen and dandy clothing; and scarcely any period of history is less generally known amongst us than the interval between that time and the beginning of the Peninsular War. Indeed, most of our middle-class people seem, like the Romish Church, to have a vague idea that the word Revolution, when unconnected with wheels, signifies a combination of massacre, anarchy, and atheism; and would be utterly surprised to hear that the first Napoleon, who was opposed to these conditions, could be regarded as a part of the French Revolution. Mr. Van Laun, as is natural—and even necessary—for such a work, has drawn mainly from French sources, to which he gratefully acknowledges his indebtedness. An introductory sketch of the state of society before 1789, and the record of events down to the establishment of the Directory in 1795, occupy about a third of the work. This portion exhibits great power, and is especially valuable as being written from a more cosmopolitan point of view than most of our histories of the period, which are either English or French in tone. The third and fourth books, treating of the Directory and Consulate, are perhaps the most valuable portion of the work, as illustrating the period which has been least described in English histories. The royalist intrigues, the foreign wars, and the rise of Napoleon to eminence, are narrated with judgment and vigour. The chapters on the Empire treat of a better known period; but their fairness and freedom from national prejudice give them a virtual novelty. The Restoration is again almost unknown amongst us. The reign of Louis Philippe, the second Republic, and the second Empire, fall within that section that is little understood because it is so recent as not yet to have escaped from the sphere of personal prejudice. Mr. Van Laun's work is a most useful contribution to the history of modern Europe. It is written in admirable language, and it possesses the rare historic gift of true critical judgment. We prophesy for it a large circulation, and are sure that

³ "The French Revolutionary Epoch." By Henri van Laun. Two Vols. London: Cassell, Petter, & Galpin.

it will popularise the knowledge of the important period of which it treats.

Mr. Spencer Walpole⁴ sends us a History of England from the battle of Waterloo to the passing of the Reform Bill. He is justified in remarking that "no other period of English history is of greater interest" than these seventeen important years. They saw the last struggle of the opponents of our liberties, and the first steps in the march of Free Trade: they saw the emancipation of Nonconformist creeds from the chains which blasphemous Bigotry and ignorant Selfishness had put upon them: they saw the reform of Parliament. Among their minor changes were the improvement of the old criminal law with its all but single penalty—death, and the introduction of a just, generous, and frank foreign policy. The author devotes nearly a third of his work to a bold sketch of the social state of Great Britain in the first years of the century. The introduction of steam, improvements in travelling, parliamentary and governmental abuses, the shamelessness of the upper classes in respect of pensions and places, the condition of the poor, the effects of some of the more important of the unjust laws, the state of letters, the personality of the most important men of the time: all these are touched with a rapid, but firm and discriminating pen. The distress resulting from the great war, the popular discontent, and its results in riots and the Six Acts, are next described. The first volume ends with the brief happiness and death of the Princess Charlotte, the consequent marriage of her uncles *en bloc*, and the trial of Queen Caroline. The reign of George IV. and the struggle which ended in the triumph of the Reformers fill the second. Mr. Walpole has wisely avoided the old-fashioned chronicle system; and, after selecting the great movements of the time, he describes each from beginning to end. Thus he has five chapters in his second volume; and, though he uses no such titles, they might be headed respectively, Finance, Ireland, Foreign Affairs, Catholic Emancipation, Reform; and certainly the period 1821–1832 could not be better divided. So large a work naturally contains a few venial errors. The author ought, however, to have remembered that Frederick the Great never had issue. It was his nephew, not his son, "who first threw down the gauntlet to revolutionary France." The book is written in a comprehensive and judicial spirit. The language, and the minor incidents selected as illustrations, are such as to make it highly interesting.

Mr. Mowbray Morris has written an opportune and handy sketch⁵ of the War with Afghanistan in 1838–1842. The painful story is narrated with brevity and clearness. The information it affords is likely to benefit our politicians more than our soldiers.

It is perhaps not too much to say that the disturbed state of the

⁴ "A History of England from the Conclusion of the Great War in 1815." By Spencer Walpole. Two Vols. London: Longmans & Co.

⁵ "The First Afghan War." By Mowbray Morris. London: Sampson Low & Co.

Sultan's realm has been the efficient cause of the publication of two large volumes⁶ on the history of Jerusalem from 1853 to 1856, by the late Mr. Finn, at that time Consul at Jerusalem. It is true that certain occurrences or claims concerning that city were among the Russian pretexts which induced the last Anglo-Russian war; but these pretexts were of very small moment. The Holy Places had far less to do with the fall of Sebastopol than had the defence of our Eastern dependency. And if every consulate in the Turkish Empire is to devote a couple of octavo volumes to the occurrences of three years which happen to be rather important years in other places, then indeed are our lives shortened. This work is introduced by a preface, or letter to the publishers, by the Viscountess Strangford, who says that "she has been unable to study it carefully," or "to give it the attention it justly claims;" and can only tell us "what strikes me most from my hasty glance at its pages." What appears to strike Lady Strangford most from this hasty glance is, that the salaries of Consuls should be more carefully adjusted to their needs; that the unofficial Turks are very good and possess vast capacity for improvement (a most dubious compliment, by the way); and that Russia is addicted to aggression, falsehood, greed, and rapine. Lady Strangford probably held these opinions before she bestowed her glance on Mr. Finn's book. And we, who have given more than a hasty glance, are bound to confess that such preconceived notions as we had remain unchanged. These two imposing volumes are full of the ordinary trivial details which a diary-keeping tourist in the East at that time would have recorded. The headings of the chapters, such as "Jerusalem Literary Society and Jerusalem English College," "The War Ended," "Current Events in Palestine," "Royal Birthdays and National Flags," "Reign of Yakoob Pasha," "Protestants in Palestine," and the like, sufficiently indicate the small talk, old news, consular squabbles, and discussions of precedence of which they consist.

Mr. Digby, who is, we believe, editor of a Madras daily paper, and who served as Honorary Secretary of the Indian Famine Relief Fund, publishes a detailed history⁷ of the campaign against the famine. Of this work, as of the last noticed book, we have to complain on the ground of its inordinate size. Here are two large octavo volumes, which record countless incidents of that terrible time and a few official squabbles. The latter had best be forgotten, and the story of the famine would be far more instructively told by a few well-edited tables of statistics and maps. In this form the average length of life and the high rate of pay of Indian officials would enable those whom it concerns to study the causes and conditions of such an awful visitation. But it puzzles us to guess what free man will wade through these

⁶ "Stirring Times; or, Records from Jerusalem Consular Chronicles of 1853 to 1856." By the late James Finn, M.R.A.S. Edited and compiled by his Widow. With a Preface by the Viscountess Strangford. London: Kegan Paul & Co.

⁷ "The Famine Campaign in Southern India, 1876-1878." By William Digby, Hon. Sec. Indian Famine Relief Fund. Two Vols. London: Longmans & Co.

thousand pages of few statistics and many unpleasant details told in what Canon Kingsley used to call "newspaper English."

Messrs. Chatto and Windus have reissued Mr. Hueffer's excellent translation⁸ of the great work on Greek and Roman Antiquities of Professors Guhl and Koner. Of the merits of this work we spoke in very favourable terms some years ago; and we retain the same high opinion of its utility and excellence. The erudition which it displays is wonderful. The most obvious commendation of the book, however, is to be found in the five or six hundred well-chosen woodcuts which explain and adorn its pages. The translation is neat and clear. This is a book which will be useful to the deepest scholars, while it will not be out of place on the table of any drawing-room in which persons of culture occasionally find themselves.

Mrs. Beesly sends us a pleasing little book of stories from Roman history.⁹ Feeling that fairy tales were hardly sufficient for her children, she took to telling them stories from the history of the great conquering people; and her success in her own family has induced her to publish them. Those incidents are chosen which inculcate the spirit of duty, and they are told with a simple clearness which leaves nothing to be desired for children.

Mrs. Creighton's biography¹⁰ of Sir Walter Raleigh is an admirable picture of one of the most remarkable of the men who have illustrated this our island. Like that of most great men, Raleigh's fame came after his death. Like a Becket, like Nelson, like Canning, he gained his immense popularity by the circumstances of his death. In our brief space we need not make any comment on a career which is comparatively well known. We would, however, note how curiously people generally ignore age in thinking of those who perish on the scaffold, especially in cases where execution has been preceded by long imprisonment. How many, for instance, of the men whom we meet in the street suspect that Marie Antoinette was nearly forty years old at the time of her execution? And how few persons would say off-hand that Mary Queen of Scots lived until her forty-fifth year, and Raleigh until nearly seventy! Raleigh was a man who excelled as a hero, as a poet, and as a politician. In introducing the potato and tobacco he effected a revolution in the social life of Europe which is simply unparalleled. No fruit, nor wine, nor meat, nor any thing, except wheat, is used daily by anything like such a number of persons in Europe as these comparatively mushroom novelties which Raleigh brought from beyond the Atlantic. Of such a man a bad biography would be worth having; Mrs. Creighton's life is excellent in judgment and style.

The mere name of Dr. R. Willis on the title-page of a biography of Harvey is a guarantee of a good book. Since we received the

⁸ "The Life of the Greeks and Romans, described from Antique Monuments." By E. Guhl and W. Koner. Translated from the Third German Edition by F. Hueffer. London: Chatto & Windus.

⁹ "Stories from the History of Rome." By Mrs. Beesly. London: Macmillan & Co.

¹⁰ "Life of Sir Walter Raleigh." By Louise Creighton. London: Rivingtons.

present volume¹¹ we have read with great regret of the death of its learned author, in whom scientific literature sustains a very heavy loss. Before beginning his biography of Harvey, Dr. Willis has given a series of brief but instructive sketches of all the great anatomists who preceded him, from Plato and Aristotle to Eubelais, Servetus, and Rudino, carefully tracing through all the progress of knowledge of the blood. As the result of his investigation the author is able authoritatively to dismiss all claims to the discovery of the circulation which have been put forward on behalf of others than our great countryman. William Harvey was the eldest of several sons of a Kentish squire or yeoman, and was born in 1578. After taking his degree at Cambridge, he studied for four years at Padua, receiving the doctorate from both universities. He married and settled in practice in London in his twenty-sixth year. He became a member of the College of Physicians, and, being successful in his profession, was appointed physician to St. Bartholomew's Hospital in 1609. He first developed his views on the circulation of the blood in the lectures which he was in 1615 appointed to deliver at the College of Physicians; but he published them in book-form (at Frankfort-on-the-Maine) early in the year 1618. In 1630 he travelled on the continent with the young Duke of Lennox. Three years later he became physician to King Charles I., and was afterwards in frequent attendance at Court. He, indeed, accompanied the King to Edge Hill fight, during the progress of which event he read a book under a hedge. He followed the King to Oxford, and was, in 1645, elected warden of Merton College. This appointment he had to resign next year, when the Parliamentarians took Oxford. He now returned to London; and, avoiding politics entirely, resided now with one, now with another, of his excellent brothers, making the investigations, which resulted in the publication in 1651 of his *De Generatione Animalium*. He was now recognised as the first physiologist of his time. In 1653 the College of Physicians erected his statue in their hall; and a year later elected him their president, an honour which he declined on the ground of his advanced age. He died in 1657, in his eightieth year. Being a widower and childless, he left his property to the College of Physicians, part of it being assigned to foundation of the well-known Oratiou which bears his name. In all the relations of life Harvey was a man of the highest rank. Dr. Willis's work contains a thorough examination of Harvey's great discoveries, as well as of his less valuable, though still important, development of the principle *omne animal ex ovo*. It triumphantly refutes the claims of other nations to the discovery of the circulation. The Italians are Harvey's chief detractors; and our author aptly and consolingly says that they may fairly be content with having given Harvey the most valuable part of his scientific education. Dr. Willis's book is in every way a valuable contribution to literature.

¹¹ "William Harvey: a History of the Discovery of the Circulation of the Blood." By R. Willis, M.D., author of the "Life and Letters of Spinoza," "Servetus and Calvin," &c. &c. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co.

From Messrs. Sampson Low & Co. we have received a biographical study of Lord Collingwood,¹² by Mr. W. Davies. It purports to be, not so much a biography, as a study of the great admiral's character; and we may say that the text for the discourse is to be found in a "Roundabout Paper" by Thackeray, in which Collingwood is quoted, with Southey and Heber, as a model Christian gentleman. We could wish that Mr. Davies had been more biographical, and rather less didactic. His book is, however, a good one. It will give a fair picture of the noble sailor to many to whom Mr. Newnham Collingwood's biography is inaccessible; and a knowledge of such a man is a perpetual possession. We know, indeed, of no more beautiful and simple life than Collingwood's. He believed that exterminating Frenchmen was the first duty of a Christian as fully as Nelson or the Princess von Bismark. His chief joy and hope in life were centred in his wife and his two daughters; and by a cruel irony of fate his public duties allowed him to spend only one year (the year of the Amiens peace) with them, from the breaking out of the war in 1793 to his lonely death in the Mediterranean in 1810. Whatever he and they suffered from this, we are the gainers; for there is no more charming reading than the letters of the old sea-lion to and of his little girls. After Lord Howe's victory in 1794, he writes that, after long and weary cruising they sighted the French fleet "on the morning of little Sarah's birthday." On the 31st of May they bore down on the foe and formed line.

"The night was spent in watching and preparation for the succeeding day; and many a blessing did I send forth to my Sarah, lest I should never bless her more. . . . We had to go through the French admiral's fire, and that of two ships next him, and received all the broadsides two or three times before we fired a gun. It was then near ten o'clock. I observed to the admiral that about that time our wives were going to church, but that I thought the peal we should ring about the Frenchman's ears would outdo their parish bells."

In 1801, being stationed near Plymouth, but unable to leave his ship, he sent for his wife and child to come to him. Just before their arrival he is ordered to sea at once. Nelson, however, begged him to stay and dine with him on shore, and during dinner their arrival was announced.

"I flew to the inn where I had desired my wife to come, and found her and little Sarah as well after their journey (from Northumberland) as if it had lasted only for the day. No greater happiness is human nature capable of than was mine that evening; but at dawn we parted, and I went to sea."

And to another friend he writes of the same incident.

"How surprised you would have been to have popped into the Fountain Inn, and seen Lord Nelson, my wife, and myself, sitting by the fireside cosing, and little Sarah teaching Phillis, her dog, to dance."

To little Sarah herself he wrote:

¹² "A Fine Old English Gentleman, exemplified in the Life and Character of Lord Collingwood." By William Davies. London: Sampson Low & Co.

"Never forget for one moment that you are a gentlewoman; and all your words and all your actions should make you gentle. I never knew your mother—your dear, your good mother—say a harsh or hasty thing to any person in my life. Endeavour to imitate her. I am quick and hasty in my temper; my sensibility is touched sometimes with a trifle, and my expression of it sudden as gunpowder: but, my darling, it is a misfortune which, not having been sufficiently restrained in my youth, has caused me much pain. It has, indeed, given me more trouble to subdue this natural impetuosity than anything I ever undertook. I believe that you are both mild; but if ever you feel in your little breasts that you inherit a particle of your father's infirmity, restrain it and quit the subject that has caused it until your serenity be recovered. So much for mind and manners: next for accomplishments To write a letter with negligence, without proper stops, with crooked lines and great flourishing dashes, is inelegant; it argues either great ignorance of what is proper, or great indifference towards the person to whom it is addressed, and is consequently disrespectful. It makes no amends to add an apology for having scrawled a sheet of paper, of bad pens, for you should mend them, or for want of time, for nothing is more important to you, or to which your time can be more properly devoted. I think I can know the character of a lady pretty nearly by her handwriting. The dashers are all impudent, however they may conceal it from themselves or others; and the scribblers flatter themselves with the vain hope that, as their letter cannot be read, it may be mistaken for sense. I am very anxious to come to England, for I have lately been unwell. The greatest happiness which I expect then, is to find that my dear girls have been assiduous in their learning.

"May God Almighty bless you, my beloved little Sarah, and sweet Mary too."

What can be more touching, more natural? To think of the brave old admiral, in command of the Mediterranean, pining for the home he scarcely knew, even to the death which seized him a year later, counselling his loved ones from his lonely cabin. The mutual generosity of Collingwood and Nelson at Trafalgar is well known, but it bears repetition. In bearing down on the enemy's fleet, Collingwood's ship, which led the lee division, forged a mile ahead of the column. Nelson, who (contrary to arrangement) had made his own ship head the weather column, observed this, and said, "See how that noble fellow Collingwood takes his ship into action." At that very moment Collingwood, in the elation of leading the battle, was saying to his officers, "Gentlemen, what would Nelson give to be here?" Where can we find a nobler incident? Happy for us that in those days the navy was a profession so little tempting to idlers that it escaped in some measure the corruption and favouritism which undermined other branches of the public service. How Collingwood cared for national property is shown by his saying to his boatswain during the battle of Cape St. Vincent, "Bless me, Mr. Peffers, how came we to forget to bend our old top-sail? They will ruin that new one; it will never be worth a farthing again." The only two favours that Collingwood ever asked of the Government were declined. They refused his application to continue his peerage through his daughters, in spite of his quaint argument (in a letter which we think Mr. Davies has forgotten) that had he not been detained on unbroken foreign service he might have had half a dozen stalwart sons around

him. And when the noble servant of the nation pleaded for recall when growing old and ill and heart-broken by the separation from his loved ones, this, too, was refused, and the willing horse was ridden to death. As we have said, any knowledge of this admirable Christian warrior must improve every one. Mr. Davies has fairly shown his chief virtues; and, with a little better arrangement, and a little shortening, his book would be a very good one.

Mr. Edward Smith has supplied a want of long standing, and conferred a real benefit on the nation, by writing a life¹³ of William Cobbett, who was one of the foremost men of his time, who was one of the most maligned, and of whom too little is known in our day. It is notorious that no higher praise can be given to any man or thing in this country than to say that he, or it, is *English*. This self-appreciation has indeed become a familiar joke, and supplies one of its happiest points to a play which is amusing London at the present day. If there was one quality which existed in Cobbett in a far greater degree than all others, it was that of being an ultra-Englishman. He was more honest, more pugnacious, more self-opinioned than most men: but he was more English than any man. And perhaps no stronger proof could be given of the essentially conservative and order-loving nature of this country than the fact that the people have almost forgotten a great man who did great things for them, a man whose faults, hardly less than his virtues, assured his popularity, mainly because his name has been unjustly associated with radicalism and revolution. The same popular misjudgment which claimed Pitt as an opponent of Catholic Emancipation and Reform has treated the name of Cobbett with equal want of appreciation. But do we not live in an age in which Prince Bismarck is commonly thought to be a Conservative and supporter of aristocracy? William Cobbett, the third of four sons of a small farmer at Farnham, in Surrey, was born in 1762. He was taught to read and write, and to help on the farm. At the mature age of twenty-one he ran away to London, and passed a few months in "quill-driving" for an attorney in Gray's Inn. He then enlisted in the 54th Foot, and was shortly sent out to join his regiment, which, after the difficulties of the American War of Independence, was lying in Nova Scotia. While with the depôt at Chatham he had acted as copyist to the Commandant, and here he had the energy to add to this labour, and to that of acquiring his drill, the ambitious work of further instructing himself:

"The colonel saw my deficiency and strongly recommended study. He enforced his advice with a sort of injunction, and with a promise of reward in case of success. I procured me a Lowth's grammar; and applied myself to the study of it with unceasing assiduity, and not without some profit, for though it was a considerable time before I fully comprehended all that I read, still I read and studied with such unremitting attention, that, at last, I could write without falling into any very gross errors. The pains I took cannot be de-

¹³ "William Cobbett: a Biography." By Edward Smith. Two Vols. London: Sampson Low & Co.

scribed; I wrote the whole grammar out two or three times; I got it by heart; I repeated it every morning and every evening, and, when on guard, I imposed on myself the task of saying it all over once every time I was posted sentinel. To this exercise of my memory I ascribed the retentiveness of which I have since found it capable. . . . The whole week's food was not a bit too much for one day. . . . I have seen soldiers lay in their berths, many and many a time, actually crying for hunger

"The edge of my berth, or that of the guard-bed, was my seat to study in; my knapsack was my bookcase; a bit of board lying on my lap was my writing-table. . . . I had no money to purchase candle or oil: in winter-time it was rarely that I could get any evening light but that of the fire; and only *my turn* even of that. . . . To buy a pen or a sheet of paper I was compelled to forego some portion of food, though in a state of half-starvation. I had no moment of time that I could call my own; and I had to read and write amidst the talking, laughing, singing, whistling, and brawling of at least half a score of the most thoughtless of men, and that, too, in the hours of their freedom from all control."

This extract from the autobiography of a man who became one of the most powerful writers of the English language is an encouragement for all. It is very rare, however, for a man whose culture begins after the attainment of manhood to attain excellence. We have, indeed, read that the late Andrew Johnson, who was President of the United States, was unable to read or write at the age of twenty-one, and we have heard him make an eloquent and forcible speech; but such cases are only the exceptions which prove the rule. In 1791 Cobbett, then a sergeant, with a promise of a commission, left the service. He returned to London and married a comrade's daughter on the money which he had saved. Mr. Smith says rightly that he knew nothing beyond a few books and military life: but he had acquired two strong feelings, one of love for the common sort of people, the other of indignation at the peculations of their superiors. He now attended debating societies, and set to work to bring before a court martial certain dishonest officers of his former regiment. This attempt failed, apparently from a desire of the authorities to screen the accused. Cobbett was threatened, and fled to France in March, 1792. He was on his road to Paris a few months later when he was stopped by the news of the awful Tenth of August. He turned back and sailed for America. For two years he gained a living by teaching English to the French *émigrés* at Philadelphia. In 1794 Priestley came out to America, where he was received with ovation. Cobbett was indignant at the revolutionary tone of the addresses presented to Priestley, and with his replies, and published a pamphlet called "Observations on Priestley's Emigration," in which the doctor and revolutionists in general were somewhat roughly handled. "I am," he says, "one of those who wish to believe that foreigners come to this country from choice, and not from necessity. . . . The most numerous, as well as the most useful, are mechanics. Perhaps a cobbler, with his hammer and awls, is a more valuable acquisition than a dozen philosophi-theologi-political empirics, with all their boasted apparatus." The first party divisions in the United States were those of the Federals and Democrats. The former, among whom were such men as Washington, Adams, and

Hamilton, desired a powerful central government, and were friendly to the mother country from whom they had won their independence. The Democrats, whose leaders were Jefferson and Madison, made the sovereignty of the individual states their main principle, and favoured France, their ally during the recent struggle. Cobbett now took up arms against this party, and under the pseudonym of "Peter Porcupine" published pamphlets and journals defending the English and attacking the French cause with great vigour. He presently became a bookseller. In 1799 he lost an action for libel, which cost him rather dear. The verdict disgusted him with America, where he found much that he did not like; and in 1803 he returned to England. Here he was at once taken in hand by the Anti-Jacobins, Canning, Gifford, and Windham; and we find him dining with Pitt shortly after his arrival. He now revived the *Porcupine*, and published a series of letters on the Peace with France, which were received with great applause. They are indeed written with great power and close reasoning. Mr. Smith might have told us that the historian, Johann von Müller, who was the most un-German of Germans, as Cobbett was the most English of Englishmen, declared that nothing more eloquent than these letters had appeared since the time of Demosthenes. In January, 1802, Cobbett published the first number of his *Political Register*, which continued to appear weekly until 1835, with a break of three months, during his second visit to America in 1817. Cobbett supported Pitt's Government, but soon was in opposition to that of Addington, which followed it. That Government contrived to get a verdict for libel against him. In 1804 he went to reside at Botley, in Hampshire, where he spent much time and money in planting foreign seeds, among others, the acacia and maize. About this time his views appear to have changed. He had always avoided anything like dependence on the Government of the day, though the Tory party had had his support. He now commenced a fierce and active war against all forms of corruption and speculation in high places; and this brought him naturally into connexion with the Radical chiefs. It is perhaps not too much to say that a hatred of all forms of what he called "plundering of the people" was the base of Cobbett's political opinions; and this could hardly fail to make him a foe of any government in England before the Reform of Parliament. He issued several large publications—"The Parliamentary Debates," "The State Trials," and "Parliamentary History of England" being the most important. In 1810 he was sentenced to two years' imprisonment and a fine, which ruined him, for a pamphlet against flogging in the army. In 1817 he again sailed for America, driven away mainly by fear of the "gagging," and other repressive measures of the Government. He returned a year later, and continued his struggle for the improvement of the condition of the masses. In 1831 the Whigs, to whom he was as little forbearing as to the Tories, instituted a foolish prosecution against him for a "libel with the intent to raise discontent." It failed; and, as Mr. Smith well remarks, from that day no attempt to gag the press has been made in this country. Cobbett, of course, fought the fight of Reform, and was

sent by the borough of Oldham to the first reformed Parliament. He here shocked the respectables by sitting on the ministers' bench, and by beginning his maiden speech with the words:—

"It appears to me, that, since I have been sitting here, I have heard a great deal of vain and unprofitable conversation."

He made no great mark in Parliament, as was, indeed, natural for a man entering upon a new career when more than seventy years of age. He died in June, 1835, after seventy-three years of happiness and vigour, spent in a righteous warfare for the cause of the masses whom he loved, and for the extinction of political corruption. He not only fought, but won; and the nation owes a vast debt to this self-willed, honest Englishman. This debt can be paid in part by reading Mr. Smith's biography, which is an excellent book, and one which we should like to see read throughout the length and breadth of the land.

Mr. Hodgson's life of his father,¹⁴ Provost Hodgson of Eton, is a most interesting book, and one that is of historic value, for it explodes finally that filthy story which came to us not long ago from beyond the Atlantic, from a family which has exercised the prurient more than once in recent years. Not all the statements in the world can ever revive that foul calumny after the publication in this work, of the contemporary letters of the persons concerned, with all of whom Mr. Hodgson was intimate. Francis Hodgson was born in 1781, at Croydon, where his father, a clergyman of good stock, filled the mastership of Archbishop Whitegift's school. He was educated at Eton and King's College, Cambridge. After taking his degree, he held a private tutorship for three years, succeeded in due course to a fellowship, and was in 1806 appointed an assistant master at Eton. He held this post for a year only. He thought of the bar for a time, during which he translated Juvenal. In 1808 he accepted a tutorship at his college, which he held until his marriage. At Cambridge he formed an intimate friendship with Byron, his junior by seven years, and the pair corresponded until death separated them. Hodgson was ordained, and married in 1815, Byron having generously presented him with 1000*l.* for the purpose. In 1814 Hodgson began a life-long intimacy and correspondence with Byron's sister, Augusta Leigh. He was trusted and consulted on their separation by both Lord and Lady Byron, as well as by Mrs. Leigh; and the letters on this subject now published give this book its chief value. Lady Byron writes, before the separation was final:

"I may give you a general idea of what I experienced by saying that he married me with the deepest determination of revenge, avowed on the very day of my marriage, and executed ever since with systematic and increasing cruelty. . . . My security depended on the total abandonment of every moral and religious principle. . . . The circumstances, . . . shall not be generally known whilst Lord B. allows me to spare him. It is not unkindness that can always change affection. . . . You will continue Lord Byron's friend."

¹⁴ "Memoir of the Rev. Francis Hodgson, B.D., Scholar, Poet, and Divine." By his son, the Rev. James T. Hodgson, M.A. Two Vols. London: Macmillan & Co.

In a second letter she says :

" Considering the case upon the supposition of derangement, you may have heard. . . . that it is in the nature of such malady to reverse the affections and to make those who would naturally be dearest, the greatest objects of aversion, the most exposed to acts of violence. . . . I believe the nature of Lord B.'s mind to be most benevolent. . . . I must observe that I *had* expectations of personal violence."

These letters sufficiently prove that Lady Byron's grievance was some form of personal ill-treatment. Mrs. Beecher Stowe's story is further disproved by the following extracts from Mrs. Leigh's letters. In June, 1816, she writes :

" I had a letter from Lady B. the other day. . . . The bulletins of the poor child's health, by B.'s desire, pass through me, and I'm sorry for it, and that I ever had any concern in this most wretched business. I can't, however, explain all my reasons at this distance, and must console myself by the consciousness of having done my duty, and, to the best of my judgment, all I could for the happiness of both."

In October :

" I believe I have not written to you since I had the pleasure of seeing [poor Lady B.] and the dear little girl in London . . . It was a very great comfort to see dear Lady B., for I had suffered great uneasiness, of which I think I gave you hints, and this has been entirely removed."

A previous letter shows that this uneasiness was caused by a fear that Lady Byron thought her too partial to her brother's side of the question. In November Mrs. Leigh writes :

" If I may give you my opinion, it is that *in his own mind* there *were* and *are* recollections, fatal to his peace, and which would have prevented his being happy with any woman whose excellence equalled or approached that of Lady B., from the consciousness of being unworthy of it. Nothing could or can remedy this fatal cause but the consolations to be derived from religion, of which, alas! dear Mr. H., our beloved B. is, I fear, destitute. My anxious prayer for him, is for that first and *only certain good*, and I should be wretched indeed bereaved of *hope* on that subject. His friends (who for the most part are more or less deceived about him) argue thus : 'Oh! had he married a woman of the world' . . . this is worldly reasoning. I happen to know that dear Lady B. would have sacrificed all her own tastes and pursuits, everything but her duty, to make him happy; but all was in vain. . . . I shall pain you as much as I feel it myself, but it is a relief to talk of him to one who loves him and feels so rationally at the same time all that there is to *hope* and *fear* for him. I'm sure it is very useless to try and express my feelings towards him—I *never* could."

In March 1817 :

" His last letters have been *uncomfortable*. In one of them, after giving me the history of a *new attachment*, he says, 'And tell Hodgson his prediction is fulfilled; you know he foretold I should fall in love with an Italian, and so I have.' I should prefer giving you a more agreeable message, dear Mr. H., but I don't like to withhold any of his words *to you*. As for the circumstances it alludes to, it is only one among a million of melancholy anticipations of mine."

These letters prove conclusively that either Lady Byron was insane in later life, or that Mrs. Beecher Stowe's story was an impudent fabrication. They are the most important part of this biography. The rest of Hodgson's life was spent in pleasant intimacy with many of the leading men of his time. He had been rector of Bakewell for more than twenty years, when he was appointed Provost of Eton. There he made himself famous by abolishing the absurd and mischievous *Montem*, and by other wholesome reforms. He died in 1852. His son has given us a book which is most lively and entertaining in addition to its other more important merits.

Some quarter of a century ago a memoir of the American poet Poe was published in his own country by Dr. Rufus Griswold. This narrative gave a very unfavourable account of the poet; and made out that he was not only a habitual drunkard, and capable of committing outrage on the honour of his friends, but that he was an arrant scoundrel, who extorted money from women by threats of publishing letters, and defrauded publishers by selling the same poem to two or three persons. This book has probably been the chief cause of the neglect of Poe's works and name by his countrymen. Our American cousins are not generally disposed to underrate native talent, especially after it has received, as was the case with Poe, the stamp of European approbation. And it is certain that Poe possessed the true divine fire in a very high degree. Yet with the exception of one or two very hackneyed poems, his works seem to be much less in vogue than those of many an inferior poet. However this may be, he is now avenged. Mr. Gill has published a biography of Poe¹⁵, now in its fourth edition, which amply repays any abuse that Griswold may have heaped on the unhappy poet, and more than hints that the cause of his injustice is to be found in a severe critique by the latter of a book by Griswold. We need not trouble our readers with any remarks on the controversial part of the book, beyond saying that Mr. Gill seems to us to make out his case that Griswold was a most inaccurate biographer, if not a most malicious calumniator. Poe was born at Boston in 1809. Like many Americans who attain to the distinction of a biography, he was descended from a most ancient family, which, it seems, took the name from the river Po, though "in its Gallic form it is spelt Le Poer." Mr. Gill somewhat inconsistently says that "we find descendants of the parent family rooted in Ireland as far back as 1327," and then proceeds to remark that "Sir Roger le Poer was Marshal to Prince John during the reign of Henry II." The father of the poet ran away with an actress at the age of eighteen; they were married, and both died in 1811, leaving three infants unprovided for. Edgar, the second child, was adopted by Mr. Allan, a wealthy citizen of Richmond, in whose house he seems to have been a spoilt child. Mr. and Mrs. Allan visited England during his childhood, and so it happened that the boy received his first schooling at Stoke Newington. He returned to America while still a child. There was little that is remarkable about his youth. After leaving the

¹⁵ "The Life of Edgar Allan Poe. By William F. Gill. Fourth Edition. New York: Middleton. London: Chatto & Windus.

University of Virginia he had a dispute with his adopted father, and left his house for that of an aunt, where he first saw his cousin Virginia, who afterwards became his wife. He became reconciled to Mr. Allan, who procured him a cadetship at the United States' Military Academy, at West Point. Poe presently left the Academy; and this fact, and Mr. Allan's second marriage, hindered any further peace. Mr. Allan died in 1834, leaving Poe nothing. The latter soon afterwards married his cousin. His means were small and precarious, being derived from periodical writing. His first important book, "Arthur Gordon Pyne," met with more success in England than in America. From 1838 to 1844 we find him editing a magazine at Philadelphia, and writing his extraordinarily powerful tales. The next two years are spent in writing for the magazines in New York. His wife's health failing, in 1846 he took a cottage at Fordham, a village a few miles from the city. Here he presently fell into great poverty, and his wife died. The remaining three years of his life were spent in misery. He was perpetually in need of money. He became engaged to one or two widows. A morbid state of mind, from which he had suffered all his life, became exaggerated to something like insanity. If he was not a drunkard, he had the misfortune to be excited to frenzy by the most moderate quantity of strong drink. One day in October, 1849, he arrives in Baltimore without any apparent reason. He becomes intoxicated, is found lying in the street, is taken to a hospital, where he dies. His brief career was sad enough in itself without being aggravated by calumny. Mr. Gill's biography will improve the general idea of Poe; but such a life affords, at best, but little to interest or instruct. It is in his Poems and Tales that Poe is to be studied. In them he was certainly great; and we predict for them a vigorous life when many productions which have succeeded better are dead.

The Correspondence of Prince von Bismarck will doubtless one day be published, and it will certainly be an interesting as well as an important publication, and will be received by the world with eagerness and gratitude. But that he, or his family, should bring out a little volume¹⁶ containing about two score of letters, dated from 1844 to 1870, mostly addressed to his wife and sister, and all of them unimportant (and probably chosen for that fact), seems to us a most unnecessary step. It shows us, indeed, that the Prince writes with a rapid and lively pen, but that is all. Mr. Maxse's translation is evidently extremely well done.

Mrs. Cowden Clarke has collected and improved some papers of Recollections of Writers¹⁷, which she herself and her late husband contributed to the *Gentleman's Magazine*. The writers who are chiefly commemorated are Keats, the Lambs, Leigh Hunt, Douglas Jerrold, and Charles Dickens. A book of this kind cannot be criticised; it is

¹⁶ "Prince Bismarck's Letters to his Wife, his Sister, and Others, from 1844 to 1870." Translated from the German by Fitzh. Maxse. London: Chapman & Hall.

¹⁷ "Recollections of Writers." By Charles and Mary Cowden Clarke. London: Sampson Low & Co.

impossible to give any idea of it except by extracts, a method which our space denies us. Suffice it to say, that Mrs. Cowden Clarke's "Recollection" is a very well written and interesting book, and that the large number of unprinted letters (especially those of Leigh Hunt and Jerrold) which it contains, will give it a permanent value.

Mr. Joseph Johnson, having written a book called "Clever Boys of our Time and how they became Famous Men,"¹⁸ is indiscreet enough to exhibit his want of originality by announcing himself on his title-page as "Author of 'Clever Girls, and how they became Famous Women.'" We know nothing of the last-named work, but hope sincerely that it was better than its successor. "Clever Boys," &c., is a collection of very feeble accounts of twenty men whom the author considers famous. The selection is quaint. With Dickens, Faraday, and Arago, we find Joseph Brotherton, Thomas Spencer, "the boy-preacher," and Charles Bianconi. The book is apparently intended for boys. It will not do them much good.

Mr. Tait, one of the Masters at Clifton College, sends us an analysis of Mr. Green's "History of the English People,"¹⁹ intended apparently for school use. Now, whatever its excellences, and they are many, Mr. Green's book has always appeared to us to be one which is suited only to those who are well acquainted with the facts of history. His theories and comments are generally very good; but they are laid on with a large and free brush, and it is not easy to find the date or other details of any given incident in his book. If our view is correct, Mr. Tait must have had hard work, and must have used many other books, in the preparation of this analysis. His work has been performed carefully, and with judgment. A book of this kind is peculiarly liable to suffer from misprints. Thus, in the few pages which we have perused, July—not June—was the month of Robespierre's fall; the first battle of Copenhagen took place in 1801, not 1802; and the battles of Lützen and Bautzen in 1813, not 1814. It was the Portland Ministry, not the Canning Ministry, which fell in consequence of the Walcheren failure; but as he subsequently speaks of the "Canning Administration 1822—1827," Mr. Tait, perhaps, designedly names the Governments after their most gifted member. We would suggest that this practice leaves room for confusion when there happen to be two great men in a Cabinet, and that the words "Canning Administration 1822—1827" would distinctly mislead a lad as to Canning's promotion, and the treatment which he experienced in the latter year. But where did Mr. Tait learn that Louis Napoleon's *coup d'état* took place in 1852? and that he became Emperor in 1853? and (strangest of all) that he was ever *Consul*? With corrections of these misprints and slips, Mr. Tait's book will be a most useful companion to the student. It seems to us too full for boys, but University students will find it an admirable guide and help.

¹⁸ "Clever Boys of our Time, and how they became Famous Men." By Joseph Johnson. Edinburgh: Gall & Inglis.

¹⁹ "Analysis of English History, based on Green's Short History of the English People." By C. W. A. Tait, M.A., Assistant-Master in Clifton College. London: Macmillan & Co.

BELLES LETTRES.

"SAUL WEIR"¹ still pursues its wonderful course. The fourth part contains more imitations of Dickens' latest and worst style. Nearly the whole of the twenty-ninth chapter is nothing else but a parody upon that novelist's lowest and most mechanical sort of humour. Offensive as this style was in Dickens' hands, it becomes ten times more so in those of his imitator. We must suppose, however, that its admirers are numerous, if we are to judge from the opinions of the press. These favourable criticisms, however, do not prove that the author of "Saul Weir" is a great novelist, but rather the utter incompetence of the critics. In the fifth number we meet with a change. The writer abandons the style of Dickens for that of the Rev. George Gilfillan, of whom it has been said "he thought himself a painter, because he painted with a big brush." The Rev. George Gilfillan, it may be remembered, was always discovering new poets. His imitator follows in his footsteps, and also discovers a new poet. This is the way in which the new poet comes to London, "Ardour, fire, lights up the eyes as he presses forward for the great metropolis, bespattering his banner until the sweet and stately face of his muse is flushed by reason of his blushes" (page 358). Grammar and sense are all set at defiance. Any one else but a Gilfillanite would have written, "Ardour, fire, light up the eyes." Any one else but a Gilfillanite of the purest water would have stopped to have inquired how ardour and fire could possibly bespatter any banner in the world. Yet this particular bit is not a whit more extravagant or more foolish than other passages which we could quote. It is indeed deplorable to think that such dreary trash finds favour with the public, but still more deplorable to think that there are critics who will praise and puff it.

When two novelists enter into partnership, how do they arrange matters? Do they act as two dogs do when they go hunting on their own account? Does one start the hare, and the other cut it off and catch it? In other words, does one author suggest the characters and the other fill them in? Or do they work as painters do when they go into partnership, one paint the landscape and the other the figures? We will not inquire too closely. There are critics in our day who profess to be able to discriminate between Shakspeare's touch and Fletcher's in various plays. It would be well then for them to try their hands on Messrs. Besant's and Rice's new novel.² We pretend to no such critical niceties. We shall content ourselves with a word of general praise. The workmanship throughout is good and even. The

¹ "The Cheveley Novels." Saul Weir. Parts IV., V., VI., VII. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons. 1878.

² "The Monks of Thelema." A Novel. By Walter Besant and James Rice. Author of "Ready-Money Mortiboy," "The Golden Butterfly." London Chatto & Windus. 1878.

book is not quite to our taste. We should have been glad to have seen the topics upon which it touches treated from another point of view. It is, however, thoroughly light and amusing, and as there are so many thousands of idle people who only want to be amused, we can recommend it to them with a clear conscience.

For a long time past novels have been increasing in number and going back in quality. The reason is obvious. The subscribers at the various circulating libraries are also increasing in number, but not, so to speak, in quality. The new class of readers in our large towns are utterly destitute of any literary taste. Many of them are little above the rank of shop-girls. They are fresh from the beauties of the *London Journal*. One novel to them is as good as another. Publishers know this, and therefore do not care what rubbish they print. Why should a publisher pay a long price for a book, when he can get one which suits his purpose equally well, for either nothing or almost nothing? Here, for instance, is "Cressida,"³ by Miss Thomas, which is as good an example as could be wished of the ordinary circulating library novel, written by one, who, if she chose, could do a great deal better. In her first work, "Proud Maisie," there was, as we noticed in this REVIEW, a certain amount of vigour and dash which amounted almost to originality, and augured well for future success. But in the present volume all the originality has vanished. We have a number of commonplace incidents treated in a happy-go-lucky way. But Miss Thomas has by this time probably found out that this style is quite good for circulating-library readers. As the coal-merchant replied, when taxed with selling bad coal, "anything that is black is good enough for my customers," anything, in three novels, is good enough for my readers, replies the Mudie novelist. So things will go on for years. As the reader is, so is the writer. Not until readers acquire higher tastes will the novelist write in a higher style. In "Cressida" may be found plenty of love-making, but no true love, sketches of society, plenty of incidents, and a suicide and shipwreck, in short, all the ingredients of a circulating-library novel, and if these things command success, then "Cressida" is a most successful tale.

Yet there are few novels better than "Cressida" on our table. Many sink decidedly below it, as far as mere workmanship is concerned. The truth is that average novel-writing has sadly deteriorated during the past ten years. There is no disguising the fact. What claim, for instance, has such a book as "Is It True?"⁴ to be considered literature? Throughout the tale there is not a gleam of insight into human nature, not one touch of poetry. As for character, the writer does not appear to have the slightest notion what it means. But the most curious thing about recent novel literature remains to be noticed. Publishers are not content to publish worthless English novels, but so great is the demand for rubbish that they actually find that it pays to

³ "Cressida." By Bertha Thomas. Author of "Proud Maisie." London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, & Rivington. 1878.

⁴ "Is It True?" A Novel. In two Volumes. By H. Elvington. London: Remington & Co. 1878.

import it. We should have imagined that there was a plentiful supply of home-made English rubbish always to be had. But it seems not. At all events, Mr. Dunstan⁵ does not think so. He has been at the pains of translating one of the most senseless French novels which we ever read. Mr. Dunstan, we suppose, knows what he is about. There must be a class of people who like a tale of vulgar crime, and for that class, we must suppose, he has translated a very worthless book.

"Once! Twice! Thrice! and Away!"⁶ and "Elinor"⁷ may be paired together. They are both somewhat above the average circulating-library novel, "Once! Twice! Thrice! and Away!" being the better written of the two, and showing more knowledge of life and the ways of society. In Chapter VII., however, of "Elinor" may be found a very good account of a refusal, somewhat, perhaps, prosaically written and hard, but still decidedly good in its way. What makes the author of "Once! Twice! Thrice! and Away!" quote some lines from Henry Kingsley at page 158? They are nothing but a feeble imitation of the garden song in *Maud*. Surely the original would have served her purpose very much better.

We certainly felt some misgivings when we read the first lines of the dedication of "The Spring of My Life." "My Mother. My first literary work can only be dedicated to you. Without your insistance I should never have decided to publish it." Is "insistance" a misprint for assistance, or does it mean that the Princess's mother insisted upon her publishing this book? In either case she cannot be congratulated upon her judgment. It is commonly said that the bulk of the wretched novels with which we are infested are written by poor governesses trying to earn a penny. "In the Spring of My Life" conclusively shows that a princess can write just as bad a novel as a poor governess.

"Auld Lang Syne"⁸ is a seafaring tale written in somewhat too loud and spasmodic a style for our taste. The author, however, appears to be thoroughly at home on the sea, and those who delight in Captain Marryat will certainly read his tale with pleasure.

"Rachel Oliver"⁹ and "Light and Shade"¹⁰ are two novels which may fairly for their genuine merits be classed together. In both

⁵ "A Tragedy Indeed." Translated from the French. By H. Mainwaring Dunstan. London: Remington & Co. 1878.

⁶ "Once! Twice! Thrice! and Away!" A Novel. By May Probyn. London: Remington & Co. 1878.

⁷ "Elinor." A Novelette. By Clara Talbot. London: Remington & Co. 1878.

⁸ "In the Spring of My Life." By the Princess Olga Cantacuzene. Translated by Eugenie Klaus (with the Author's approval). London: Samuel Tinsley & Co. 1878.

⁹ "Auld Lang Syne." By the author of "The Wreck of the Grosvenor." London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, & Rivington. 1878.

¹⁰ "Rachel Oliver." A Tale. In three Vols. London: Macmillan & Co. 1870.

¹¹ "Light and Shade." By Charlotte G. O'Brien. London: C. Kegan Paul. 1878.

writers we fancy that we detect signs of still greater excellence. Both have an idea what character-drawing should be. Both understand the niceties and the difficulties of conversation. Their language has none of the stiffness and awkwardness which distinguishes most conversations, especially with young writers. It has something of the play and freedom of natural dialogue. Both writers possess, too, genuine feeling. Both, however, fall into the mistake of being over sad.

"George Hern"¹² is one of those tales of which it is difficult to speak with any certainty. Most critics would, we should suppose, condemn it unhesitatingly after having gone through the first volume. They would justly say that most of the characters both in high and low life were ill drawn; that the conversations of the former were stilted and of the latter were forced. Still, in spite of these great defects, it is easy to see that the writer possesses some observation. It is not very deep, but still it is there. What on earth, however, can Mrs. Oscar mean when she warns young Storker "against frivolous, gauzy pleasures?" (vol. i. p. 83.) What are "gauzy pleasures?" Does the author mean a weakness for ballet-girls?

Far higher in every way than "George Hern" is "Eliot the Younger."¹³ Here and there the author shows real literary power. The descriptions of the scenery round Oxford are filled in with a great deal of poetic feeling. His wit, too, is often epigrammatic. When the hero spends his last penny on having his shoes blacked, the writer remarks it is as if one of the foolish virgins instead of using her last drop of oil for her lamp had put it on her hair. We can recommend this tale for its vigour and truthfulness. Its Bohemian scenes in London are particularly well done.

There is not one redeeming literary virtue in "Will is the Cause of Woe."¹⁴ Our feeling, after reading half a dozen chapters of its dreary trash, is to say the severest things which the law would allow us. It is almost inconceivable that anybody could write or anybody can read such stuff. But the book exists, and we dare say will find plenty of readers.

"Lady's Holm"¹⁵ and "By Ways"¹⁶ may not be unfairly classed together. They have no particular defects nor any particular merits. They may both of them serve to while away an idle hour. On the other hand, "Frozen Hearts"¹⁷ makes far higher pretensions, and, to a

¹² "George Hern." A Novel. By Henry Glenham. London: Samuel Tinsley & Co. 1878.

¹³ "Eliot the Younger." By Bernard Barker. London: Samuel Tinsley & Co. 1878.

¹⁴ "Will is the Cause of Woe." A Novel. By the author of "Altogether Wrong," "What Money Can't Do," &c. London: Tinsley & Co. 1878.

¹⁵ "Lady's Holm." A Novel. By Annie L. Walker, author of "Against Her Will," &c. London: Samuel Tinsley & Co. 1878.

¹⁶ "By Ways." A Novel. By Mary W. Paxton. London: Samuel Tinsley & Co. 1878.

¹⁷ "Frozen Hearts." A Romance. By G. Webb Appleton. London: Samuel Tinsley & Co. 1878.

certain extent, justifies them. Along with these three foregoing novels may also be classed "A Great Mystery Solved."¹⁸ The author, as we learn from his preface, is a German by birth. His imitation of Dickens' style is far from bad. But why set oneself to such a foolish task? "The imitator dooms himself," not as Emerson says, to "hopeless mediocrity," but dooms himself altogether. Dickens' style is his own. There are many opinions about its merits, and we need not now go into them. "The Mystery of Edwin Drood" was certainly not one of Dickens' happiest efforts, and we cannot see why anybody should be at the trouble of solving it, especially in three long volumes. Still the mere name of Dickens has a charm for the ordinary novel reader, and we dare say many an uncritical subscriber to Mudie's will read Herr Vase's production with as much pleasure as they would do a genuine work of the great novelist himself.

Two translations of foreign novels ought to be noticed, one from the French and one from the Russian. For our own reading we prefer Count Tolstoy's tale,¹⁹ and can recommend it not merely as a story, but on account of its valuable information, which is not obtruded, but artistically worked in, so as to add to the effect and the interest. Turgenief (and he ought to be a judge) told the translator that he considered "The Cossacks" the finest and most perfect production as a novel in Russian literature. After this it is not necessary for us to say anything in praise of the work. Mr. Maitland has in giving us "Colonel Fongas' Mistake"²⁰ made a better choice than he did before.

There still remain a great number of English novels. From them we must make a selection. First and foremost in point of merit stands Mr. Hardy's "Return of the Native."²¹ Mr. Hardy possesses nearly every qualification of the novelist. In the first place his imagination is quick and strong; he has a keen eye not merely for the surface; he probes the feelings; his descriptive power is good. His sketches of nature may be placed beside those of Mr. Black and Mr. Blackmore, and higher praise we cannot well give. Lastly, he brings with him no small amount of reading and reflection. This, however, is never obtruded. If any one wishes to know what we mean, we should advise them to turn to the description of Clym Yeobright.

We are no admirers of Mr. Wilkie Collins. As we have more than once touched upon the defects of his style in this REVIEW, we shall simply content ourselves with mentioning the title of his last work.²²

¹⁸ "A Great Mystery Solved." Being a Sequel to "The Mystery of Edwin Drood." By Gillan Vase. London: Remington & Co. 1878.

¹⁹ "The Cossacks." A Tale of the Caucasus in 1852. By Count Les Tolstoy. Translated from the Russian by Eugene Schuyler. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, & Rivington. 1878.

²⁰ "Colonel Fongas' Mistake." By Edmond About. Translated by J. E. Maitland. London: Rivington & Co. 1878.

²¹ "The Return of the Native." By Thomas Hardy. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1878.

²² "The Haunted Hotel." By Wilkie Collins. London: Chatto & Windus, 1878.

If any one requires an antidote to Mr. Collins's sensational stories, we should advise them to turn to two novels by unknown writers, at least unknown as far as we are concerned. Both books show promise of future excellence. Perhaps "Among the Welsh Hills"²³ is the better story of the two, at least it is the pleasanter reading, although "For Percival"²⁴ shows more power, not always, however, wisely used. Better still, however, had the reader turn to Mr. Skelton's "Essays in Romance."²⁵ Here he will find a thoroughly healthy tone, quiet humour, quiet thought, and a deep, pure love of the country. Yet even in Mr. Skelton a critic can spy faults. If our knowledge has increased in one direction more than another, it is in our deeper acquaintance with the facts of nature. It behoves a novelist, therefore, to be particularly careful in his descriptions of scenery. The ordinary novelist is always blundering. But even Mr. Skelton, in fits of carelessness, makes mistakes. Thus he describes a place, "where the owl sweeps softly through the darkness or blinks at the passers-by from her nest, high among the bush ivy on the rocks" (page 10). Now there are ten species of British owls, and we do not know which Mr. Skelton means, but assuming that he intends some of the commoner kinds, he labours under a mistake in fancying that they build in ivy bushes, or bushes of any kind. They breed in holes of trees or rocks. Again, immediately afterwards we come upon the following passage—"When the thrush discourses exquisite music through the April twilight,—thanking God in her sweet fashion that since He has denied her immortality, her lines upon His earth have fallen in pleasant places" (p. 10). Now here are two mistakes. In the first place it is not the female but the male thrush who sings. In the second place, as Darwin has shown us, the song is not a song of praise or thanksgiving, but the means whereby the male attracts the female, being one of many methods of "sexual selection." We do not pick out these mistakes—and we might pick out more—for the purpose of disparaging Mr. Skelton, but to point out that if so careful an observer as he is falls into mistakes, what errors may not be expected from inferior writers.

The poetry of the quarter is very inferior. With the exception of Mr. Payne's "Lautrec," we have not a volume of any merit, and scarcely one which shows any promise. We do not know whether the author of "The Two Marriages"²⁶ is the same Mr. Barlow who wrote "Through Death to Life," noticed in our last number. If he is we can only say that he has done himself great injustice. Neither the blank verse nor the lyrics are worthy of his former book. We think, too, that the stage direction at page 16 will disgust most people, and make them close the drama at once.

²³ "Among the Welsh Hills." By M. C. Halifax. London: Groombridge & Sons. 1878.

²⁴ "For Percival." By Margaret Veley. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1878.

²⁵ "Essays in Romance and Studies for Life." By John Skelton. Author of "The Impeachment of Mary Stuart." London and Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons. 1878.

²⁶ "The Two Marriages." A Drama. In Three Acts. By George Barlow. London: Rivington & Co. 1878.

"The Millenium"²⁷ must not be judged too severely. It has been written under circumstances which would have quenched the spirit of most poets. The author, as we learn from a short autobiography which is appended, has been a journeyman printer, whose education and whose means have been very limited. He has not only written the poem, but like Franklin set up the type of his own work and printed and published it. All this is very creditable. But to say that the poetry is creditable is to condemn it.

"The Prince's Triumph"²⁸ does not aim very high, but at all events it hits its mark, and this is no small achievement amidst so many ambitious failures. It is, in fact, a drama for young people, very carefully worked out, full of interesting situations, and characterised by much dramatic power. This is no small praise, but the little play thoroughly deserves it. Its style is simple and unpretentious. Probably the writer might, if she pleased, do something of a higher order, as she thoroughly understands the meaning of individuality of character and plot-interest. Whether, however, she possesses "the faculty divine," without which no drama can hope to live, we cannot say.

Mr. Welcker is an American. His poems,²⁹ however, are much of the same type as those which fill the corner of a provincial English paper. In England, village schoolmasters and young curates are the principal contributors. We suppose that in America the same rule holds good. Mr. Welcker's contributions are, on the whole, somewhat better than those to which we are accustomed. Both the grammar and the rhymes are correct, and this is a great deal more than we can say for the newspaper poetry of our country.

Below will be found the title of a most extraordinary poem.³⁰ The mere title alone nearly takes up a closely printed page of the original. Further the author warns his readers against any "fragmentary perusal of his poem." He tells them, too, that he will not be responsible for the effects produced by disregarding his advice. As we should most decidedly like to find out "the deep secret of the universe," and to discover the "central truth of philosophy," and the "basis of morals," and the "final cause of all religions," we began the poem with no slight interest. We are compelled, however, to say that the author soars into regions of thought far beyond our powers of following him. Perhaps we might understand him if he would put his views into plain

²⁷ "The Millenium." An Epic Poem. By Edward Francis Hughes. Melbourne: (Printed and published by and for the author).

²⁸ "The Prince's Triumph: or, The Three Riddles." A Drama for Home Representation. By A. M. Y. London: Hirst, Smyth, & Son. 1878.

²⁹ "A Voyage with Death, and other Poems." By Adair Welcker. Oakland, Cal. Strickland & Co.

³⁰ "The Mountain Mystery." An Apocalypse proclaiming openly the deep secret of this Universe, which is also the hidden wisdom of Prophecy and Mythology, the central truth of Philosophy, the key of Natural History and Science, the basis of Morals, and the final cause of all Religions, in its practical relation to this great social Revolution, now impending over the nations of the world, as predicted by men of wisdom from early times. By Henry R. S. Dalton, B.A., Oxon. London: Rivington & Co. 1878.

prose. We can, however, say that he possesses an ear for rhythm, a feeling for nature, no little descriptive power, and an unusually large vocabulary, but we think that he does not at all understand the tendencies of modern thought.

Mr. Chandler's "Exchanged Identity"²¹ is better than some of his former attempts at rhyme. Still it is very poor in every way. We have tried in vain to find a single quotable passage. As Mr. Chandler seems to have set his heart upon literary distinction, we would advise him to study only the best models, and, above all, to avoid that slangy style and forced jocularity which he so much affects.

Mr. Ranking's little poem²² is in every way much better. In the first place, Mr. Ranking respects himself, and takes a subject which is worth treating. Mr. Ranking, though he can hardly be called a poet, has true poetic instincts. He has, too, evidently taken great pains. He has studied our elder poets to some purpose. The way in which he reproduces some of our forgotten though most beautiful archaic words, shows that he possesses both delicacy of feeling and delicacy of ear.

In certain quarters Mrs. Phillips²³ has been hailed as the coming poetess. We should be glad to think so. The world has at present known only one Sappho. Fate, too, in her case has been unusually unkind, and left us nothing but fragments by which to judge the verdict of her contemporaries. Mrs. Phillips has, at all events, given us plenty by which to judge her. In a closely printed volume of nearly three hundred pages, she has treated nearly every subject under the sun in every species of verse. Had Mrs. Phillips given us about one-tenth of what she has done, it would probably have been a great deal better for her true reputation. As it is, we perceive in her volumes, with one exception, little else but a power for mere rhetorical expression. Fluency of language meets us on every page, but little depth of thought. Commonplaces abound. She seldom sees beyond the surface, and even sees that surface very inaccurately. Let us, for instance, take the first eight lines from a piece called "Autumn Hedges":—

"See the purple vetches climb
Through the lush green grasses;
Hear the bluebell's fairy chime
As the light wind passes.
The poppy, like a scarlet flame,
By snowy star-wort blazes;
The buttercup its golden head
By rosy campion blazes." (P. 89.)

Now, this is mere surface painting. Taking it, however, as a mere piece of surface painting, it is excessively inaccurate. We should be

²¹ "The Exchanged Identity." By W. A. Chandler. Author of "Not to be Broken," "Thrice," &c. London: E. W. Allen. 1878.

²² "Bjorn and Bera." A Norse Legend. By B. Montgomerie Ranking. Author of "Fair Rosamond." London: Rivington & Co. 1878.

²³ "On the Seaboard, and other Poems." By Susan K. Phillips. London: Macmillan & Co. 1878.

very sorry to condemn any poet for inaccuracy on the ground that all the flowers which he happened to mention did not bloom at the same time, as critics have condemned Milton for his flower-catalogue in "Lycidas." The very rarity of a flower may make it all the more valuable on certain occasions. But Mrs. Phillips's case is different. She is describing the autumn hedges, and we should suppose wishes to express those feelings which most of us experience but cannot describe when we see them; for this, if anything, is the aim of poetry. She wishes, in fact, to bring the autumn hedges again before us. She has certainly arranged her pictures very badly. If the purple vetch conjures up any idea, it is not that of autumn but of midsummer, whilst the bluebell brings back the spring. The bluebell blossoms in April and May, and is out of flower by the end of June. Probably Mrs. Phillips means the harebell, which is a very different flower. Again, the starwort is a spring and summer flower; so, too, are the buttercup and the campion. None of these flowers are, in short, characteristic of an autumn hedge. Its characters are of a very different kind. If Mrs. Phillips wishes to know how autumn scenery should be described, let her study every line and word of Keats' "Ode to Autumn." But we will not quarrel with the mere inaccuracy; we will look at the description itself. There is not an epithet which is not mean and commonplace. "Purple," "lush green," "snowy," "rosy," are simply bald. As for "bluebells ringing a fairy chime," we are surprised that any one can, in these days, print such a barren commonplace. But this image is one of Mrs. Phillips's standing dishes. At page 85 the "bluebell rings" again, and at page 109 the "lily bells are ringing." Very rarely do we see any signs of an original mind. At page 109 Mrs. Phillips talks about "the moonlight-coloured may." This is nothing but a gross plagiarism from Shelley's "Dream":—

"And in the green hedge grew lush egiantine,
Green cow-bird, and moonlight-coloured may."

In the very next page Mrs. Phillips describes some hyacinths "as a bit of sky fallen to the ground." This is nothing else but Tennyson's magnificent description in "Guinevere" spoilt—

"sheets of hyacinth,
That seemed the heavens up-breaking through the earth."

And so we might go on through Mrs. Phillips's book, tracing the origin of her thoughts, but we have neither the inclination, the space, nor the time. Now, though we have spoken so severely of Mrs. Phillips's shortcomings, yet there is a side of her poetry which, by assiduous cultivation, might produce something. She has strong love for the sea and sailor-life, and feels the pathos of both; but she has the whole art of poetry to master. Judging by the present volume, she would appear to write whatever comes uppermost. She has yet to learn to be her own critic. As for the foolish praise which has been poured forth on her book, it can but do her infinite harm. *Pessimus genus inimicorum laudatores.* Careful study, careful revision, a stern

resolve to cut out all commonplaces, and to write only what comes from the heart, can alone produce any worthy or noble work.

We deeply regret that we have not room to notice Mr. Payne's fine poem of "Lautrec"²⁴ at greater length. Mr. Payne belongs to that small band of cultivated men who will probably be the glory of Victorian literature, who have succeeded in wedding thought to new music. Mr. Payne has hitherto been distinguished for a delicacy of style rather than strength, for a weirdness of thought rather than robustness. His critics have perhaps, not without reason, objected that he failed to get a firm grip of his subject. He has mostly dwelt in a region of twilight. "Lautrec," however, thoroughly removes these objections. Here is a description of a tournament as vivid and realistic as anything in the "Idylls of the King":—

- "Queen of the tourney was I set,
And watched the harnessed spearmen dash
Athwart the mellay, and the flash
Of helmets, as the fair knights met
And the spear shivered in the crash.
- "Full many a deed of arms was done,
And many a mighty man that day
Rode, meteor-like, through the array;
But over all the mellay shone
One knight's white plumes; and through the fray
- "Rose Lautrec's war-cry, as he clave
The throng of riders, and the sweep
Of his broad falchion did reap
The mail-clad knights, as some stout knave
Shears through the corn sheaves tall and deep." (Pp. 16, 17.)

Mr. Payne has here completely overcome the great difficulties of the measure which he has chosen, a measure suited rather for describing the more delicate moods and passing changes of the mind than rapid incidents. Everywhere is the poem characterised by this mastery of the rhythm and the rhyme. The English language has become with Mr. Payne, as with Swinburne and Gosse and Rosetti, perfectly flexible. Further, Mr. Payne gives new beauty to the oldest subjects, and there cannot be a better test of a poet's power. Here is the way in which he describes an early summer's evening in a wood:—

- "The nightingale upon the tree
Did with her summer-sacring note
Hallow our happiness. By rote
All that Love knows of sweets did she
Pour hour-long from her honeyed throat." (P. 44.)

There is, in short, nothing commonplace in Mr. Payne. He may not be popular with the "bisson multitude," but he is sure to be so with all lovers of poetry both to-day and to-morrow.

²⁴ "Lautrec." A Poem. By John Payne. Author of "The Masque of Shadows," "Intaglio Sonnets," &c., &c. London: Pickering & Co. 1875.

At the end of the volumes of poetry we may fitly notice a little book with the high-sounding title of "Ethics and Æsthetics of Modern Poetry."⁵⁵ If ever there was a book to which the saying, "What is new is not true, and what is true is not new," might be applied, then Mr. Selkirk has written it. If there is any meaning in this book as a whole, it is to warn poets against science. This is the only moral which we can extract from it. The first chapter is entitled, "Scepticism and Modern Poetry." In it we encounter the following remarkable passage :

"In these days of irresponsible faultiness, studded over with dipso- and klepto-maniacs, when so many are anxious to prove that we are 'villains by necessity,' as Shakspeare would have put it—'fools by heavenly compulsion; knaves, thieves, and leechers by spherical predominance,' we have often wondered that some charitable *doctrinaire* with a scientific mind has never started his atheomaniac." (P. 17)

Mr. Selkirk then proceeds to say what a happy thing it would be if it could be shown that the various degrees of unbelief are only varied phases of mental disorder. Now, either Mr. Selkirk believes in the doctrine of free-will or does not. If he does believe in it, as is implied here, why does he not meet the Necessarians in fair argument, instead of misrepresenting them? Does Mr. Selkirk think that he can possibly do anything else than damage his own reputation by such a passage as that which we have quoted? In one or two places Mr. Selkirk performs a certain amount of lip-service to science. The impression, however, which we derive from the book as a whole is that Mr. Selkirk does not understand the true relationship of science to poetry or of poetry to science, that he is utterly blind to the tendencies of the day, and utterly deaf to the new harmonies which are beginning to gladden the hearts of men. Before he writes again on the subject let him study Mill, Bain, and Spencer.

There is a large number of miscellaneous books this quarter, which we can only briefly notice. First of all comes the garrulous, harmless, empty A. K. H. B.,⁵⁶ who is a kind of prose Tupper. This good man, too, has his views upon science. His idea is that scientific men, "unbelieving" scientific men more particularly, have entered into a bond to puff one another, and in this way scientific ideas get spread. A far happier idea is that which Professor Knight has carried out, of illustrating "Wordsworth's country" by Wordsworth's own poetry.⁵⁷ Everybody who goes into the lake district is at once conscious of the spell of Wordsworth. If we may so speak, his spirit pervades the district. Professor Knight's book gives a definite expression to those vague feelings which most of us experience. Let no

⁵⁵ "Ethics and Æsthetics of Modern Poetry." By J. B. Selkirk. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1878.

⁵⁶ "The Recreations of a Country Parson." Third Series. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1878.

⁵⁷ "The English Lake District." As Interpreted in the Poems of Wordsworth. By William Knight, Professor of Moral Philosophy and Political Economy in the University of St. Andrew's. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1878.

one go to the lakes without this admirable companion. Another work,³⁸ of a different kind, we can also recommend. Its author must not be confounded with Mr. G. M. Fenn. Mr. W. W. Fenn was an artist, who, through the loss of his eyesight, was obliged to give up the brush for the pen. One of the most pathetic chapters in the two volumes is that in which he details the gradual loss of his eyesight by amaurosis. The essays are of all kinds, suited to all sorts of persons and to all ages. Some of them may be regarded as fancy sketches, others as novelettes drawn from real life, and others again criticisms upon character and art. All of them are good, and all of them are pervaded by a healthy, cheerful tone, which make us thoroughly respect the author and sympathise with him in his sad affliction.

Amongst the books which may be said to belong, more or less, to the season, Miss Mitford's "Our Village"³⁹ stands first. Miss Mitford's quiet style, so full of poetry, observation, and humour, would alone procure readers, without the attractions of the binding, paper, and illustrations. Both Mr. Boot and Mr. Murray have entered into Miss Mitford's spirit. If we rightly remember, Mr. Boot a few years since illustrated a work on Sherwood Forest. His present drawings show a great advance upon those in that work. Mr. Murray's task has been more difficult than Mr. Boot's, and there is more inequality in his work. Some of his sketches are, however, marked by great spirit. Of books for boys and girls there are plenty. "My Mother's Diamonds"⁴⁰ will suit the latter, and "The Mariners of England,"⁴¹ and "The Wreck of the Grosvenor"⁴² the former, whilst "Adventures of a Field Cricket"⁴³ and "Two Friends"⁴⁴ will suit both. For grown-up people we have a selection of aphorisms from George Eliot,⁴⁵ and for those who wish to gain an insight into Eton, "About Some Fellows."⁴⁶ All of these books are good in their several ways. The

³⁸ "Half Hours; or, Blindman's Holiday; or, Summer and Winter Sketches in Black and White." By W. W. Fenn. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, & Rivington. 1878.

³⁹ "Our Village." By Mary Russell Mitford. Illustrated by C. O. Murray and W. H. J. Boot. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, & Rivington. 1879.

⁴⁰ "My Mother's Diamonds." A Domestic Story for Daughters at Home. By Maria H. Greer. With Frontispiece by A. Ludovico. Griffith & Farran. 1879.

⁴¹ "The Mariners of England." Stories of Deeds of Daring. Written for English Youth. By W. H. Davenport Adams. Author of "Great Names in European History," &c., &c. Edinburgh: The Edinburgh Publishing Company. London: Simpkin, Marshall, & Co. 1879.

⁴² "The Wreck of the Grosvenor." An Account of the Mutiny of the Crew and the Loss of the Ship. By W. C. Russell. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, & Rivington. 1879.

⁴³ "The Curious Adventures of a Field Cricket." By Dr. E. Candeze. With Illustrations by C. Renard. Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, & Rivington. 1878.

⁴⁴ "The Two Friends." By Lucien Biart. Translated by Mary De Hauteville. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, & Rivington. 1878.

⁴⁵ "The George Eliot Birthday Book." William Blackwood & Sons. Edinburgh and London. 1879.

⁴⁶ "About Some Fellows." By an Eton Boy. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, & Rivington. 1878.

illustrations in "The Adventures of a Cricket" ought not to be passed over without a word of praise. If we were inclined to prophesy, we should say that the author of "About Some Fellows" would be likely to distinguish himself as a novelist. His humour is particularly good. Besides these works, we have to acknowledge a series of Jules Verne's works,⁴⁷ and a series of "The Rose Library,"⁴⁸ and a most charming edition of Longfellow⁴⁹ in eleven miniature volumes enclosed in an equally beautiful case, or rather, we should say, a casket. For a young lady this would make a most excellent present.

MISCELLANEA.

IT is difficult to avoid the exaggeration of praise in speaking of "The Gamekeeper at Home." Never since White made Selborne sacred has so fascinating a book on the country appeared. To say that it is not the peer of White's great work is only to say that it will not take rank with English classics. If it were worth while entering into a comparison of the two books, it might be said that White knew nature from the inside, and that the author of "The Gamekeeper at Home" knows her from the outside; that the chronicler of Selborne when he sought consolation for his disappointed human love, in the cultus of the nature that never did betray the heart that loved her, lived, like Thoreau, so long in her unceasing companionship and worship, as to be considered in some sense initiated into the priesthood of her mysteries, whereas the new author speaks only with the authority of a keen patient observer. But he has observed to such good purpose that those who will but see with his eyes need not fear that the goddess is clothed about with an impenetrable veil. The title of the book, though not a misnomer, does not in its direct simplicity give any idea of the beauty of the volume. It is, truly, all about a gamekeeper, about his home and his daily life, but it is also about the woods and meadows and their denizens; it is a genuine pastoral picture of the life of an English gamekeeper of the best kind, a pastoral picture that has really enriched our literature. To those dwellers in towns, who, through all the city's jar, still keep green their devotion to the rural Pan that Mr. Matthew Arnold sings of, who dream of the country and linger lovingly in picture galleries over paintings of soft meadow and gentle river, the company of this good gamekeeper will be a source of

⁴⁷ "Jules Verne's Works." (Low's Authorised and Illustrated Edition.) "The Survivors of the Chancellor." Parts I, II. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, and Rivington. 1879.

⁴⁸ "Six to One." (The Rose Library Series.) "In the Wilderness." By Charles Dudley Warner. (Same Series.) London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, & Rivington. 1879.

⁴⁹ "Longfellow's Works." (In eleven Vols. and Case.) London and New York: Routledge & Sons. 1879.

¹ "The Gamekeeper at Home. Smith, Elder, & Co. 1878.

most exquisite pleasure. If they cannot imitate the poetic loungee whom Horace sang of, he who did not disdain to spend a solid part of the day, now stretched under the green arbutus, and now by the smooth head of some sacred stream, they may for many pleasant moments forget the close companionship of streets, and the details of civic life as they wander with him and his dogs through tangled woods and by upland lawns, along sedgy rivers, and wind-blown brooks, in leafy lanes and over breezy commons, all of which lie within this little book, and are to be enjoyed at no greater pains than the reading it from cover to cover. In imagination they may enjoy the shade which beechen boughs diffuse and know the happy fields of the Virgilian shepherd. With every bird, beast, and fish too that wood, wold, and water knows of will they become familiar, even to the extent of learning how they may best be snared, of sharing for an hour in the lawless joys of poaching. "Oh, it's my delight of a shiny night in the season of the year." But soft, we are on the side of this gamekeeper, of this good gamekeeper, whose talk is as pleasant as the babble of the Syracusean fishermen given to us in the golden numbers of Theocritus. He sees no romance in poaching, he, and if we love him we must not sympathise with what he hates so much. The great charm of the book lies in its evident truth of inspiration and description. It has none of the sham rusticity, none of the elaborate efforts after word-painting, which so often do service for the presentation of rural scenes. The smell of the earth is about the book, the smell of the earth, the odorous keen air of the pine-woods; all the sounds and sights of field and forest come upon its unfamiliar reader much as the jargon of the birds and the whisper of the leaves are made known to the awakening ears of Wagner's Sigurd.

Three books about Homer lie before us, only one of which is of any value or interest to those who look upon the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* rather as great epics to be read and re-read and rejoiced over, than as the hunting grounds of philologists and the battle-fields of pedants. This is Mr. Gladstone's "*Homer Primer*,"² in which the first elements of Homerology are given with that mixture of erudition and enthusiasm which make his Homeric studies a pleasure to all lovers of Homer. In this dainty little volume is condensed all that most people ought to know about the great Greek epics, their people, their scenes, their civilisation, and the various questions and theories arising out of them. Mr. Gladstone has too much of the poet in his nature to care for the Choroizontic or Wolan slicing of Homer; in the company of Goethe and of Schiller he prefers, where absolute certainty is hopeless, to believe in the ideal poet whose name shall not be disconnected from the war of Troy and the wanderings of Ithacus so long as men shall care for poetry, in spite of all the frog and mouse battles that shall be waged against his identity. The great charm of Mr. Gladstone's Homeric criticisms is due to the openness of his mind. Like Walter Savage Landor, and unlike most Homer critics, he "warms both hands before

² "*A Primer of Homer.*" By the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone. Macmillan & Co. 1878.

the fire of life." His books are free from the hot atmosphere of the schools, and the close confinement of the student's room and the student's mind. They are the books of an active man; they are the relaxations of a never-resting intellect; they are well done, because the moments that may be given to them are very precious and must not be wasted. In reading them we feel as one who walks with a philosopher in open day; the free air blows upon us and we tread the earth with an elastic step as we listen to the charmed speech of our companion. Unlike the clergyman described in Hogg's life of Shelley, who read nothing but Greek, and who only looked now and then at a page of Virgil or Cicero in order to assure himself of their inferiority to his Hellenic models, Mr. Gladstone brings a wide culture and a wide experience to bear upon his Homeric expositions. It is this which with his poetic devotion to his hero and his judicious critical discrimination enables him to set down all that is necessary for the study of Homer in so small a space and makes this little primer outweigh so many bulky volumes.

It is one of the penalties attaching to the fame of great poets that people will write so much about them that is utterly unimportant to the exclusion of genuine study of their works. It is difficult to believe that those who spend their time in supporting one or other side of the many-sided Homeric controversy have much pleasure in the beauties of the poems themselves: they certainly have not the delight in them that belongs to the schoolboy, who for the first time has fallen in with a copy of Pope's Homer, and learns all the tale of Troy divine, and the adventures of Ulysses. While we read over Mr. Geddes' ³ pages, while we look at his elaborate tables and listen to his learned disquisitions on Achillean books and non-Achillean books, it is not without a feeling of regret that time should have been wasted in writing such a book, still more that time should be wasted in reading it. Mr. Ruskin's declaration that he did not care two copper spangles how the stars moved, might with greater wisdom have been applied to the Homeric squabbles. It is wholly unimportant whether the Iliad and Odyssey are the work of one man or many. They are the great epics of the world, and the more mankind reads them and the less it waste its time wondering futilely who wrote them, the better for it.

What shall be said of Mr. Paley's Homeric theories newly put forth in a Latin pamphlet⁴ for the benefit of the world at large after the fashion of mediæval scholarship? He claims superiority of antiquity for the Cyclic poems over what are now known to us as Homer's works, and indulges in various vain speculations and eccentricities of criticism in which those who love such enquiries may cope with him if they will. Mr. Paley's quaint conceits were admirably answered some years ago by Mr. Andrew Lang in the pages of the *Fortnightly Review*, and it is with sincere regret that we find him coming to the front again.

Almost equally reprehensible with the attempts to reduce Homer

³ "The Problem of the Homeric Poems." By W. D. Geddes. Macmillan & Co. 1878.

⁴ "Homeri quæ nunc exstant, an reliquis Cycli carminibus antiquiora jure habita sint." By F. A. Paley. F. Norgate. 1878.

to a ridiculous nonentity are the efforts to invade the sacred domain of fairy-land with the theories and teaching of modern science. Even where this is done with all the apparatus of knowledge it is not greatly interesting, but when as in the case of Mr. Bunce⁵—whose name suggests recollections of that time-honoured Mother Bunch—the effort is unaccompanied by any remarkable erudition, the result is very disheartening. Mr. Bunce commences in an airy light-hearted fashion to talk of the winter season and the appropriateness of the fairy tales beloved by children; then, still in the awkwardly chatty manner which some popular lecturers mistake for ease, he branches off into the solar myth and what we may be permitted to call the Aryan heresy. Few things appear more preposterous in the hands of amateurs than the solar myth. It is so easy to make a smattering of knowledge go a long way, and to get up a pretentious appearance of learning and critical faculty by twisting out of the simplest fairy tales allusions to the sun and moon, that we are not surprised to find Mr. Bunce trying his 'prentice hand at the experiment. We remember a clever article in a university magazine some years ago in which Prof. Max Müller himself was treated by the writer as a solar myth, and a very good case indeed the author made out for thus considering the great philologist. We should be sincerely sorry to see Mr. Bunce's dreary volume put into the hands of any child. It is even better to allow infancy no entrance into the sacred world of fairydom where *la mère l'oie* presides, than to destroy its imagination with the melancholy spectacle of a dissected fairy tale and the analysis of sham science.

To all who have drunk of the waters of the fountain of Trevi, and who bear deep in their hearts a home-sickness for the "Prima inter urbes divum domus, aurea Roma" of Ausonius, Mr. Northcote's volume on the epitaphs of the Catacombs⁶ will appeal, and not in vain. Of all the varied charms of Rome which make it still, as it ever has been, chief among the cities of the world, there is nothing that appeals more directly to human interest than its melancholy and mysterious graves. To the wanderer in the Catacombs Rome seems indeed a city of the dead, and it is only as the traveller returns from the Appian way, whose broken monuments are the bones of a dead Empire, into the Piazza Colonna, when perhaps the band is playing the Garibaldi Hymn, that the truth of the title of Eternal City seems most clear and keen. Mr. Northcote's volume on the Inscriptions in the Catacombs should be read by all students of Roman History. It is of course indebted for its existence to the labours of de Rossi, but as de Rossi's great works are not readily accessible to the mass of students, Mr. Northcote has really conferred a blessing upon the lovers of early Christian archaeology by presenting them in one small volume with so large a body of inscriptions and so much valuable criticism and elucidation. Of special interest to the curious in such matters is the

⁵ "Fairy Tales; their Origin and Meaning." By J. Thackeray Bunce. Macmillan & Co. 1878.

⁶ "Epitaphs on the Catacombs." By J. S. Northcote. Longmans, Green, & Co. 1878.

chapter on symbolic inscriptions, and on the somewhat rare cases in which the trade of a man or woman was represented on the grave by some carved effigy of some instrument of their profession.

It is difficult to believe that there are many who, being unable to read Erasmus in the original, will care much for a translation of his "Encomium Morice." Mr. Copner does not seem to think so, for he has brought out a translation, which is remarkable for its excellence of print and paper, and for little else. The English is mediocre, and the notes poor. It is indeed a pity to see so exquisite a piece of special pleading, such fanciful advocacy of sweet Folly, done into English by any one incapable of making it such a possession of the language as some half-a-dozen translations in our literature may boast themselves to be. The praise of Folly is among the most excellent pieces of mediæval fooling we possess; and if Mr. Copner's version and the recent French translation by Emmanuel des Essarts are any sign of a returning taste for genuine humour, they deserve at least the welcome of all bearers of good tidings.

Mrs. Webster is not only a good poet and better translator, but she is also a good writer of social articles. In these days of universal journalism, social articles are in great demand; but though the supply is plentiful, merit bears but a small proportion to the abundance of matter. Those, therefore, to whose mental appetites the genial diffuseness and brisk garrulity essential to "Socials" are attractive, will find in Mrs. Webster's volume of essays,⁷ reprinted from the *Examiner*, food of a light, attractive, and wholesome nature. She discourses on all kinds of topics, from Browning to legs of mutton, from translation to toys, with a ready vivacity and brisk goodwill which should make a Housewife's opinions deservedly popular not only among housewives.

Those vulgar instincts in man which make him meanly desirous of mean information about the private life and character of public individuals, the instincts of Paul Pry and of Jenkins, these *Vanity Fair*⁸ has set itself to gratify by its coloured caricatures of the various people of the day whom it considers important enough to compliment or to insult, and by the accompanying biographies. The Jenkinsses to whom *Vanity Fair* addresses itself will doubtless delight in learning that Lord Lyons has never yet been enslaved by woman, and that wine has no charm for him, in gazing upon the portrait of Baker Pasha, and in hearing it set down to the credit of his brother officer, Hobart Pasha, that to his efforts the failure of the gallant Cretan struggle for liberty was due.

Canon Farrar heroically tilts with Professor Max Müller in the vexed lists of philological dispute, and the contest will doubtless be of great interest to the specially concerned. Canon Farrar¹⁰ has certainly collected together a vast amount of erudite statements, which have, however, rather more the appearance of being intended to appal by their number than by their special relevancy of connexion. There is to the

⁷ "Erasmus's Praise of Folly." By J. Copner. Williams & Norgate. 1878.

⁸ "A Housewife's Opinions." By Augusta Webster. Macmillan & Co. 1879.

⁹ "Vanity Fair Album, Jan. to June, 1878." "Vanity Fair" Office.

¹⁰ "Language and Languages." By Canon Farrar. Longmans & Co.

cultured amateur an especial attraction about the study of language, because it is so comparatively easy to get up a case for any theory, however wild, and to support it by an array of facts and figures. The guesses of some among our modern philologists are scarcely less eccentric than those of the distinguished philosopher who attempted to derive Hebrew from Greek read backwards. It is an open question whether we do not hear just a little too much about languages at present—whether there is not abroad too much of that spirit of criticism which sees nothing in Plautus but the Carthaginian speech of Hanno, and turns Shakespeare into a system of verse-measurement. We should not be inclined to grumble much, however, if all the books, whether right or wrong, which are given to the subject, were as interesting to read as Canon Farrar's. We do not quite understand why in his pages on what he is pleased to call the argots of the *dangerous* classes throughout Europe, he says that in French slang a soldier, by an onomatopœia which it would take too long to explain, is *piou-piou*. *Piou-piou* is a slang reduplication of the old French word *pion*, which comes from the Latin *pedonem*, and is found in the Spanish *peon* and the Italian *pedone*. "Entre le Jean-jean et le tourlourou il y a un intermédiaire, le pion-pion," says M. Saint-Hilaire. Canon Farrar might have found in Loredan Larchey's Slang Dictionary many better examples of onomatopœic words than he has chosen—for example, "frou-frou," made famous by the young Dumas; *gilboq*, culled from billiard-room babble, *bouis-bouis*, &c. At the same time Canon Farrar dwells too much upon the imitative nature of slang. The forgotten langue Javanais, which was once the speech of Parisian foyers and coulisses, consisted simply of the insertion of the syllable *va* between every syllable that composed a word. In mentioning the various philosophical languages that the folly of mankind has composed from time to time, we are surprised to find no allusion to a curious contribution made to this kind of literature by America in the form of an attempted universal language entitled "Alwato," by an American author, Mr. Stephen Pearl Andrews.

Professor Leon Delbos¹¹ attempts to condense into a small compass the results of former discussions on several interesting philological problems, and his attempt will be well worth reading in companionship with Canon Farrar's volume. Like Canon Farrar, he rejects the lesson usually adduced from the famous experiment of the Egyptian King Psammetichas, and contends that the *bekkos* uttered by the secluded children was merely the vocal imitation of the bleat of their companion goat.

Of Mr. Marshall's attempt to revive the forgotten forms of English language,¹² there is no need to say anything.

Mr. Oliphant's volume *Old and Middle English*¹³ deserves the highest commendation from all who have any care for the honour and dignity of our language. To begin with, he deserves all praise for writing clear English, for saying, "I should be heartily ashamed of

¹¹ "Chapters on the Science of Language." By Prof. Leon Delbos. Williams & Norgate.

¹² "England's Language." By W. Marshall. Longmans.

¹³ "Old and Middle English." By T. L. K. Oliphant. Macmillan & Co.

myself if I thought I had used any word that a twelve year old English schoolboy, a reader of Cæsar and Ovid, could not understand," and for acting on this principle in this he sets a most notable example to certain of our scientific writers. Altogether the book is one of the most interesting works on old English we have ever met with, it has a good index, and it is the work of a scholar who is a master of his art. What more need be said? We should like to see it adopted as a textbook in every school where any serious study of the speech of Englishmen was carried on.

Mr. Kennard¹⁴ has made a very interesting selection from the later poems of scholars, the most attractive of which to our mind are the epigrams of Muretus, epigrams by no means so well known as they should be. The epigram addressed to Gaurus, which may be paraphrased thus,

"They say all poets are to die this year,
But, my dear fellow, what have you to fear?"

is too delightfully apt for quotation to be suffered to lie in oblivion. Mr. Kennard's own *latinity* deserves praise.

It may be said of most of the Clarendon Press publications that they are exceedingly good, and the more recent additions are no exception to this general rule. It is with great pleasure that we welcome Mr. Hamann's edition of Lessing's "Laocoon."¹⁵ Few books have been of more importance in the history of art; few books have been more persistently unread or unappreciated in England of late. We should be inclined to place the "Laocoon" at the very head of the literature of art criticism. Mr. Hamann's edition is a well-printed little volume with scholarly notes and introduction. English readers will thank him for printing the text in the Roman, not the Gothic letters.

The labour of twenty-five years has added to critical literature an annotated edition of Juvenal,¹⁶ which might serve as a monument of English scholarship. Two volumes of 330 and 450 pages, out of which the text occupies but 87 pages, will at once suggest to the classical student a feast of erudition, which he will not find to prove on inspection a Barmecidal banquet. The humanists of the nineteenth century have not rendered to Roman literature a more worthy tribute of painful toil than is presented by Mr. Mayor's Juvenal. We cannot imagine a greater pleasure for lovers of Juvenal than its careful perusal will afford.

Mr. Merry has now completed his edition of the *Odyssey*,¹⁷ and the highest praise we can give it is that it is a worthy contribution of the first half. Some of his notes are, however, open to argument.

C. S. Jerram's second book of Xenophon *Anastasis*, and A. O. Prickard's *Prometheus Bound* of Æschylus, are both good editions.

¹⁴ "Arundines Stuci." Edited by R. H. Kennard, M.A. Oxford: J. Parker. 1878.

¹⁵ "German Classics: Lessing's Laocoon." Edited by A. Hamann. Clarendon Press. Macmillan & Co.

¹⁶ "Juvenal." By J. E. B. Mayor. Two Vols. Macmillan & Co.

¹⁷ "Homer: *Odyssey* XIII.—XXIV." By W. W. Merry. Clarendon Press.

The well-known editors and translators of Tacitus¹⁸ have published an excellent school edition of the sixth book of the *Annals*, in which most of the notes in their translation are reprinted.

Those who learn Latin in the manner usually taught in schools will find Mr. Bennett's first Latin writer¹⁹ as serviceable as most works of its kind.

It is an exceedingly good sign of the growth of art-feeling in the United States, that one of the best manuals of china painting²⁰ we have seen comes from the presses of an American publisher. It has often been a matter of wonder to us that amateurs with a taste for art do not go in for china painting more largely than is the case. The labour is so comparatively light, the amount to be learned so little, and the results may be so happy, that we know of no better employment to which fingers desirous of some easy and useful artistic work may be devoted. Nothing quickens the artistic sense so markedly in individuals as the personal cultivation of any form of art-work. The difficulties encountered awaken the mind more keenly to the labour necessary for the completion of any artistic inspiration, and reveal new and more subtle beauty in things hitherto admired without appreciation of the causes of admiration. With Miss McLaughlin's little volume, a few pigments and some tiles, an entrance might be made into the art-world by the portal of decoration, which could not fail to be of good to the maker of the experiment. We can speak from our own experience when we say that we know no pleasanter mode of wasting time wisely than tile painting affords.

Children's books are naturally numerous at this time of year, and present no marked difference to the juvenile literature of preceding Christmases. Children's books may be and are produced in any quantity, but of the few which any year or any ten years produce worth remembering, it may be said with Thackeray, "Get a very small piece of paper and write them all down." The batch we are about to consider does not include any work worth placing upon this list, but most of them are sufficiently meritorious to amuse the passing moment. Clifford Merton's "Funny Foreigners" (Sampson Low) is a pleasant brightly-coloured picture book, accompanied by the usual silly rhymes that are supposed to attract young people. The "blue and white" picture from the willow pattern plate is the best in the volume.

"Chums,"²¹ "Great and Small,"²² "Queen Dora,"²³ "The Children's Isle,"²⁴ are all fair specimens of the kind of writing for children which, in most cases, is worthless enough, and may be hurtful when it teaches them to look upon themselves as heroes and heroines, not in the healthy,

¹⁸ "Tacitus *Annals*, Book II." Edited with Notes by the Rev. Alfred J. Church and the Rev. J. W. Brodribb. Macmillan & Co.

¹⁹ "First Latin Writer." By George L. Bennett. Rivingtons.

²⁰ "China Painting." By Louise McLaughlin, Cincinnati. Robert Clarke & Co. 1877.

²¹ "Chums." By Harleigh Severne. Griffith & Farran.

²² "Great and Small, from the French of Mme. Madeleine Laroque." By Harriet Poole. Griffith & Farran.

²³ "Queen Dora." By Kathleen Knox. Griffith & Farran.

²⁴ "The Children's Isle." By Eliza Meteyard. Hodder & Stoughton.

ennobling sense which gladdened the boyhood of Daisy Copperfield, but of their own proper age and personality. It is the demand and supply of literature like this for young minds and dawning ideas which makes us wish that Rousseau's limitation of a child's library to "Robinson Crusoe" could be laid down as a law, with any infringement thereof penal.

"Animals and their Social Powers"²⁶ is a much better kind of book. The love for animals is a feeling that should be carefully fostered in children, and any volume which helps in a kindly and sympathetic manner to stimulate this feeling should be commended.

The stories of A. L. O. E.²⁷ will always be liked by the admirers of her style of religious narrative.

The yearly volumes of *Prize* (W. W. Gardner) and *Chatterbox* (W. W. Gardner) keep up to their usual standard of merit, &c.

The art of doing good picture-books for children has been given a new direction by the efforts of Walter Crane, Marks, and Moyr Smith. It is therefore a pity to see "The Prince of Nursery Playmates" (Sampson Low) illustrated in the old, common-place fashion. "A New Child's Play," by E. V. B. (same publisher), is much better. The illustrations are in their way works of art, with evident influence of the German School upon them.

The best picture-book for children, with the exception of Walter Crane's "Baby's Bouquet," that this year has seen, is "Child-life in Japan."²⁷ The craze of the day has made Japan somewhat of a nuisance, and its art a bugbear, but with this fascinating volume we seem to get back to a time before London boasted so many shops for the sale of Japanese wares, before artists thought it necessary to imitate oriental eccentricity, and before it became the fashion to prattle pompously of the æstheticism of Japanese art. All the fantastic simplicity, all the unaffected truth and beauty of Japanese child-life, are here presented in dainty little tales and quaint pictures, that will delight and educate their fortunate young owners. The strong, simple nature-study which makes the art of Japan what it is, will educate their love of form, and the wholesome, sweet morality of the stories will never weary the little ears that love no preaching, but which are quick enough to accept good lessons that come in guise so attractive.

The official "Handbook for the National Training School of Cookery"²⁸ will be a valuable volume to all directly interested in the main branches of that important art of which Rabelais and Brillat Savarin are prophets. It is eminently sensible, and if it does not rise to any high flight, it lays down a good basis upon which to act. We miss, however, with regret from the list of puddings that delightful compound of figs, flour, and wine which we owe, in the first instance, to the observant

²⁶ "Animals, and their Social Powers." By Mary Turner Andrewes. Griffith & Farran.

²⁷ "Pomegranates from the Punjaub." By A. L. O. E. Gall & Inglis.

²⁸ "Child Life in Japan." By M. Chaplin Ayrton. Griffith & Farran. 1879.

²⁹ "The Official Handbook for the National Training School of Cookery." Chapman & Hall. 1878.

nature of Herodotus, and which can be most successfully adapted to modern days.

Hugh MacColl sends a valuable pamphlet on the calculus of equivalent statements, reprinted from the proceedings of the London Mathematical Society for 1877.

Mr. J. W. Clare, whose case and whose grievance have been so often brought before the House of late, and whose name has been familiar to people in Manchester for the last five and twenty years, presents the public with two pamphlets, one on the construction of a cork waistcoat,²⁹ the other on the least expensive method of raising ironclads.³⁰ The former is of interest to every one connected with the water; the latter ought to be of special importance to our Government, as most of our ironclads seem made chiefly to go to the bottom.

There is a great deal of pleasant reading and much information in the fourth volume of the papers of the Manchester Literary Club.³¹ Those who are fond of the varied knowledge obtainable from essays of the kind, will find that the Manchester Literary Club can hold its own with any similar institution for variety of topics and merits of literary style. Mr. Holyoake's paper on the provincial mind, and Mr. Axon's on the catalogue of the British Museum, are of special interest.

Mark Twain's latest joke is a scrap-book of his own invention,³² gummed, ready for use. A very good joke it is.

Recent additions to the two admirable series of popular pamphlets published in Berlin comprise an admirable essay on foreign words in German³³ which will be of interest to the students of language who act on the lines laid down by Mr. Ruskin in his "Sesame and Lilies," an interesting legal essay by Herr Theodor Hegenhalm³⁴ on the important question of State prosecution in German criminal law, a valuable paper on some of the reactions of the brain and will in men and animals, by Dr. Jul. Jensen³⁵ and a sketch of the history of King Apollonius, of Tyre,³⁶ from an old French story.

As we once owed to Germany some of the most valuable contributions to Shakespearian literature, so we now owe it many of the best works on English literature. Herr Hortsman's³⁷ collection of old English legends and Dr. Kölbing's English studies,³⁸ are indispensable to all the thorough students of early English literature now so numerous.

²⁹ "Instructions for the Manufacture of a Double Waistcoat to prevent People being Drowned." By J. W. Clare, Civ. Eng.

³⁰ "A Plan for Raising Ironclad Ships of War." Presented to the public by J. Davis.

³¹ "Papers of the Manchester Literary Club." Vol. IV. Manchester. 1878.

³² "Mark Twain's Patent Scrap-Book." Slote, Woodman, & Co.: New York and London.

³³ "Ueber die Fremdwörter im Deutschen." Von Th. Heinze.

³⁴ "Das Antragsrecht im Deutschen Strafrecht." Von Theodor Hegenhalm.

³⁵ "Thun und Haudeln." Von Dr. Jul. Jensen.

³⁶ "Der Roman von König Apollonius von Tyrus." Von Prof. Hermann Hagen. Berlin: Carl Habel.

³⁷ "Sammlung Altenglischer Legenden." Von C. Hortsman. Heilbronn: Gebr. Henninger.

³⁸ "Englische Studien." Von Dr. Eugen Kölbing.

Dr. Buckheim, the eminent professor of German, has observed that in the study of a foreign tongue great benefit in pronunciation and in confidence is derived from learning by heart. He has therefore edited a small volume containing two hundred short classical pieces suitable for recitation.³⁹ He has wisely chosen poems likely to attract the young; and, as his volume is intended for those to whom German is a foreign tongue, he has avoided poems the spirit in which is peculiarly natural. The reader of German will meet many old and favourite friends in this excellent little book; and among the hitherto unknown poems he will find none whose acquaintance he is not glad to make.

Franz Grillpazer shared with Rossini, though in a far less degree, the happiness of writing successful works in early life and surviving to enjoy their success during many years of rest. Grillpazer was born long enough ago to have stirred by his plays the admiration of Byron, who was his senior by only three years; and he died in 1872. He enjoyed the unquestionable advantage, for a man of letters of not quite the first rank, of living at Vienna, a great capital, which is perhaps the least literary of great capitals. There in the first quarter of a century he produced several poetic dramas in classic form. In some, as in the *Ahn frau*, he exaggerated the fatalistic or supernatural element; in others, as in *König Ottokar*, his best drama, perhaps, the sentimental is exhibited to a degree which we hardly like in a historical tragedy. Among other classical dramas he wrote a trilogy of the Golden Fleece; and of its three parts the "Medea" gained a long popularity, owing in no small degree, it must be owned, to the acting of Sophie Schröder in the *Titelrolle*. This piece has been translated into English by Mr. F. W. Thurstan and Mr. S. Wittmann.⁴⁰ Their version preserves as its chief charm, what was certainly Grillpazer's greatest excellence, poetic elegance and dignity of language. It is, indeed, so readable that one is tempted to ask the question whether we are ever to witness a modern tragedy in admirable verse in our days. Burlesques succeed in rhyme, and even a tragedy is tolerated, provided the verse be unambitious and poor; in other words, if it be a drama in verse by a playwright. But shall we ever again see, on our unsubsidized stage, a tragedy by a poet? Or must those who delight in exalted language applied to action content themselves with chamber study? This play of Grillpazer, as rendered by Messrs. Thurstan and Wittmann, makes us wish that an English manager would try the experiment of a stately play. It should be remembered that such plays succeed with the Parisians, among whom *opéra bouffe* was invented and has its chief seat.

³⁹ "German Poetry for Repetition: a Graduated Collection of Classical Pieces, with copious English Notes." By C. A. Buckheim, Ph.D., F.C.P., Professor of the German Language and Literature in King's College, London, and Examiner to the University of London. London: Longmans & Co.

⁴⁰ "Medea: a Tragedy by Grillpazer." Translated by F. W. Thurstan, B.A., and Sidney A. Wittmann. London: Nisbet & Co.

THE
WESTMINSTER
AND
FOREIGN QUARTERLY
REVIEW.

APRIL 1, 1879.

ART I.—THE FEDERATION OF THE ENGLISH EMPIRE.

1. *Imperial Federation.* By FREDERICK YOUNG. Crown quarto. London: S. W. Silver & Co. 1876.
2. *The Best Means of Drawing Together the Interests of the United Kingdom and the Colonies: A Paper.* By C. W. EDDY. Published in the Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute. Vol. VI. 1874-5.
3. *The Permanent Unity of the Empire.* By FRANCIS PETER LABILLIERE. London and Chilworth: Unwin Brothers. 1875.
4. *Imperial and Colonial Responsibilities in War.* By Captain J. C. R. COLOMB, R.M.A. 1877.

THE attention of the British public has of late been directed to the question of the Federation of the Empire by various discussions that have taken place at meetings of the Royal Colonial Institute, by the publication of a volume on Imperial Federation by Mr. Frederick Young, and by the appearance in leading periodicals of articles dealing with the matter. It is not, however, pretended that though attention has been directed to the question, public interest in it has been evoked to any large extent. As a rule, the British public is supremely indifferent to colonial affairs. Probably not one man out of a hundred of what are called the educated classes is at all conversant with the salient features of any of the colonies, could give more than the roughest sketch of the geographical peculiarities, or even an outline of the

[Vol. CXI. No. CCXX.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LV. No. II. U

social, political, and economic characteristics of the country. Those few who do know anything of the colonies are generally either those who have friends resident in them or who have business relations with them which necessitates some knowledge of Colonial affairs. Nor is the reason of this indifference far to seek or difficult to understand. To the individual Briton the colonies are totally uninteresting, because he has no immediate interests bound up in them; and to the British public collectively, they are totally uninteresting, because they in no direct way affect the wealth or strength of England. As the result of this feeling we have the fact that many of the leading minds of England would be in favour of allowing the colonies to drift asunder from the mother country, that most would be inclined to allow matters to go on as at present, and that few, if any, would favour such changes in the system of governing as would draw the connexion more closely.

Recognising such a condition of things, the reader may perhaps ask, "What good can be gained by discussing the question of the Federation of the Empire?" It is the aim of the following pages to answer this question, and to show that in the future the welfare of England and her colonies must be interdependent. Hitherto as the Empire has grown, the political system of the Empire has remained stationary. The acquisition of new territory, and the gradual growth of additional peoples and societies has not been accompanied by a similar growth and development of the political system of the Empire. To draw a parallel from animal life we may say, that while the limbs and various parts of the organism have developed to a prodigious extent, the cerebro-spinal centre has remained the same. In other words, the Empire of Britain, as we see it to-day, consists of the mother country, and an appendage of loosely-connected States in various conditions of dependence, or rather independence. And perhaps not the least curious fact in this connexion is that those States that are the largest, wealthiest, most populous, and most likely to be of value to the mother country are precisely those that are most independent. And there can be no doubt that under the present political system of the Empire this independence of each colony will increase with its wealth and population. It cannot be otherwise. Undoubtedly there exists in the colonies a very strong sentiment of affection and love to the mother country, which has held them together, and will continue to hold them long after a consideration of material interests would advise a different course. There is more of an imperial feeling, and more love for the ideal Empire among colonists than is to be found in the mother country. Colonists are proud of being British subjects; they are proud of the historical traditions of

England, proud of her freedom, of her statesmen, of her literature, of her wealth, and deeply loyal to her Queen. It must not be forgotten, too, that to a very great number of colonists there is some one "little green spot" of the old country that is particularly dear and sacred, if not from personal recollection, then by tradition as the place where "father was born," or where "mother" lived before she "came out," or perhaps where the more pretentious "family" originally came from. All these and kindred sentiments are important factors, as helping to maintain the connexion between the colonies and the old country, and only those who know the colonies can know how important these factors are. The English public is very apt to look upon colonists as to a certain extent foreigners, and to lose sight of the fact that they are in reality just such as they are themselves—sprung from the same stock, inheriting the same traditions, and animated with the same national spirit. But no matter how strong these sentiments and feelings may be, it must be borne in mind that after all they are only sentiments, and in the natural course of affairs, when the material interests of the colony run counter to these sentiments, it cannot be otherwise but that these sentiments should give way. As pointed out above, we believe that the sentimental regard of the colonies for the mother country, the love of colonists for the ideal Empire, is so strong that material interests will frequently be sacrificed to this feeling, the connexion between the colonies and the mother country being maintained long after a thoroughly dispassionate view of the case would recommend separation. But as the development of nations goes on there must ultimately be reached a point when the tension becomes too great to be borne; when the sentimental feelings will be more than counterbalanced by the material interests; when to maintain the connexion would mean ruin and misery for the colony, while separation would bring wealth and happiness. Let us state a case exemplifying this.

In all likelihood within the next fifty years the population of Canada will have grown to twenty-five or thirty millions. There will have been, of course, a concomitant increase in the wealth of the country. Is it possible that Canada will then be able to stand in the position that she now holds towards England? In the event of England's going to war with any Continental nation Canada would immediately become an object for the attack of that nation; she would require to defend herself; to plunge into all the heavy expenditure required in modern warfare, and would become liable to devastation and pillage, and all this, not from any quarrel of her own, not because she had decided to go into war, but simply because she is part of the British Empire. Or again, we might easily conceive the position to be reversed:

that some foreign Power had not observed a certain treaty; that the infraction of this treaty affected Canadian interests very much more than English interests; that England refused to enforce observance of the treaty, and as Canada is a colony without power either to make treaties or to enforce their observance, Canada would simply have to sacrifice her interests and submit to whatever the loss or humiliation might be in order to maintain the connexion with the mother country. But is it reasonable to suppose that a country wealthy and powerful as Canada would be under this supposititious case could exist in a position so dangerous to her well-being and so humiliating to her *amour-propre*? We think not; and we think it will be equally clear to any one who will realise to himself the position supposed that Canada would be impelled to follow one of two courses, either to obtain adequate representation in the councils of the Empire, or to become entirely separated from the Empire. As a development of the present colonial policy the latter is the only course that would be possible.

Indeed, without looking so far into the future, as in the above case, we think it will become apparent, on considering the colonial policy of the Empire, that growth and development of the colony can result only in separation from the mother country. The various stages in the political growth of a colony are somewhat as follows:—In the first instance we have a governor appointed by her Majesty, assisted by a council of three or four members, probably the heads of the naval and military force stationed at the place, and who are members *ex officio*. In the next stage the council is augmented by the addition of a few local men also appointed by her Majesty. As the colony grows the people are granted the privilege of electing some members of the council—perhaps about a third of the entire number—the remainder being appointed by her Majesty. At a further stage a legislative assembly is added, entirely elected by the people, with a council, partly elected and partly nominated as a second chamber; and the fully-developed stage is reached when we have both chambers elected by the people (with a difference in the franchise), and the Government carried on by a governor (appointed by her Majesty), and a cabinet composed of members of either of the legislative chambers; or we have, as in Canada, a House of Commons elected by the people, and a senate chamber, nominated by the governor in council, constituting the parliament, the council being the Government of the day, and composed of members of the senate and parliament similar to the Government of England. In these various stages we may see that the direction of the growth of the political system of the colony is towards a system that will be perfect in itself, apart from any

other political system of the Empire. There is no tendency for the political system of the colony to become ultimately embraced in the political system of the mother country. Quite otherwise. The channel of communication between the two, and the official representation of the one to the other is absolutely the same in the first stage as in the last, and is relatively much smaller and more imperfect in the last stage than in the first. The little desert rock in mid-ocean and the vast territory containing many provinces are on the same footing as regards representation in the Imperial Parliament: for the one as for the other the only official channel is through a governor in communication with the Colonial Secretary. The inconveniences arising from this want of representation have been felt, and it has been attempted to obviate them by the appointment of an "agent" for the colony, one who represents some English or Scotch constituency in the house, and who undertakes also to advocate the cause and represent the views of some particular colony. Such representation as this, however, is of but little value, as the agent is not responsible to the colony (in a political sense), and merely renders his services in consideration of his salary. Nor can the expression of his sentiments have much weight in the House. He may be able to afford interesting information in regard to the colony he represents; but on any question arising on which a vote might be taken, he would be bound to vote in accordance with the interests of the constituency he represented, and not in accordance with the interests of the colony, should these interests at the time be different. In like manner the formation of an advisory board, composed of colonial representatives that should advise the Colonial Secretary on matters affecting the colonies as proposed by Sir Julius Vogel (in the *Nineteenth Century* for July, 1877), is open to grave objections. It would be a feature out of harmony with the principle of Government by elected representatives; it is difficult to see how such a board could be politically responsible to the colonies it represented, and it is still more difficult to see how such a board could exert any influence over the Colonial Secretary in the event of his choosing to disregard its advice. Indeed, Sir Julius Vogel himself proposes such a board as a merely temporary arrangement, recognising the fact that perfect representation of the colonies can only be effected by the popular election of men to serve in the Imperial Parliament. But representation of the colonies in the present Parliament of England would not be beneficial. The greater number of the measures brought before the House of Commons is of a purely local nature, and it would be quite out of place that colonial representatives should have a voice in the discussion of these. The only chamber to which

colonial representatives could be admitted, and in which their presence would be desirable, would be one in which the matters deliberated upon were as distinct from the local affairs of the mother country as they were distinct from the local affairs of the colonies. It must be the supreme chamber of the Empire; the apex of the political system to which all the lower chambers must lead up. But of such a chamber there is not as yet even the germ. There has been no attempt made, and there seems to be no desire to make the attempt to separate local from Imperial affairs in English Parliamentary Government. The present Parliament of England is nominally the chief chamber of the Empire, and this Parliament, with regard to the rest of the Empire, can be looked upon as none other than a local parliament. By no expedient short of representation by election could a chamber be constituted that would afford adequate representation to the colonies; such a chamber means the formation of an Imperial Parliament in which all parts of the Empire would be represented, while to local parliaments would be relegated the local affairs of the various localities. In a future article we hope to discuss more fully the relative positions of the Imperial and local parliaments, but in the meantime it may be well to point out here how the establishment of this Parliament would concentrate the whole vast Empire in one chamber. As each colony grew and developed, it would not grow as now towards independence and rivalry of the mother country, but simply towards representation in the Imperial Parliament. When it became sufficiently large and important, it would be admitted into the federation of the Empire. Its representatives would have their proportionate share in moulding the policy of the Empire, and its population would contribute a proportionate share towards maintaining the Empire. The mother country and the colony would eventually gain strength and support, the one from the other. Now, the colony is a present source of weakness and expense, and a future source of rivalry to the mother country, while the mother country, after a certain stage of growth has been reached by the colony, ceases to be any support, and may become a source of danger and disaster to the colony.

Though the formation of such a Federal Parliament is new to England it is quite in accordance with the political genius of the Empire. In the dominion of Canada now may be seen a system of confederation such as would be applicable to the whole Empire. Here in each province, Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba, and British Columbia, there is a local parliament under a lieutenant-governor entrusted with the management of the local affairs; while, embracing all these, and composed of men from all these provinces, there is

the Dominion Parliament to which is entrusted the management of general or Dominion matters. There is in the north-west an example of the undeveloped province too small to enjoy representation by election, but under the government of a lieutenant-governor and a nominated council. To parallel this system in the Empire at large we should have a local parliament for England (Scotland and Ireland also if need be), local parliaments for some colonies, a governor and council for others, while over all and superior to all would be the Federal Parliament, composed of men elected from Great Britain and such of the colonies as had grown to sufficient size and importance. Under such a supreme chamber the growth and development of each colony would culminate in representation in that chamber. Under the present system the growth and development of each colony can culminate only in separation from the mother country. And we think it is the intuitive perception of this fact that accounts chiefly for the indifference of Englishmen to the growth of the colonies.

That the development of the colony is imperilled by its tendency to separate from, and become independent of the mother country, we have many evidences constantly coming forward around us. The establishment of the Supreme Court of Canada may be taken as one of these. In this case it was found absolutely necessary for the material interests of the country to establish a supreme court in the country, from whose decisions there should be no appeal to any other tribunal. The right of appeal to the judicial committee of the Privy Council was found to be fraught with so many inconveniences and burdened with so heavy a cost that it was a right only to be enjoyed by the richer classes, and a threat of an appeal to this court would be sufficient to make a man of limited means give up his case rather than incur what must necessarily be a very heavy outlay. The establishment of the Supreme Court of Canada was the outcome of a popular necessity, as it was found practically impossible to carry on the judicial system without it. But what is the result of this? It separates the judicial system of the colony from that of the mother country; it is but one step on the road towards the disintegration of the Empire; and though as yet the separation is not complete, as there remains still the right of appealing either to the Judicial Committee, or to the Supreme Court of Canada, yet there can be no doubt that as the country develops and grows, even this modification will be removed and the right confined to the Supreme Court of Canada. The same necessities that called the court into being in the first instance will ultimately bar the right of appeal to the Privy Council.

Again, in the military system of the developed colony we find the disintegrating forces at work. In Canada the whole burden of the military system is now borne by the colony. The troops that have to be maintained, and which number about 30,000 men (in 1875 number of militia trained 28,845), are maintained entirely by the colony. There are still some two regiments of Imperial troops retained in Halifax, but these, as Sir Francis Hincks has shown recently (*Nineteenth Century* for May, 1878), are so retained to subserve an Imperial necessity, and for the convenience of the Imperial authorities, and not for the purpose of defending the colony. Of course we do not contend that the troops required for Canada should be maintained in any other manner but by the colony, so long as the existing Imperial policy obtains. It would be absurd to expect that the British taxpayer should pay for troops to garrison and support a colony from which he neither nationally nor personally derives any benefit, and particularly when the colony is quite able and willing to assume this expense herself. Colonists see this at once, and willingly assume the burden of the military expense. The result of this is immediate and direct. The Imperial and Colonial military systems are completely separated. There is established in the colony an army of trained soldiers that will grow with the growth of the colony, and which in another fifty years may, and probably will, attain to a very large size, and which army is entirely beyond Imperial control, and may be used for any purpose. We do not here mean to hint, as the words might imply, that there is even the remotest likelihood of the army being used to fight against the mother country. Knowing the intense loyalty to the mother country that exists in the colonies, it is more than probable that the first great war in which the colonial army will see service will be in the defence or assistance of the mother country. The late offer of Canadian troops to assist England in the event of an Anglo-Russian war bears out this view; but it also incidentally shows how complete already is the separation of the Imperial and Colonial military systems. The offer comes to England more like the offer of assistance from a foreign Power than as the due and proper help which should come from all parts of the Empire if the Empire were truly one. The very outburst of applause which this offer called forth from the Press of England only shows how unexpected it was, shows how spontaneous and uncalled-for it was. England had no *right* to expect it; she had no *right* to ask for it; it was the outcome of the intensely loyal and affectionate sentiment that exists in Canada towards the mother country.

But from this will it be maintained that Canada will always be ready and willing to plunge into the horrors of war to gratify

this sentiment? Canada will derive neither honour nor glory for herself from such wars; she has no voice either to approve or disapprove such wars; and even though she were reimbursed for the use of her troops by the Home Government,*at the end of such a struggle she would find herself *minus* many valuable citizens, and much property that no money could compensate, and *plus*—nothing. Lord Blachford has said (*Nineteenth Century* for Oct. 1877) that he believes that the colonies would plunge into one such war as this, but would shrink from a second, and we think in this view he is correct. Nor is such a course on the part of the colonies to be wondered at. As matters stand at present the mere fact of the colonies being nominally part of the Empire of Britain renders them liable to attack, and marks them out as proper and legitimate prey for any Power with which England may go to war. Even though the colony did not actively take part in the war by sending her troops to assist the Imperial troops, yet she would be forced to take part in it, in so far as it would be necessary for her to be prepared to defend herself from the probable attacks of the Power with which England was at war. The fact of England's declaring war would necessitate that every colony that was worth attacking should immediately put itself upon a war footing. Hitherto no evil results of much magnitude have followed from this position, but this has been, not because this danger did not exist, but because at the time of the former wars of England none of the colonies was worth attacking. But this will not always be the case. Canada twenty-five years ago was poor and insignificant in comparison with her present condition, and the growth in wealth, population, and power in future years, will be even more rapid than in the past. To put the case, as we stated it before, when the population has increased to some thirty millions, as in all likelihood it will within the next fifty years, with the corresponding growth in wealth that this population implies, would any one maintain that it would then be to her interest to continue in the position which she now holds in regard to the mother country? Nay, would any one maintain that it would be possible for her to continue in such a position? The fact that she might at any time be attacked in order to strike at England, the fact that she would be powerless to employ diplomacy to avert such attacks, that she must simply drift with the stream, no matter what resulted, the feeling of vagueness, uncertainty, and helplessness, that would result, would produce a state of tension and irritation that would be intolerable, and that no sentimental feeling, however strong, could over-balance. The general good would require the adoption of some measures that would put the country in a clear and definite position before

the world. Either she must become truly one with the Empire of Britain, with the proper voice and weight in the councils of the Empire, that this oneness infers, or she must cease to be part of the Empire. We do not think that, ultimately, there can be any *via media* between these two courses, and under the present political system the latter is the only course that would be possible. No doubt before this ultimate position was reached intermediate positions would be adopted to smooth over difficulties as they arose, but we think it must be admitted that the position to which the colonies are drifting, considering the military aspect of the case, and under the present political system of the Empire, is that of complete separation from the mother country.

Again, we can see the tendency towards separation when we consider the treaty-making power. Under the present Imperial political system, a colony has no power to make treaties with other nations, no matter how immediately and deeply her interests may be affected, she can only make treaties with other nations through the Imperial authorities, and the only official channel of communication with the Imperial powers is through the Governor, in communication with the Colonial Secretary. For the small and undeveloped colony this is sufficient. Her local interests occupy so small and insignificant a position in the International questions of Great Powers that any Imperial treaty completely ignores such interests. As the colony grows, however, local interests grow in importance, and ultimately thrust themselves forward as factors that cannot be ignored. The colonists feel that in the making of treaties in which the vital interests of the colony are largely affected, it is absolutely necessary for the well-being of the community that those interests should be properly represented and advocated, and they can only be so represented by men whose personal interests are bound up with the colony—that is, by colonists. Colonists would feel it as an intolerable injustice if a treaty should be drawn up with a neighbouring Power which would materially affect their personal well-being without any reference being made to themselves in the matter. No doubt such injustice has been done in times past, and has been submitted to, while the colony was too insignificant to bring pressure upon the mother country. But with the growth of the colony there comes a time when such injustice would produce a strain that might cause rupture. The mother country sees this, and temporarily smooths over the difficulty by allowing colonial representatives to have a seat at the treaty board.

Here, again, however, these representatives are admitted more as the plenipotentiaries of a foreign Power than as representatives

who have an inherent right to be heard—the right of all parts of the Empire to have a voice in the governing of the Empire. And this principle of representation by plenipotentiaries being once granted and adopted, we think it will be admitted that the weight and effect of such representation will be proportionate to the importance of the colony, and that as the colony develops a larger share will be claimed in the making of treaties in which the colonial interests are at stake, the final stage of which development is, when the colony claims the right to make treaties without reference to the mother country, and this means separation. There are many practical examples that could be cited, and which will occur to many, of the growth of this principle of representation by plenipotentiaries. Thus, at the time of the drawing up of the Ashburton Treaty in 1834, which lost to Canada a greater part of the State of Maine, Canada, or more properly, New Brunswick, was unrepresented at the treaty board, except through her governor, in correspondence with the Colonial Secretary, and there can be little doubt that the blunders and injustice committed by that treaty were mainly traceable to the want of proper representation of the local interests of the colony. Again, at the drawing up of the Treaty of Washington in 1872, in which the question of the Canadian Fisheries was involved, we find that local interests had so grown in importance that they could no longer be overlooked by the Imperial authorities, and Canada was represented by a plenipotentiary appointed by the Canadian Government whose special mission it was to advocate the proper recognition of Canadian interests. Still more was this principle recognised in the appointment of the Halifax Commission which sat in 1877 to decide the Canadian Fisheries question, where Canada had an equal voice with England and the United States, and a largely preponderating influence when we consider the appointment of counsel. It is not a little significant, too, that in this last case, the only International tribunal at which Canadian interests have been adequately represented by Canadian representatives, the decision for the first time in any dispute, as between Canada and the United States, was favourable to Canada, thus emphasising the value of due representation of local interests in the settlement of Imperial questions.

Thus we see that with an increase in the wealth and population of a colony, there goes a corresponding decrease in the strength of the ties to the mother country. Instead of an expansion of the political system of the mother country, that would embrace the colony, there is a development of the political system of the colony, that renders it independent of the mother country. And this separation does not arise from a

desire on the part of the colonies to be separate from the mother country, nor yet from a desire on the part of the mother country to throw off the colonies, but is simply the only possible result, that can follow under the present political system of the Empire. Under the present system there is no possibility of a true extension of the Empire. England may acquire colonies, as she has done, and hold them for a time, but the growth and development of these colonies must be continuous steps towards separation. As the foregoing analysis we think has shown, their ultimate development, considered under various aspects, means complete separation from the mother country. At no stage in the political life of the colony is there any tendency to become merged in the political life of the Empire at large, but at every stage we can mark a step towards separation from the mother country. Nor can it be otherwise. The political genius of the Anglo-Saxon races requires that the government should be carried on by the representatives of the people elected by the people. But there is no room for the representation of the colonies under the present Imperial system. To add colonial members to the present English House of Commons, and to require men from various far distant parts of the Empire to vote and spend their time in listening to debates upon all the local matters belonging to England, Scotland, and Ireland, would be absurd. Equally absurd is it to imagine that the present House of Commons of Great Britain can ever be the true parliament of the Empire, the chamber in which would be found the concentrated opinion and will of the Empire. A parallel to this might be seen if it were attempted to make the local Legislative Assembly of Ontario, containing only representatives of Ontario, the parliament of the Dominion of Canada; or if it were attempted to make the local Legislative Assembly of the State of New York, containing only representatives from the State of New York, the Congress for the United States of America. But just as in the Dominion of Canada there is one Dominion parliament superior to the local legislatures and containing representatives from all the provinces in the Dominion, and just as in the United States of America there is one chief congress superior to all the State assemblies and containing representatives from all the States of the Union, so in the English Empire—if the Empire is ever to be truly one—there must be a chief parliament of the Empire, superior to all the local parliaments of the various countries, provinces, and colonies composing the Empire, and containing representatives from various parts of the Empire. We cannot see that any scheme short of this would be in accord with the political genius of the peoples composing the Empire. We do not mean that every

colony, great or small, as we find them at present, should be at once given representation in the Imperial Parliament, but that as each colony grows in strength and importance, it should ultimately be granted such representation, and thus be embraced in the Empire. Any Imperial system of governing that lacks this fundamental principle of representation of the colonies in the chief parliament of the Empire contains the germ which, when developed, must break up the Empire; and, however great may be the difficulties in the way of forming this chief parliament, we must either deal with these difficulties, or accept the alternative of seeing in the near future the Empire of Britain broken up, and the present colonies constituted as independent and powerful nations.

Before closing this article let us briefly sketch the condition of the Empire under one chief Imperial parliament, and point out some of the changes that would be necessary if the Federation of the Empire were ever to be an accomplished fact. The one great principle which must form the ground-work of the required changes is the separation of local from national or Imperial interests. In a truly unified empire the Imperial Parliament should be entirely superior to the local affairs of any one part of the Empire. The local affairs of Great Britain should have no more place in the Imperial Parliament than have the local affairs of Canada or Australia. The Imperial Parliament should deal only with the affairs of the Empire at large. In the so-called Imperial Parliament at present, however, it is far otherwise, more than two-thirds of the measures dealt with having reference to purely local matters, in which the rest of the Empire is no more interested than the people of England would be interested in the extension of the water-system of the City of Winnipeg. The first change would be the separation of local affairs from Imperial affairs, and this could only be effected by the formation of local parliaments for Great Britain and Ireland. To these parliaments should be left the management of all local business, such as education, sanitary inspection, railway regulation, liquor questions, licensing, traffic laws, and all the hundred and one other local matters that at present clog the machinery of the Imperial Parliament. These parliaments would be under a Lieut.-Governor, or Viceroy, (as in Ireland) who would be appointed by the Queen, with the advice of her ministers, these ministers being chosen from the Imperial Parliament. The Imperial Parliament would deal with all international, inter-colonial, and Imperial matters. It would be composed of men sent from various parts of the Empire, and would be formed on the same principles as at present. As the local affairs of Great Britain and Ireland would no longer have a

place in this chamber it would be unnecessary to have so complete a representation of each locality, and therefore the number of members might be considerably less than at present, and still leave an adequate representation of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and a proper preponderance over the colonial members.

Under such a parliament as this the whole Empire would be held together. This would be the central point from which would emanate the supreme controlling force to every part of the Empire. To this parliament every colony as it grew in wealth and strength would bring its support and health. England would not then look with an indifferent eye at the growth of the colonies, but their development and extension would be of as immediate importance to her as is the development of the wealth of an English county. The Empire of Britain would then truly be an "empire on which the sun never sets," and an empire vast and powerful such as the sun never shone on before. Boundless resources would be contained within herself, every conceivable want could be supplied from her own territory, while at the same time she would have at her call armies so vast that the whole world would stand in awe of the might of England. For such results as these would it not be desirable to carry out a Federation of the Empire?

In a future article we hope to be able to show, from an economical point of view, the practical benefit that would result both to England and the colonies from the adoption of a federal system.



ART. II.—THE RELATIONS OF THE SEXES.

PROBLEMS of sociology are among the most difficult with which science has to deal; not only by reason of the extreme complexity necessarily resulting from the great number of factors involved, but because the application of scientific methods to their investigation is of comparatively recent date. However, it is in this field that science makes its first serious encounter with questions of morality and religion, and there are relatively few minds capable of examining these questions dispassionately and without intellectual prejudice.

Morality is understood to consist in conformity of conduct to

rules of right; and the universal precept—"Whatsoever ye would that others should do unto you, do ye even so unto them"—is generally accepted as lying at the foundation of morals.

Kant reproduces this ancient injunction in saying: "Act always so that the immediate motive of thy will may become a universal rule;" and Emerson re-enunciates the same golden principle: "that is moral which respects, in action, catholic or universal ends."

Has morality, then, no fixed laws to which conduct must conform in order to be considered right? Evidently not, if each individual's conception of right is to be accepted as a standard of conduct, a standard varying with the degree of development of the whole character, and especially of the moral sense.

Mr. Darwin traces the origin of the moral sentiment to the social instincts. The lower social animals, as well as men, manifest sympathy for each other, and have learned that association for mutual benefit involves some sacrifice of individual interests, in other words, that morality is useful to sociality.

Mr. Spencer also finds morality founded in utility, not that he accepts the utilitarianism of mere present expediency, but he holds that the deductions generally recognised as laws of conduct have been derived from experiences of utility. He says, nevertheless, that there *is* an "absolute right" as well as a "relative right," since the one conception presupposes the other.* But this is a purely metaphysical idea—one which Mr. Spencer has himself convincingly banished to the region of "the unknowable"—and it can have little practical bearing on conduct, though an *ideal morality* undoubtedly acts as a "stimulus to improvement." While the absolute in morals may serve as a theme for intellectual speculation, it does not come within the pale of scientific discussion, and if results of any value are to be reached in the investigation of social questions, they must be withdrawn from the sphere of metaphysics and examined by methods similar to those employed in other fields of inquiry.

Morality has its limitations. This follows when it is admitted that, like every other human interest, it is a matter of relations, and since morality is not the only condition of progress it is often apparently subordinated to a greater good. Says Lecky: "The time will come when he who lays the foundation stone of a new manufacture will be able to predict with assurance in what proportion the drunkenness and unchastity of his city will be increased by his enterprise, yet he will pursue that enterprise, and mankind will still pronounce it to be good."†

* See *Fortnightly Review*, April 1871: *Morals and Moral Sentiments*.

† "History of European Morals." W. E. H. Lecky.

It is said that Eastern missionaries do not always insist upon the abandonment of polygamy among their converts, because the repudiated wives, left without homes and means of support, would almost inevitably fall into lives of infamy. Early marriage, no doubt, promotes chastity; but it is the source, on the other hand, of serious evils to society, and is, on the whole, a bar to progress. The Irish peasantry supply an example in point. Among them early marriage is the rule, and while they are noted for their chastity, they are equally notorious for their unprosperousness; the prevalence of early marriage being, without doubt, an important factor in this result, not that chastity is to be set down as in itself opposed to the welfare of society, but that the measures necessary to secure it are followed by other consequences which are evil and fatal to prosperity.

Does it then follow that prostitution (the special subject of this paper) is, *per se*, neither an immorality nor an evil? It has already been shown that such an inquiry does not belong to the true scientific method of study. Prostitution is a great social fact. Its history (if a record of some of the facts more or less connected with its existence can be called a history) has been written; but its philosophy, its *raison d'être*, has scarcely been touched, many of its more important correlations having been overlooked.

From this point of view the history of prostitution is the history of woman; and its discussion (if the subject be philosophically treated and its connexions be duly traced) involves a consideration of woman in all her relations—to the family, to the State, to education, to law, in short, it necessitates the study of her social and political status, and of her physiological and intellectual nature. The most that will be attempted in the present paper will be to call attention to a few of the relations here indicated with special reference to their bearing on our subject, also, if possible, to suggest to the sanitarian and the philanthropist some better methods of effort than those hitherto employed for the suppression of prostitution and its attendant evils.

It will not be denied that the prevailing view in all countries, among all classes of people (including women themselves) in regard to the position of woman in society, and her relations to the various interests and affairs of life as compared with man is expressed in these few words:—"He was made for God, and she for him," which may be paraphrased as follows:—Man was made for the best possible development of his varied faculties, for the achievement of the highest work within his power, and for the attainment of the greatest good; woman to assist him in the accomplishment of these objects, thereby realising also her own

greatest good—all of which is expressed in the single phrase, a subordinate position. In accordance with this view girls are almost universally trained with the object of making them acceptable to men, rather than as individuals responsible to society and to themselves for the best development of their individual powers; in other words, they are educated with reference to their probable future relations with men; and since prostitution must be included in the range of relations between the sexes, it follows that *prostitution is a phase of the life to which by common consent a majority of women are trained.*

Social no less than physical facts are the product and outcome of that which has gone before, and the true understanding of any social fact implies a knowledge of its antecedents as well as of its present environment. We will therefore examine our subject briefly by the light of history, with the purpose of bringing into view the spirit and principles by which the relations of the sexes have thus far been characterised.

It appears that entire promiscuousness in sexual relations preceded the institution of marriage, and that monogamy, its purest type, has been slowly evolved through the lower forms of polyandry and polygamy—polygamy even now being the prevailing system, if population and extent of territory alone be considered; while the “marquette,” the “mundium,” the “morgengabe,” the “osculum,” the “dowry,” and the “jointure” indicate the varying degrees of servitude of woman at progressive stages of her history, and mark her gradual advance from a condition of absolute chattelism towards equality in the marriage relation.

By the law of *marquette*, under the feudal system (which rested on personal vassalage), to the “lord of the soil” belonged the privilege of first entering the nuptial couch unless the husband had previously paid a small sum of money,* or its equivalent, for the ransom of his bride; and we read that those feudal lords thought it no worse thus to levy upon young brides than to demand half the wool from each flock of sheep! In this transaction the alternative was with the husband; it was he who might submit or pay the fine, as he preferred or could afford.

The *mundium* was the price set upon the daughter by the father, and represented his authority over her person and her fate. In return for the *mundium* the father transferred his power without reserve to the husband, who was not necessarily most acceptable to the daughter, but best able to pay the price. If she afterwards became a widow and desired to marry again, she must not only obtain the consent of her father, but of her deceased husband's kindred, since she had been purchased by

* Five shillings and fourpence: Grimm.

him and belonged to his heirs; she must also restore to them the money paid for her at marriage.

Later, instead of the *mundium* to the father, came the *morgengabe* or "morning-gift" to the newly-wedded wife, presented by the husband on the day following marriage. It was both the price and the proof of her having brought to him the evidences of virginity.

The *osculum* was a gift bestowed by the lover upon his betrothed for the first kiss, involving the same idea of purchase as the other customs cited.

In all these ancient usages among different nations, one of the elements of modern prostitution (viz., the purchase and sale of sexual relations) is easily recognisable. The survival of the same principle in modern marriage also is often exemplified, and the woman who marries merely for a home, for a position in society, or from any mercenary motive whatever, is a purchased woman, acting essentially the part of a prostitute who barter her body for a consideration.

Nor is the approval of society withheld, though the motives to the transaction be plainly recognised. In fact, it is common, especially among the middle classes, to hear a marriage criticised on the ground that the woman already had a good home and was able to provide for herself, thus putting the matter squarely on a money basis. As for the fashionable classes, many a young man, in seeking a wife among them, might truthfully adopt the language of Tibullus, the Roman poet, when repulsed by a courtesan because he had no money: "She demands her money, and her hand is hollowed that it may hold the more."

What follows is equally significant as suggesting the reactive influence upon men: "Leave me then, Muses," he exclaims, "since you are unprofitable to my love. Gold! that is what I wish—what I must now acquire even by outrage and murder, that I may not be left like a beggar before a barred door."* To-day has been well called the pupil of yesterday. It is also its descendant and heir.

The *dowry* seems to have had a different meaning. As the wife became partially emancipated, and was no longer bought and sold like a chattel, the husband demanded an indemnity for the burden of her support, and the dowry originally belonged to him, conveyed by the father to the husband of his daughter. In the course of time it came to be secured to the daughter herself at marriage, as a protection against the possible abuses or misfortunes of her husband; and still later, with the same object, a *jointure* from the estate of the future husband (a refinement

* Cited by Legouv . "Histoire Morale des Femmes."

of the *morgengabe*) was secured to the prospective wife as a condition of marriage. Both the dowry and the jointure were calculated to insure a degree of influence and importance, hence independence, to the wife.

The varying forms of the marriage ceremony prevailing at different stages of civilisation also throw a significant light on the social position of woman at corresponding periods. The inquiry in the presence of assembled friends: "Wilt thou have this man to be thy wedded husband?" is in striking contrast with the early practices of barbarians among whom wives were captured from neighbouring tribes, and brute force usurped the place of choice and consent.

There is a form of marriage ceremony (perhaps the most primitive known to history) said to be still in use among the Australian blacks, in which the man stealthily and unexpectedly draws near to the "object of his affections," falls her to the ground with a single blow of his club, and proudly bears away her insensible form slung over his shoulder.*

The practice of capture of wives co-existed with infanticide of females; it was easier to steal wives than to rear them. It also gave the right of exclusive possession, and was thus influential in the introduction of monogamy—for the woman reared in the tribe *belonged to the tribe*, and individual marriage was regarded as an infringement of communal rights.† Capture must nevertheless have favoured polyandry in the weaker tribes, robbed of their women by their more powerful neighbours. As the practice of capture gave way to the more peaceful method of purchase, both polyandry and murder of female infants were discouraged. Fathers could afford to rear their daughters when they were sure of getting a good price for them, and the greater number of women thus thrown upon the market made it easy for every man to secure a wife exclusively for himself. By either method, whether of capture or of purchase, the husband became the owner of the wife, and exercised that absolute power over her person which everywhere belongs to the relation of master and slave.

The testimony of history is thus seen to be clear and unmistakable. The relations of the sexes—beginning in promiscuousness and controlled first by brute force, later by ownership founded on purchase—have eventuated (through a process of differentiation) in the types at present existing, which exhibit in various degrees the traces of their lowly origin. Of these types a perpetual monogamous marriage contracted from the highest motives, and the degrading temporary union of a licentious man

* "Primitive Marriage." J. F. M'Lennan, M.A.

† Sir John Lubbock: "Origin of Civilisation."

with the hired instrument of lust, are the extreme examples. Between these extremes there exist unions of various grades of refinement, according to the degree in which they approach the ideal and depart from the complete prostitute type. It must be admitted that the spirit of prostitution, under the guise of marriage, is nurtured by many powerful social influences. Prominent among these is the legal subjection of women—a subject treated by John Stuart Mill with a force and acumen calculated to break the legal bonds of the entire sex, could such a task be accomplished by argument; but logic is weak when pitted against social forces whose roots penetrate to the very subsoil of the race; and the existing legal status of women is not to be regarded as the direct result of tyranny and injustice on the part of the present generation of men, but more broadly as a “survival” from the very dawnings of civilisation—one to which the present generation has, however, affixed its seal.

It has been said that the man of the nineteenth century insists upon having for a wife a woman of the seventeenth century. It is, perhaps, nearer the truth that he demands the spirit of the two centuries combined in one woman; the activity and liberality of thought which characterise the present era, with the intellectual submission to authority which belonged to the past.

It has also been intimated by partisan advocates of the complete enfranchisement of women that men are afraid to abandon their legal control of women lest, with this loss of power, they should also lose their attractiveness for and influence over these important members of society. But this is probably an aspersion upon both sexes; the mutual interests which unite men and women are of a nature too deep and far-reaching to be endangered by the fullest liberty for both; and no possible modification or reconstruction of the basis of the relations between them will ever lessen their legitimate influence over each other.

The power of habit, the authority of precedent, the tyranny of heredity, all combine to perpetuate the old and to blight the new; but when we reflect that these very conditions are necessary, not only to stability but to progress itself, that modern civilisation is largely an expression of accumulated experiences and tendencies inherited from past generations—a vast and most intricate web of “survivals”—we accept the seeming evil with the recognised good as forming an equally essential part in the grand harmony of evolution.

Respect for tradition is an important element of social strength, and to reconcile this sentiment with the changes of advancing civilisation is a social necessity. This reconciliation (which zealous reformers are apt to disregard) is the true secret of progress in all social matters; for it is in this sphere that respect for tradition

holds the most powerful sway. Centuries of slow progress have been required for the elevation of society from a state in which every woman was the absolute chattel of some man—father, brother, husband, or son—to the present degree of civilisation, in which there is at least partial freedom for women. Legouvé (who has so eloquently advocated the cause of liberty for women) says:* “Their history offers an uninterrupted series of emancipations; and their present condition, which is subjection as compared with the future, is liberty as compared with the past.”

The enfranchisement of woman (in whatever degree it may be admitted to exist), though gradual and progressive, belongs especially to modern civilisation. The brief statement—“But Saul had given Michal his daughter, David’s wife, to Phalti the son of Laish”†—graphically depicts the position of women among the early Jews. Among the ancient Greeks, a father had power to dispose of his daughter, and a husband of his wife, by will; and the mother of Demosthenes actually constituted an item in a legacy left by her husband to his friend Demophon.‡ The Roman father not only gave his daughter in marriage without her consent, but, like the Jewish father, he had authority also to take her away from a husband whom she loved, and from her children, and marry her to another.§ In all these matters, constituting almost the sole interests of her life, she had neither voice nor will, and was supposed to have no choice. That such could not really have been the case is manifest; the females of the lower animals even exercise a decided choice in mating; otherwise the law of sexual selection would never have been established.

Whence arose this condition of affairs? How are these strange facts in the history of woman to be explained? It has been said by a recent writer that “all woman’s subsequent disabilities have descended from her original inferiority in hunting and fighting;” that is, in maintaining existence under the rude conditions of the early times. This has been shown to a demonstration by the great naturalist-philosopher; but the deductions of Darwin, known as the laws of Natural and Sexual Selection refer all secondary sexual differences (such as difference in muscular power) to a pre-existing difference in the strength of the sexual instinct in the two; and this, in its turn, is traced back to the fact that to the female belongs the function of supplying the means of direct nutrition to the offspring during the early

* “*Histoire Morale des Femmes.*” E. Legouvé.

† 1 Samuel xxv. 44.

‡ Legouvé; loc. cit.

§ Laboulaye: “*Histoire de la Succession des Femmes.*”

periods of its existence. Hence the reply to our question, and to all similar questions, proves to be—*because woman is woman.*

This seems to be the only answer. The ages of animal passions, of muscular supremacy, of conflict with wild animals, of barbarian wars—in short, the ages of physical prowess, when the only ordeal was one of muscle, belong indisputably to man. The subserviency of woman was one of the conditions of progress in those rude phases of human existence. But it does not follow that this will always be the case. It is a generally recognised principle that the stepping-stones of one generation are likely to become the stumbling-blocks of a succeeding one; and Mr. Spencer even uses the argument of a presumptive evidence against opinions which have arisen in a barbarous age. Legouvé says:* “The protracted subjection of woman proves but one thing, that the world so far has had more need of the dominant qualities of man, and that her hour has not yet come. We have no reason to conclude from this fact that it will not come.” And he fortifies his position with the following striking illustration: “How many centuries did it take to produce this simple maxim of common sense, ‘All men are equal before the law?’ The tardy advent of an idea, so far from proving its uselessness and fallacy, is often an argument in favour of its grandeur. The principles of liberty, charity, fraternity, are all modern principles.” It remains for these principles to become still further modernised by their extension to woman as a part of the human family. Their co-existence, with certain curious “survivals” from the ages of muscle, supplies a striking example of the remarkable tolerance of the average human mind for incongruous ideas, provided these ideas have been associated for a sufficient length of time.

In England, until the reign of William and Mary, women were refused the benefit of clergy; and in the time of Henry VIII. an English Parliament prohibited the reading of the New Testament in English by women and others of low estate.† The male Mohammedan to-day indignantly rejects the idea that his female companion, as well as himself, may have a soul. Among the Hindus, women are still excluded from the advantages of reading and writing, and, with a few exceptions, the higher institutions of learning are everywhere still monopolised by the more muscular sex. That these facts (gathered from widely separated ages and countries) harmonise in spirit and principle, thus revealing a common origin, scarcely needs to be pointed

* Loc. cit.

† WESTMINSTER REVIEW, April, 1876: “Legal Position of Women.”

out; the laws of heredity and descent are therein conspicuously illustrated: and, as between men and women, the age of muscle still exists.

Without doubt, the law of the non-survival of the unfit will in time be illustrated by the extinction of these conditions; questions of justice and privilege will cease to be questions of sex; and the higher institutions of learning, maintained at the public expense, will be made available for the whole public on equal terms, instead of being reserved for a minority distinguished for their sex—more especially since the distinctions in physical endurance and mental power so widely claimed, if they exist, must inevitably be sustained and increased by the very discrimination in privilege based on these differences!

The reasoning so skilfully employed by Darwin to prove the impossibility of the future intellectual equality of women is evidently fallacious. He says: * "In order that women should reach the same [intellectual] standard as man, she ought, when nearly adult, to be trained to energy and perseverance, and to have her reason and imagination exercised to the highest point; and then she would probably transmit these qualities chiefly to her adult daughters. The whole body of women, however, could not be thus raised, unless, during many generations, the women who excelled in the above robust virtues produced offspring in larger numbers than other women;"—conditions manifestly incompatible with each other.

To this argument are opposed many important facts. It is not through their progeny alone that strong characters elevate the race. The representative men and women of the past are known, not by their lineal descendants, but by their own lives and works, which have made an impression upon all succeeding generations, and which will continue to influence the race until it shall have outgrown them. Hence, exceptional women, through the powerful example of their individual lives, must elevate the tone and tendency of their whole sex, even though they should add nothing to its actual numbers.

Again: accepting, for the moment, the untenable position assumed by Darwin that individuals influence the race only through their offspring, it is not the most prolific members of society who do most for the improvement of the stock; quite the contrary, since it is not the number but the quality of offspring that is most important. Hence, the few children, vigorous in body and mind, added to the population by women physically and intellectually superior, will inevitably drive to the wall the inferior progeny of their more prolific but less developed sisters.

* "The Descent of Man." Charles Darwin, M.A.

The remarkable difference in the verdicts pronounced by society upon a lapse from chastity on the part of a woman, and the same offence on the part of a man, has been made the subject of severe strictures by philanthropists and reformers; and reasoning from the premise of "absolute right," there can be no possible moral difference in the two cases. But if it be granted that the moral sentiment has been developed from ideas of utility—that primarily the morality of an act was estimated by its results, and the degree of immorality was held to be in direct proportion to the degree of unhappiness and suffering involved—then the existence of a different code of morals for men and women on this point is found to be in harmony with the general principles of morality; and it is easy to see how society has come to regard as a venial offence on the part of a man, that which is looked upon as an unpardonable sin in the case of a woman. Suppose the two to have been originally on the same footing in this respect, alike the subjects of instinct and the impulse of the moment, which was undoubtedly the real condition of the race in its infancy, when the moral sense was forming, circumstances, not under the control of either, shortly occur to separate the two; the relation so briefly sustained is soon forgotten on the part of the man; but her different nature—structurally and physiologically different, if not morally—will not allow the woman to forget. She finds herself subjected to a long and tedious period of gestation, to the trial of parturition (accompanied, as it may be, by a risk to life itself), and to the subsequent burden of the care and support of a child. The direct consequences, to him comparatively trivial, are to her most weighty. Now, bearing in mind the supposed primitive conditions of society, it inevitably follows that there would develop for men and women a code of morals on this point, differing in proportion to the immense difference in results to those concerned. The general sentiment on this subject seems, then, to have its foundation in the constitution of things, and the condemnation of society on this account, when thus examined, proves to be a condemnation of Nature—a rebellion against the distinction of sex—a demand for the remodelling of the whole plan of animal organisms from lowest to highest.

It must not be thence inferred that Nature is kinder to one sex than to the other; the heavier penalties and responsibilities attached to the condition of womanhood tend to the formation of a purer and more thoughtful character; love though primarily developed in the race through the sexual instinct has become more spiritualised in woman than in man; her temptations to sensuality are generally conceded to be less, and compliance with the law of chastity on her part easy.

On the other hand, man reaps the advantage of the increased strength of character which comes through the exercise of greater self-control ; also (again referring to the era of development of the moral sense of the race on this point), while woman may be supposed to have been originally influenced to self-control by purely selfish considerations, it must have been regard for another's welfare rather than his own which first impelled man to self-restraint. Moreover, in maintaining a given standard of chastity, the triumph of the higher over the lower part of the nature is great in proportion to the strength of the conflict. Hence, the same conditions which have resulted in a different code of morals for men and women, have also established a different standard of morality for the two, and a higher degree of virtue is to be attributed to the chaste man than to the chaste woman—unless his claim to a stronger intellect be granted ; in that case the relations between the opposing forces would be altered, and the stronger temptation would be met by a corresponding power of resistance and self-control.

The frequency with which women yield to the persuasions of men, in spite of the heavy penalties involved, is sometimes adduced as evidence of weakness of character, and again as showing a womanly trustfulness and readiness of self-sacrifice to the claims of others ; thus it serves as an honour and a reproach, by turns. While women have undoubtedly greater facility for self-sacrifice (especially in minor matters) than men, the phenomenon under consideration does not necessarily depend upon this trait, nor upon intrinsic weakness of character. The *will* is not an intellectual entity ; it represents rather the result or outcome of a variety of mental processes ; and when conflicting emotions and ideas are contending for supremacy, the resulting action (the expression of so-called volition) represents, not the actual force of any one impulse or idea, but the preponderance of motive power ; and feebleness of will may mean only that the contending forces are nearly balanced. A selfish man bends the whole energy of his nature to the accomplishment of a single object, impelled thereto by an imperious instinct and by ungoverned passions ; in other words, he manifests a powerful will. Against these united forces are pitted those of a nature divided within itself. Instincts tending in a similar direction with those of the enemy, combined with the habit of yielding to constantly asserted authority and the tendency to self-sacrifice already mentioned, often prove too strong for the better judgment, even though fortified by the instinct of self-protection and by the lofty ideal of purity and reserve which unite to constitute a standard of personal morality for women. Thus, it is not feebleness of will, but diversity of motives impelling in opposite directions,

that so often results in social catastrophe and subsequent moral wreck.

The phrase, "religious prostitution," presents to the modern mind a startling antithesis of ideas; but they who would examine into the remote origins of things must be prepared to find not only man himself but all that he holds dearest and most sacred springing from the humblest parentage. Liberty, marriage, religion—around this triad cluster the supreme interests of society; yet history traces them all not only backwards but downwards to the lowest possible sources. Liberty is seen everywhere struggling painfully upwards from the very depths of oppression; marriage, slowly emerging from the degradation of utter promiscuousness; and religion itself, born of passions and emotions of the most sensuous nature; for it is a mooted question among archæologists whether sex-worship or sun-worship had precedence of origin; and many of the emblems, observances, and dogmas of the Christian religion are believed to have been derived from these primitive forms of a crude and sensual worship.

We read that there was in ancient Babylonia a temple of religion—where every woman was required, once in her life, to prostitute herself with a stranger, as a religious rite; and it is well known that the temples of worship in Athens and Corinth, and other classic cities, were supported by crowds of women who consecrated themselves or were dedicated by their parents to the use of the male worshippers. Even among the Hindus of to-day there is said to be a class of "Holy Women" who devote their bodies a living sacrifice for hire, the price of which goes to the support of the temple.*

But prostitution, transplanted from the habitât of heathendom to that of Christianity, has since held a very different footing, having undergone such modifications as have adapted it to its changed environment—the one inflexible condition of all life; and so far from being sanctioned by ecclesiastical authority, it has ever been repudiated and condemned alike by priest and people. In fact, the ascetic teachings of the Early Church were calculated to degrade the idea of marriage even, which was considered rather as a concession to the weakness of humanity than as a condition in itself honourable. Abstain if you can, marry if you must; such was the substance of the teachings of Paul on this subject. Marriage was indeed honourable when it became a necessity of the flesh, just as consorting with prostitutes is now regarded as at least excusable by those who advocate its necessity. Later, virginity came to be considered the only form

* "Ancient Sex-worship." By Sha Rocco.

of chastity, and chastity an indispensable condition of purity. A leading dogma of the Church—that of the “Immaculate Conception”—doubtless had its origin partly in this idea. No absolutely pure and holy being could be admitted to have sprung from a relation considered in its very essence and nature as sensual and degrading. This dogma must also be regarded as a survival from other systems, since it is not peculiar to the Christian religion. Gautama Buddha (the founder of a religion which numbers more followers than any other system extant) is said, in the sacred writings of that faith, to have been born of a virgin; and there is a Chinese legend to the effect that the first mother of mankind was in a like holy estate. Among these races, as formerly among the Jews, degrading views of women have always prevailed.

The practice of celibacy among the clergy was also founded in the belief that marriage and purity were irreconcilable; and one of its enthusiastic advocates of the third century, St. Martin of Tours, admitting that marriage was “pardonable,” exalted virginity as “glorious.”* But with the decline of asceticism, which favoured low views of the character of women, marriage gradually came to be regarded as in the highest degree honourable; and the later teachings of the Church are more in harmony with Nature. Celibacy is still enjoined upon the Catholic clergy, it is true; not, however, as a means of self-purity and salvation, but because it affords immunity from the cares and distractions of family life, which would interrupt that constant and untiring devotion to the duties of religion which their Church demands.

Prostitution has undoubtedly declined step by step with the gradual emergence of the race from the civilisations of the past, and the progressive introduction of woman into higher spheres of labour and broader fields of thought. From its proud position among the Greeks (where the courtesans represented the intellectual flower of womanhood, and were the only class of women who were allowed anything worthy of the name of liberty, or who indulged a thought beyond the distaff and the nursery) it has sunk to its present state of social outlawry—its votaries being without respect and without recognised rights. Once the intellectual and social peers of artists, poets, and philosophers, they have now ceased to have an existence, save as the instruments of sensual excess, hidden as far as possible from the public eye, and tolerated solely on the ground of a physical necessity to the excessive force of which they alone can sufficiently minister.

Some of the pictures of Greek life, drawn by Xenophon and vividly reproduced by Lecky, are most significant. In one of

* “*Sacerdotal Celibacy in the Christian Church.*” By H. C. Lea.

them is described a friendly visit of the great and good Socrates, accompanied by some of his disciples, to the courtesan Theodota, whose name has thus been handed down to students of classic literature. Socrates is represented as conversing with Theodota in regard to her duties towards those whom he calls her lovers. He instructs her how to attach them to herself by watching over them in sickness, by sympathising in their honourable achievements in life, by loving them tenderly, and by excluding from her favour the insolent and the rude. Socrates was himself indebted to the instructions of Diotima, another of this class; Aspasia is well known to have trained Pericles in eloquence, and some of his most famous orations have been accredited to her brain.

In striking contrast with these pictures is the following powerful portraiture from the pen of the modern historian already named*—overdrawn and to a certain extent libellous upon men as well as upon virtuous women—nevertheless fairly representing the position of the typical prostitute in modern society, from the moralist's point of view:—"There has arisen in society a figure which is certainly the most mournful, and in some respects the most awful, upon which the eye of the moralist can dwell. That unhappy being—whose very name it is a shame to speak; who . . . submits herself as the passive instrument of lust; who is scorned and insulted as the vilest of her sex, and doomed, for the most part, to disease and abject wretchedness and an early death—appears in every age as the perpetual symbol of the degradation and the sinfulness of man. Herself the supreme type of vice, she is ultimately the most efficient guardian of virtue. But for her, the unchallenged purity of countless happy homes would be polluted, and not a few who, in the pride of their untempted chastity, think of her with an indignant shudder, would have known the agony of remorse and of despair. On that one degraded and ignoble form are concentrated the passions that might have filled the world with shame. She remains, while creeds and civilisations rise and fall, the eternal priestess of humanity, blasted for the sins of the people."

Society cannot afford to ignore, to scorn nor weakly to weep over the abandoned, bruised, and broken woman who forms the subject of this picture. Nor must it be forgotten that the tragedy, thus set forth, is a double one—that this victim, slain in the wilderness, has herself first slain many victims. They unite in spreading both physical and moral contagion through all grades of society. The undisguised, unbridled lust of its most brutal members; the mere wantonness of its unthinking, unin-

* W. E. H. Lecky: "History of European Morals."

formed youth ; the sickly susceptibleness of the open the calculating, educated self-indulgence which seeks justification in the plea of a physiological necessity ; all contribute to these final results—the contamination of society, and the deterioration of the race.

We have seen, on the other hand, how the education and training of women, as well as many powerful inherited tendencies, serve to foster in their characters the spirit of prostitution. These facts point out unmistakably the direction necessary to any successful movement towards the eradication of prostitution. Such a movement was inaugurated with the first step towards the recognition of woman as an independent individual being, and it has developed slowly with the slow growth of this principle. They will, doubtless, continue to advance together, with steps accelerated, however, by the new conditions which are slowly but surely coming about in society, under which women are gradually securing more industrial, as well as intellectual independence. Among the foundations on which the system of prostitution has grown up, in the dependence and chattelism first of the captured and then of the purchased woman, we also find the origin of much of the popular sentiment on the subject of the sphere of duty of women ; and of that other sentiment so generally regarded as a most beautiful and womanly one—viz., that woman's natural and only womanly support is another, and not herself. The principles underlying this view are also at the foundation of prostitution ; they have originated and developed together, and the prevalence of the one is the main support of the other. As this sentiment shall wither in the increasingly invigorating atmosphere of modern opinions, and as woman shall be trained for the attainment of her own ideal rather than for the moulding of her faculties in conformity with the ideas of another (even though that other be her best and truest friend), so, *pari passu*, will this degrading phase of the social system approach extinction, becoming dwarfed and fossilised, like the flora of the carboniferous era, in the more highly oxygenated atmosphere of a later age.

If to meet the views and demands of men be the true basis of the training and education of women, then women are logically justifiable in allowing themselves to be put to such uses as men may determine ; and thus far in the history of the race, prostitution has been one of those uses.

If woman is made for man, then it is for man to choose how she shall serve him : and society must be dumb in the presence of the prostitute, the work of its own hands ; fathers and mothers who train their sons and daughters to this view must silently accept the logical results of their own teachings, even

though they lead both son and daughter to a house of infamy ; and every man and woman, whether married or single, who upholds the doctrine that the pursuits of women should be made to conform to the views of men, must recognise the prostitute as fulfilling a righteous calling ; for she is satisfying an imperious demand of men.

Independence (and this does not necessarily involve antagonism) strengthens character and develops individuality ; it must be sought for its own sake, not merely as a means to other ends, for its atmosphere is invigorating, and its tendency elevating.

As the principles here expressed shall progressively obtain a foothold in the minds of the mass of women, the schools and colleges for their higher education will become crowded with earnest students—earnest, because preparing for future work ; the professions will make a more ample place for these determined neophytes ; co-education in the college and the university will naturally grow out of fellowship in skilled labour and professional life ; and amid the sterner interests of such associations, the mere affinities of sex will be less powerfully asserted than in purely social companionship, where the entertainment of each other is the business of the hour. The influences flowing from these relations will be most healthful for both, and will undoubtedly do much towards equalising the physical natures of men and women, by lowering the sexual erethism so prevalent among men, and by strengthening the nervous tone of women often weakened and made over-sensitive by lives of vacuity and repression.

A purified marriage will grow out of these social changes ; and an increasing number of women will marry, not because they are incapable of self-support, nor because they are expected by society to marry ; but for reasons in harmony with the nature of the marriage relation. The increased working capacity of women, by means of which the non-producing portions of society will be gradually lessened, will lighten family burdens ; and there will be few men who cannot afford to marry. Thus the temptations to prostitution on the part of women, and the demand for it on the part of men, will both be reduced to a minimum. Not by legislation—not by exhortation—not by denunciation and anathema—but by long-continued measures in harmony with these broad principles, if at all, this great social problem will find its true solution.

ART. III.—THE REORGANIZER OF MODERN GERMANY:
STEIN.

1. *Life and Times of Stein; or, Germany and Prussia in the Napoleonic Age.* By J. R. SEELEY, M.A., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge. Cambridge: 1878.
2. *Das Leben des Ministers Freiherrn von Stein.* Von G. H. PERTZ. Berlin: 1851.
3. *Heinrich Friedrich Karl von Stein.* Von J. VENEDEY. Iserlohn: 1868.
4. *Blücher: seine Zeit und sein Leben.* Von Dr. JOHANNES SCHERR, Professor der Geschichte am eidgenössischen Polytechnicum in Zürich. Leipzig: 1863.
5. *History of Friedrich II. of Prussia.* By THOMAS CARLYLE. London: 1873.

OF all the extraordinary circumstances of the development of Prussia, perhaps the most extraordinary is the rapidity of that development. Passing over the fact that the province which gives its name to the State was originally inhabited by a Slavonic race, and that it was only Christianised and Germanised in the thirteenth century, and turning to strictly modern times: we have to note that the kingdom is not yet two centuries old; the reigning sovereign is but the seventh occupant of his throne; and he, and many another hale man, can still well remember the rise to power of the first statesman that Prussia produced, the subject of the present paper. Several causes were needed to bring about a progress so rapid: a persistently followed policy of aggrandisement, weakness or stupidity in the neighbouring States, and, last but not least, ability and conscientious industry in the Prussian kings. Four at least of these sovereigns, the first three and the seventh, have been conspicuously masters of their trade; and under them Prussia has become the mighty military Power which we know. Not all at once, however. All sound progress must be gradual. At no time before the war of Liberation in this century did Prussia claim the position of a great European Power. The wars of Friedrich the Great were all either *querelles d'Allemand* or struggles for existence. Friedrich Wilhelm III. was, during the early part of his reign, distinctly opposed to the theory that his kingdom was a great Power. But Prussia's progress, if gradual, has been constant. She has increased in territory, resources, and power under almost every one of her monarchs until she has attained her present strength. Strong as

she is, however, there is much popular misconception on the subject of her strength. Her military power is vast, but it is not greater than is absolutely necessary for her security and that of Europe; and the idea of her one day invading England (which occurred to some hot brains in 1870-71), or of her even becoming an aggressive Power beyond the German limits, is ludicrous. Surrounded on three sides by powerful and not over-friendly neighbours, without a "scientific frontier," Prussia must ever observe to a great extent the caution of a besieged fortress. We have seen recently how little she had to say in the settlement of the Eastern Question; and it is improbable that she will ever be able to speak on matters not immediately affecting her in the tone of Great Britain, or France, or Russia. Indeed, the very nature of her military system inclines us to think, with Professor Seeley, that her armies can scarcely be used in any but a "defensive war, or one that can be made to seem defensive."

In order to gain a just idea of the policy of Prussia towards the French Republic and the first Empire, it will be well to consider briefly the policy of her earlier kings.

Friedrich I. succeeded his father, "the great Elector," in the electorate of Brandenburg in 1688, and was in his forty-fourth year when the favour of Kaiser Leopold created for him the royal dignity of Prussia. Being until his seventeenth year a younger son, and (owing to an accident in childhood) personally deformed, he did not receive an education suited to his position. When, however, he came to power, he showed all his father's energy, and devoted that energy, as his father had done, to the aggrandisement of his house. He maintained and furthered the efficiency of the great Elector's army, and turned that terrible weapon to very good account. He supported the winning side in our "Glorious Revolution," and 6000 of his men, under Schomberg, supported William III. at the battle of the Boyne. In the wars against France, at the end of the seventeenth century, his contingents did good service for the Empire. He also increased his dominions considerably by purchase. When the Prince of Orange mounted the English throne, the Elector of Saxony became king of Poland, and the Duke of Hanover was made Elector, Friedrich, too, was anxious for promotion; and, after long negotiations, a treaty was made in November, 1700, by which the Emperor gave or undertook to recognise the royal title; while Friedrich bound himself to supply the Emperor with 10,000 men for the war of the Spanish succession, to remain a vassal of the Empire, and to vote for an Austrian prince at every election of a king of the Romans. Friedrich crowned himself at Königsberg on the 18th January, 1701. He was at once recognised by most of the European States. Spain and

France, however, only recognised the king's title by the peace of Utrecht, in 1713; while the Pope was unable to persuade himself of the existence of a Prussian kingdom until 1787. Friedrich I. reigned until 1713, his army taking a good share in the wars of Marlborough and Eugene, always, of course, on the Emperor's side. He was a patriotic German, and, unlike most of his later successors, a faithful vassal of the Empire. In him, indeed, that rivalry with the House of Austria which has for nearly a century and a half been the mainspring of Prussian policy had not yet arisen. Another point in which he differed markedly from most of his successors was his extraordinary love of pomp and splendour, which led to a most un-Prussian waste of money, and consequently to severity of taxation. He was founder of many of the most notable of Prussian institutions--among others, of the University of Halle and of the Berlin *Akademie der Wissenschaften*. He was also clear-sighted enough to welcome and protect the refugees whom the intolerance of Louis XIV. drove out of France.

Friedrich Wilhelm I., his son and successor, is well known to us as regards the less favourable side of his character, from the sketch in Macaulay's Essay on Friedrich the Great. He was, however, far more than a drill-sergeant and tyrant of his children. More than any one Prussian sovereign he increased the military power of his kingdom. We English, with our traditional antipathy to "standing armies" (which, by the way, is little more than a tradition), are disinclined to rate such cultivation of military strength as a high proof of statesmanship; but it is well to remember what her army is to Prussia, a substitute for a defensible frontier. Her military strength is not only her army and navy—it is also her "silver streak of sea." And it is only by keeping it at the highest point of power and efficiency that her existence is safe, placed as and where she is. It was wisdom, then, in Friedrich Wilhelm I. to improve his army to the utmost of his power; and it was still greater wisdom in him to use and wear out his army as little as possible. He was also a great and wise administrator of his finances. He introduced a rigid economy into every department, and nowhere more strictly than in his own house; and he was thus able not only to pay off the debts of his extravagant predecessor, but to increase the revenue very materially, and to leave behind him nine millions of thalers in his treasury. Further, he paid great attention to agriculture, and the study of the best methods of working the soil; and those who know how poor the land of North Germany is will be able to appreciate the exalted wisdom of this study in a Prussian monarch. The arts found in him a cold friend, if not, indeed, a foe; and his foundations were all of a practical

nature, consisting generally of orphan-houses, and medical, military, or village schools. A strongly pious, obstinate, honest nature, hating the French and Freethought, as he loved economy, tobacco, and his old friends of the *Tabakscollegium*. He too was, for the greater part of his life—until, indeed, he was cured by ingratitude—a zealous vassal of the Austrian wearer of the Imperial crown.

Of his son Friedrich II., or the Great, who succeeded to the throne at the age of twenty-eight in 1740, little need be said, because much is known. We have all read enough of the wanton wars of his youth, and of the heroic struggles of his middle life, of his literary ambition, of his relations with Voltaire, of his shabby old clothes, of his autocratic and minute government of his State and army. Of facts let it be enough to say that he inherited in 1740 a population of two millions and a quarter, a treasure of nine millions of thalers, and a well-appointed army of seventy thousand men. At his death, in 1786, he left to his successor six millions of subjects, seventy millions of thalers, and an army of two hundred thousand men, who were universally allowed to be the best troops in the world. A cynical contempt for men, a disregard of religion and sentiment, a dislike of everything German, and a passion for everything French, except French interference in Germany, were drawbacks in a German sovereign; but Friedrich's genius, his dauntless courage, above all, his indefatigable industry, could not but make him a great king. It is, however, a danger for a State when its prosperity depends on its being ruled by a great king, because it is useless to hope for a succession of great kings. The great Friedrich was not without forebodings of what must happen after his death. He knew and disliked his nephew, the heir-presumptive, as a man of extravagant and dissolute life. The nation, indeed, was passive enough, and gratefully obedient to the monarch who had done so much for it. No murmur was heard before the old king's death. But there must have been men in Prussia who saw that the State could not always be administered by one man, even if there should always be a great man at the head of affairs. These men, however, held their peace, from gratitude and respect to the old hero, as well as from regard for his great popularity, much probably as the more Radical spirits in England were silent during the closing years of Palmerston's life.

But when in 1786 Friedrich Wilhelm II., a dissolute man of forty-two, ascended the throne, everything was changed. The peace-loving old warrior who had in his later years been a sort of umpire in Europe, was succeeded by a blunderer who soon destroyed the reputation of the Prussian State by errors of policy

leading to useless wars, and squandered its treasure on disreputable favourites of both sexes. He took an unnecessary part in the squabbles of Russia, Austria, and Turkey. He plunged with Austria into the foolish and disastrous invasion of France in 1792, and withdrew from the war disgracefully in 1795. His character was one of indecisive and futile benevolence, in which a miserable mixture of pietism and lust was the chief feature; a mixture by no means rare, as the records of revival meetings prove. His benevolence led him for a time to support the independence of Poland as that kingdom was left after the first partition; his want of clear-sightedness, however, prevented his doing anything, and he finally joined in the second and third partitions. Surrounding himself with demireps, of whom a woman Rietz, whom he created Countess Lichtenau, was chief, and with incapable hypocrites, among whom Wöllner deserves mention, he had passed his time between profligate idleness and superstitious spiritualism, Rosicrucian mysteries, and the like. From such a king the Prussians received in 1788 the famous *Censuredict*, which placed all native and foreign publications under the licensing power of a board, thus reversing utterly the spirit of the great Friedrich's rule, who was half contemptuously content that others might *say* or *think* what they liked, provided that he alone might *do* what he liked. The same year was also marked by the *Religionssedict*, which subjected the views of the clergy to a sort of military rule, but expressly allowed men of any belief to retain their posts if they taught only orthodoxy *in public*. Friedrich Wilhelm II. died in 1797, to the great benefit of his kingdom, tended on his deathbed by his queen and by the woman Lichtenau.

He was succeeded by his son Friedrich Wilhelm III., then in his twenty-eighth year, who reigned until 1840. The new monarch was in respect of morals the exact reverse of his father. He had four years previously married a princess of Hessen-Darmstadt, since which event he had lived almost in retirement, disgusted with the state of affairs under his father. He was an irreproachable husband and father—as how, indeed, should he have been otherwise—the husband of one of the noblest of women, a graceful vision of beauty, then most worthily the sharer of a crown, and sanctified to later generations by her wisdom consolatory of misfortune, her sufferings heroically borne, her early death—Luise, the mother of the venerable old man who now sits throned in honour at Berlin. The present German Emperor was some eight months old at the time of his father's accession in 1797; he was in his tenth year when Jena was fought, and more than thirteen when he was taken to see his mother die. The last two incidents—his mother's

years of misery, the insults with which Napoleon attempted to load her name—all these things must still stand out among his distant recollections with the positive clearness of boyish memories. And who that knows the history of the years 1806-10 will not admire the moderation of the king of Prussia in 1870? Every act that we can reasonably attribute to the king personally—the entry into Paris, the treatment of the representative of the man who had tried to vilify his mother's name, the general bearing of the Prussians towards the French not in arms: in all these things Wilhelm I. showed himself considerate and generous. Much of this generosity is due, perhaps, to the noble admonitions of his royal mother, who wrote after Jena to her two eldest sons (of whom he is one):—

“Ah! my sons, you are already of an age when your understanding can grasp these heavy visitations. Recall, in the future, when your mother and queen no longer lives, this unhappy hour to your recollection; weep tears to my memory, as I in this unhappy moment weep for the fall of my country. But content yourselves not with tears alone—act, develope your powers. Perhaps Prussia's tutelary angel may descend upon you: then free your country from the shame, the reproach of the humiliation in which it languishes. Seek to conquer back from France the now darkened glory of your forefathers, as your ancestor, the great Elector, formerly at Fehrbellin avenged on the Swedes the defeat and disgrace of his father. Ah! my sons, do not be carried away by the degeneracy of this age; be men, and thirst after the glory of great commanders and heroes. If this ambition were wanting to you, you would be unworthy of the name of princes and descendants of the great Friedrich. If, however, with all your efforts, you cannot raise again the down-trodden State, then seek death, as [your uncle] Louis Ferdinand sought it (at Jena).”

The husband of a beautiful woman who could write this at thirty, the king of a military nation, himself bred to arms, Friedrich Wilhelm III. ought to have been at least a man. He failed, however, to attain this standard: and must be confessed to have been one of the feeblest of comparatively right-minded men. He was even feebler than his contemporary Louis XVI. The most marked feature of his character was indecision. He would delay and waver long over the most obvious lines of conduct, and, like most undecided men, would make up his mind at the end with startling abruptness, always in the wrong direction. It was his clear duty, for instance, to go to war with Napoleon in 1803 and in 1805: he did neither; but in 1806 he foolishly resolved at a few days' notice on a war which ruined his country. When in the retreat from Russia in 1812, Yorck, who commanded the Prussian contingent with Napoleon, asked for instructions as to going over to the Russians, the king sent him no answer; but when Yorck with noble treason deserted

the French on his own responsibility, the king at once displaced him, and ordered him before a court-martial. He was of a cowardly nature that is inconceivable when we think who were his ancestors and who are his descendants. When he heard of this decisive step of Yorck, which perhaps tended more than any other single act to Napoleon's ruin, he at once sent to Paris to offer the Emperor 30,000 men more. He had a great sense of his own dignity when it seemed safe to assert it; and though he could give up half his realms to Bonaparte, and follow the French and Russian Emperors about, begging for a few fragments back; though he could stoop to make his queen, whom Napoleon had stigmatised to his soldiers as unchaste, come and almost kneel before the conqueror for the sake of a town or two; yet he could make the strongest resistance to his ministers in such small matters as dismissing an unimportant but worthless official such as Von Haugwitz or Beyme, and could suddenly burst out into a most insulting letter to Stein when he thought his own rights were being affected. It was, of course, only natural that such a man should prefer to surround himself with the emptiest and most inferior of the men who were willing to serve him, and that great men who had broad views and independence of character were suspected, dreaded, hated: employed only when necessary in extremities, and thrown away the moment the emergency was ended. Of all men in conspicuous station who were not actually dishonourable we know no one who was more contemptible than Friedrich Wilhelm III., and not the least of the reproaches we have to bring against Professor Seeley is that he speaks of him with such undue consideration as to suggest that he was afraid of giving offence at Berlin. He occasionally, for instance, treats us to whole pages of conjectures as to what might have passed in the king's mind at this or that conjuncture. As if the king ever had a mind!

To be the servant of such a monarch with such a man as Napoleon for one's enemy, and such a weakly, well-intentioned dreamer as Alexander of Russia to play the part of Providence—now on one side, now on the other: this was a cruel destiny. It was Stein's.

And here we will enter a decided protest against another fault of Professor Seeley. His book is far too long. The more important part of Stein's life does not cover more than ten years. His main achievements were performed in despotic countries where there are no long debates or agitation, and where a great measure is carried out by persuading one man to sign a paper. Three large volumes then are more than the Professor's task required. His book is long perhaps because *Das Leben des Ministers Freiherrn von Stein*, by Pertz, is long; but then Pertz was a

German, and a German of the old long-winded school, who, if he could not uproot an oak, was at least capable of picking up pins with his trunk; and besides, Pertz was the friend and creature of Stein. He himself tells us how, a boy of thirteen, he first saw the statesman's name in Napoleon's famous proclamation against *le nommé Stein*; and when he reached manhood Stein selected him for the editorship of the *Monumenta Germanica historica*, and so made him famous. He is then to be pardoned if he worshipped his benefactor at somewhat unnecessary length. But Professor Seeley has no such excuse for his redundant

Heinrich Friedrich Karl, Baron von and zu Stein, was born at Nassau, on the Lahn, in October, 1757, two years before William Pitt the younger, whose mortal race was run before Stein's name had been heard outside of a small circle. He was of an ancient family of knights of the Empire, which held sovereign power over a very small domain on which it had resided for six or seven centuries. Though the youngest of four brothers, by a family agreement not uncommon a century or two ago in great houses, he was appointed to be the heir and continuer of the race. In the latter respect he was found wanting; and as none of his brothers ever married, the male line of his family died out with him. He studied jurisprudence at Göttingen, with a view to the Imperial legal service. After a few years of travel, however, he resolved to enter the service of Friedrich the Great; and in 1780 he was, by the interest of Minister von Heinitz, appointed to a post in the Prussian Mining Department. He rapidly earned advancement, and in 1785 was chosen to go as ambassador to the Courts of Mainz, Zweibrücken, and Darmstadt, in order to win them over to Friedrich's *Fürstenbund*. At Mainz he met Metternich, then Austrian minister at the Court of the Elector, and Dalberg, the Elector's coadjutor, afterwards Primate of the Confederation of the Rhine. Stein so performed his mission as to gain the approbation of the old king. After a brief stay in his department, in 1786 he visited England, but we have, unfortunately, little record of what he saw or did here. This is the more to be regretted as Stein was, in early and in late life, especially attracted to English studies; and his notes on England would probably have been as good as those of Arthur Young on France. On his return to Prussia he received the offer of several diplomatic appointments, all of which he rejected, having perhaps seen too much of petty intrigue in his mission to Mainz. (Those who care to learn the ways of a secondary German Court in the last century may turn to Pertz's somewhat full account of that mission.) In 1788 he was appointed Director, and in 1793 President, of the *Kriegs-und Domä-*

nenkammer of Mark; and after other promotions was made, in 1796, President of the *Kammer* of the whole of Westphalia. In these posts he proved himself an excellent practical governor—making roads, improving the navigation of rivers, and doing all in his power to abolish forced labour. He learnt the details of the business of administration very thoroughly, and formed ideas, which he afterwards turned to good account, of the limitation of the provinces of government work and private enterprises. In 1793 he married the Countess Walmoden, the daughter of an illegitimate son of George II. and his mistress, the Countess of Yarmouth. He was some sixteen years older than his bride, and their relations were for several years of the calmest kind. After the birth, however, of three daughters, there arose between husband and wife a mutual respect and earnest friendship, which made their union one of the happiest.

In 1802 he received and declined an offer to become a minister of George III. in Hannover. The next year was the year of what Professor Seeley rightly calls the German Revolution. The Resolution of the Imperial Deputation (*Reichsdeputationshauptschluss*), passed mainly by French influence, abolished almost all the Ecclesiastical States and Sovereign Municipalities, and divided their territories among the greater States which had been plundered by France. In compensation for her lost lands on the left of the Rhine, Prussia received a fivefold extent of territory in Lower Saxony and Westphalia; and Stein was appointed to receive, and form an administration for, the newly acquired part of Westphalia. This task he performed with great tact and moderation. While he was engaged upon it, the Prince of Nassau assumed the sovereign rights over certain villages which belonged to Stein, and provoked a dignified protest from the latter. It may be asked how could he, who was Prussia's agent in annexing the territories of the Bishop of Münster, object to similar conduct in the Prince of Nassau? There was an obvious distinction in the two acts—Prussia acted under the sanction of the Empire, and Nassau did not. Stein, moreover, warmly approved the merging of Münster in Prussia as a step in the direction of his dearest hope—German unity—and would have been glad to cede his own sovereignty to either of the Great Powers with that view; but the union of his small sovereignty with the unimportant State of Nassau could in no wise tend to that great object. In 1803 it was his great sorrow to see the French occupy Hannover without resistance from the German Powers.

The next year, 1804, was the great turning-point in Stein's life. At its close, Struensee, brother of the Danish minister who was executed for adultery with Queen Matilda, sister of

George III., by his death vacated the headship of the Prussian Department of Excise and Customs, and of the Maritime Institute. Beyme, a Cabinet Councillor, strongly recommended the appointment of Stein to these posts. The king dreaded Stein as "*excentrisch und genialisch*," to use his own phrase, and also wished to appoint another person. After some delay, however, Stein was in October nominated Minister of State over the Department of Excise and Customs, and in the next month he received the control of the Maritime Institute and the Bank in addition. In his first year of office he reformed the Salt Administration, and abolished all internal customs between the various provinces of the Prussian State.

We must now give some attention to the foreign policy of Prussia. Ever since Friedrich Wilhelm II., in 1795, abandoned his allies by the disgraceful treaty of Basel, Prussia had been at peace, and had maintained a foolish and discreditable neutrality, even when France annexed her territories west of the Rhine, and made herself master of the Low Countries. She stupidly threw away the chance of joining the Second Coalition. Again an opportunity of opposing France with reasonable hope of success was lost when Napoleon was suffered to occupy Hannover in 1803, and so to place a French army between the two halves of Prussia; and it was then publicly declared that the king "will positively have no war unless he is himself directly attacked." Such a declaration only invites outrage from foes and contempt from friends, a doctrine which we could wish instilled into certain factions in our own country. In October, 1805, Pitt's third and last Coalition commenced hostilities. Both sides treated Prussia with the contempt she had merited. Russia, in September, marched an army through Silesia. Friedrich Wilhelm at last turns like the trodden worm, but that is all. While he is thinking of joining the French to punish the Russian outrage, Napoleon marched a division across Ansbach, whereupon he thinks of joining the Coalition against the French. Had he done so he might have changed the history of the world. If Napoleon had been checked at Austerlitz, a few weeks (be it remembered) after Trafalgar, he might have developed into a wise and moderate French sovereign. But Friedrich Wilhelm did not do what he thought or talked of doing. He adopted the eternal policy of the weak, cowardly, undecided man—he did nothing. And a year later he reaped his reward.

In November, 1805, the king at last, in union with the Allied Powers, determined on sending to Napoleon an ultimatum requiring him to accept his proposals of peace within four weeks on pain of Prussia's joining the Coalition with 180,000 men. This document was entrusted to Haugwitz, who, travelling by

very slow stages (owing, according to Von Ranke, to the Duke of Brunswick's report that Prussia would not be ready for war until late in December), presented himself before the French Emperor at Brünn on the 28th November. Napoleon seems to have guessed his errand, and deferred the reception of his message for a few days. On the 2nd December he crushed the Austrian and Russian armies at Austerlitz; and on the 7th Haugwitz presented the congratulations of Prussia on this victory, keeping his ultimatum in his pocket. Prussia was not only forced back into neutrality, she was compelled to occupy Hannover in hostility to Great Britain, and to cede certain portions of her own territory. She was now in the lowest depth of moral degradation. Her punishment was yet to come.

Stein had to see all this. More than once in the changeful moods of the king he had been invited to suggest proposals of finance for the case of war. These he had made, in the hope that his country would not fail in her duty. It might be supposed that, as a minister, he would from his position have had some power, or at least some opportunity of advising and influencing the king. This was not, however, the case. At this period the Prussian ministers were mere heads of departments. They did not meet in council, and had not free access to the king. The real advisers of the king were what were called the *Cabinet Secretaries*, who (with one exception) were not ministers, but mere personal favourites of the king, constantly about his person, and frequently meeting in council. The original intention had been that the Cabinet should be a Committee for Foreign Affairs, which in a monarchy are always the more especial province of the sovereign; and the minister of Foreign Affairs was still called *the* Cabinet minister, and was a member of the Cabinet. Under Friedrich the Great, who did nearly everything himself, the members of the Cabinet were little more than clerks. Under his successor, the slave of favourites, they had become all-powerful. They now consisted of Haugwitz, the Foreign Minister; Von Lombard, who was the real mover in Foreign Affairs; Von Kleist, for military matters; Von Beyme, for the Interior; and lastly, General von Köckeritz, a mere personal friend of the king, who was present at all meetings, and was perhaps the most influential member of the Cabinet. It is clear that there could be no real ministerial responsibility when such a body as this, which could always shield itself behind the royal authority, stood between the sovereign and the ministers. Hardenberg himself says of it:—

“None of these men do I accuse of bad intentions; yet their influence and their conduct of business were among the principal causes of the downfall of the Prussian monarchy. . . . It was

most difficult for the ministers to obtain access to the king. Except those of Foreign Affairs, and for certain purposes Count S., the rest scarcely ever saw him in business, some never. Nothing remained but written reports, which were laid before the king by the Cabinet Secretaries. . . . Many times the most beneficial plans could not be carried through till a negotiation with the Cabinet Secretary had taken place. . . . Lombard ventured to hear Foreign Ambassadors, who applied to him, and to negotiate with them. . . . I myself experienced that an addition of salary and a money grant, which the king had sanctioned at my instance and had issued the orders in due form, was later declared to have been unduly obtained because it had not passed through their hands."

Hardenberg was now a sort of co-minister of Foreign Affairs with Haugwitz, and his substitute during his frequent absences. He was not in the Cabinet, and of course all his plans and counsels had to be approved by Haugwitz or Lombard. It was not unusual for the king to keep Hardenberg or Haugwitz in ignorance of negotiations with the other.

Such a state of things appeared unbearable to the practical mind of Stein. Accordingly he took advantage of the embarrassed position of the State to write, in May, 1806, a strong Representation of this miserable system, and a sketch of a Council of Ministers. This document is very able, and rather bitter. The constitution of the Cabinet is severely criticised, and its members are treated almost ferociously. Thus—

"Lombard is debilitated and enfeebled physically and morally, his attainments are only those of a French *bel esprit*. . . . His early participation in the orgies of the Rietz family . . . have stifled his moral sense.

"As to the minister Von Haugwitz . . . his life is an unbroken series of disorders or evidences of corruption . . . he shared in the revels of the Rietz and in that woman's intrigues, became her obsequious attendant, and wasted the time that belonged to the State at the ombre-table, and his powers in every sort of brutal sensuality.

"General Kückerkitz is a narrow-minded, uneducated person . . . with a very mischievous turn for thoughtless gossip."

This document appears to have been laid before the queen, who, according to Professor Seeley's opinion, suppressed it.

The one wise step of the Prussian Government in 1806 was an effort to retain the friendship of Russia, an effort which was successful. In July of this year Napoleon formed out of the middle States of Germany the Confederation of the Rhine, of which he assumed the "Protectorate." At the same time he announced that he would no longer recognise the German Empire. In consequence of this, on the 6th August, 1806, the last head of the Holy Roman Empire formally extinguished

himself, declaring that he felt his office to be practically abolished by certain points of the Peace of Pressburg, and by the formation of the Confederation of the Rhine. To neither of these events could Prussia be indifferent. The Confederation was practically a new and powerful neighbour under the control of her enemy. And in the extinction of the Empire (to which she herself had so greatly contributed) she lost a protector and ally on whom she could almost always have counted. A few days later the king received from England the malicious but merited message, that in the negotiations between France and the All-the-talents Ministry of Fox, which had succeeded to office after Pitt's death in January, the French had replied to England's stipulations about Hannover, "*Le Hanovre ne fera pas de difficulté.*" This last insult pricked the conscience and roused the courage of the Prussian eagle. On the 9th August the mobilisation of the army was ordered. A few weeks later an ultimatum was sent to the French Emperor, who was ready and biding his time; and by the 14th October had occurred on the fields of Jena and Auerstädt that which justified the statement that "*La Prusse n' existait plus.*"

Just before the fatal die was cast, on the 2nd September, a memoir, which expressly asked for the dismissal of Von Haugwitz, Beyme, and Lombard, and was generally in the sense of Stein's "Representation," was presented to the king. It contained the following prophetic passage:—

"The universal conviction, grounded on notorious facts, is that the Cabinet plays in every way Bonaparte's game, and will either purchase peace by the most shameful compliance, or in war adopt the feeblest measures; or if your Majesty prescribes strong measures, and honourable generals are prepared heartily to carry them out, will hinder, if not betray them, and so bring the utmost disaster on your Majesty and your noble House and faithful subjects."

It was drawn up by Johannes Müller, the historian, at the request of Prince Louis Ferdinand, who was destined to fall in action a few weeks later. It was signed by Stein, by the king's two brothers, the Princes Heinrich and Wilhelm, and by Generals Rüchel and Phull. It may here be noted that Prince Wilhelm became afterwards a great friend of Stein; and that the latter did not allow any personal feeling of obligation to Beyme, who had recommended him for the ministry, to affect his public conduct. Friedrich Wilhelm was far too small a man to receive properly so reasonable a State Paper. He characterised it as a piece of "censurable presumption," and ordered his disapprobation to be expressed to Stein. Within six weeks the prophecy contained in the paper had been fulfilled to the bitter end; and Schulenberg, the Commandant of Berlin

(a favourite of the king), was proclaiming to the citizens that "the king had lost a battle; that the first duty of the citizen now was to be quiet; that he charged this duty on the inhabitants of Berlin; and that the king and his brothers still lived."

For the next few weeks all was confusion. When at length a feeble light began to dawn over the storm-swept State, even Friedrich Wilhelm III. could not but see that reforms were needed, and that it might possibly be wise to consult those who had told him this before disaster fell upon Prussia. When it was decided at Osterode (November 21st, 1806) to resist the excessive demands of France, and to remain faithful to the Russian alliance, the ministry of Foreign Affairs was offered to Stein, who had strongly counselled that patriotic course. He declined it. The Foreign Minister was still Haugwitz, the coward, who advised complete submission to France. Hardenberg, who was of the patriotic way of thinking, still held his post of substitute for Haugwitz. There was still the third person whose weight in foreign questions must have been very great, to judge by the hatred he awakened in the Cabinet Secretary Lombard, who was also devoted to the French side. Hardenberg was absent, and was not even invited to the Osterode Conference on the French demands. No wonder then that a man of Stein's practical wisdom refused to accept an undefined post of such difficulty, which was so confusedly divided. He alleged his want of special knowledge, and recommended the appointment of some person well acquainted with Russia, by this means giving a plain outline of his opinion as to the policy to be pursued. A week later, however, the king again wrote asking him to take the post *ad interim*, as "Haugwitz has such a severe attack of gout," and stating that Beyme would undertake the work until Stein's arrival. The latter again declined on the ground of inexperience, recommended Hardenberg for the post, and concluded his reply with a renewed protest against the existence of the Cabinet. A king of Prussia was not accustomed to receive papers written in so independent a spirit; and we may feel sure that Friedrich Wilhelm did not like Stein's reply. He had, however, become firmly persuaded that Stein was the only man who could save the country. He accordingly proposed a compromise. He would not abolish the Cabinet: he would not have a General Council of Ministers: but the three principal ministers—those of Finance (who was to be the chief), War, and Foreign Affairs—should discuss with the king all important State matters, with a Cabinet Secretary to keep the records. This was the king's proposal of December 10th, drawn up by Beyme. It did not, however, satisfy the Stein-Hardenberg party, and on the

14th they asked again for a complete abolition of the old Cabinet. On the 19th December, however, the king decreed the creation of a Council of three ministers according to his scheme of the 10th, and appointed Stein Home and Finance Minister, Rüchel to the War Office, and Zastrow (who was scarcely better than Haugwitz) to the department of Foreign Affairs. Hardenberg was passed over entirely. On the 20th Stein wrote to Rüchel, declining office; and a day or two later he wrote to the king expressing his willingness to serve his Majesty as before, but refusing to recognise the new Council. This letter the king appears to have misunderstood; and in a few days he required a report from Stein as holder of the office created on the 19th. Stein refused, and stated that he could not deceive himself with the idea that a real Council existed.

This to a king of Prussia—especially to one who knew that he was a feeble and inferior man—was too much. On the 3rd of January he wrote to Stein a letter in which the following passages occur :—

“I had formerly prejudices against you. . . . I took you for an eccentric genius—that is, for a man who, always regarding his opinion as the true one, was hardly suited for a post where there were many points of contact to annoy him. . . . I overcame these prejudices. . . . I persuaded myself that your management of your Department was excellent. . . . Accordingly I committed to you the portfolio of Foreign Affairs, to hold at least *ad interim*. You refused to accept this honourable post in a bombastic essay. . . . Although this refusal at the time could not but embarrass me . . . in order to meet your views still more in respect of an improved method in the conduct of public business, I issued the order of December 17th (? 19th), which I presume to be known to you. I say ‘*I presume*,’ since your persistent silence, which at first I laid to the account of your state of health, must otherwise remain completely inexplicable. I am indeed well aware in what an insolent manner you have expressed yourself orally and in writing in the presence of Generals Rüchel, Von Zastrow, and Von Kockeritz, and that just now you have twice refused to report on an affair which was sent to you by myself, and was plainly to be regarded as in your Department. From all this I have been forced, to my great regret, to see that I unfortunately was not wrong about you at first, but that you are to be regarded as a refractory, defiant, obstinate, and disobedient official, who, proud of his genius and talents, far from having the good of the State before his eyes, led only by caprice, acts from passion, personal hate, and rancour. . . . It really pains me that you have forced me to speak so plainly. As you, however, profess to be a truth-loving man, I have given you my opinion in good German, and must add that, unless you are willing to alter your disrespectful and indecent bearing, the State can no longer count on your services.”

Half an hour later Stein replied :—

“As your Majesty regards me as ‘a refractory, &c.’ [here he quotes the king’s words], I must beg your Majesty for my dismissal, which I await here, as I am obliged, under the circumstances, to give up my purpose of going to Memel.”

The king replied on the 4th January, 1807 :—

“As Baron von Stein has, under date of yesterday, passed sentence on himself, I have nothing to add.”

Stein was not the only man among the Liberators of Germany who suffered dismissal with intended disgrace at the hands of a king of Prussia. In 1772 Captain von Blücher wrote to Friedrich the Great :—

“Von Sigersfeld, who has no other merit than that of being the bastard of the Margrave von Schwedt, is promoted over me. I beg your Majesty for my discharge.”

By way of reply, the old king put the plain-speaking captain under arrest. In this condition he remained some nine months, when, to a second and probably more respectful petition for his discharge, the king replied :—

“Captain von Blücher is dismissed from the service, and can go to the devil.”

Captain von Blücher seems to have disregarded this authorisation. He lived to be restored by the king’s successor, to be one of the few Prussian soldiers who came well out of the Jena campaign, to be the friend of Stein, and to administer the *coup de grâce* at Waterloo. Another odd coincidence afforded by these two men is in Scharnhorst’s remark, that he knew only two men who were free from all fear of men—Stein and Blücher. The latter wrote, shortly before Jena, with a vigour which he may have learnt of Friedrich II.: “I wish Stein were our Foreign Minister, and that the present one (Von Haugwitz) were in hell.”

The king of Prussia had now, at the worst extremity of fortune, deprived himself by neglect of the help of Hardenberg, by insult of the help of Stein—the only two men in whom his subjects or allies had any confidence. Hardenberg was, however, now recalled to power, while Stein returned to his home at Nassau. The campaign of Eylau and Friedland so far restored Prussia’s honour that Napoleon became alarmed, and in the negotiations of Tilsit he expressed his objection to a “foreigner who had been educated about the person of the Prince of Wales” being minister in Prussia. In vain Hardenberg protested that he had served in Prussia seventeen years, and that his chief

relation with the Prince of Wales was that his Royal Highness had deigned to seduce his wife. In vain the king protested that he had no one to put in Hardenberg's place. "*Prenez donc, M. Stein,*" said Napoleon, "*c'est un homme d'esprit.*" And as Stein had been appointed to his first ministry at the suggestion of Beyme, so he owed his second promotion to a foe. It is just to say that Hardenberg, on retiring, strongly recommended the appointment of Stein. On the 6th of July Hardenberg left the king: the offer of a real Premiership reached Stein in August; and, after a delay which was caused by illness brought on by news of the Peace of Tilsit, he reached Memel at the end of September. Meanwhile Beyme managed State affairs; and Prussia had ceded half her territory by the Treaty of Tilsit.

At Stein's first interview with the king, the latter complained of being pressed by destiny; and expressed a wish to retire into private life. It did not occur to him that his own weakness and obstinacy had had more to do with the fall of Prussia than destiny had. He soon gave Stein all the powers which the minister demanded; and Stein found himself in an almost dictatorial position, aided by two commissions formed of the ablest officials—one devoting itself to the reorganisation of the army, the other (called the Immediate Commission) to general purposes of government.

The Treaty of Tilsit had stipulated that the French should evacuate Prussia by the 1st November, 1807; a later article made this conditional on payment of an unnamed war indemnity. It was then computed that this would amount to about 19,000,000 francs, or 760,000*l.* The revenue of Prussia for 1805 had been about 4,040,000*l.*; but since that year her population had been reduced from 10,000,000 to about 5,000,000. In September, however, Napoleon wrote that he should occupy Prussian fortresses with 18,000 men, at the expense of Prussia, until the latter State should have paid him 150,000,000 of francs, or 6,000,000*l.* After some ineffectual negotiations, the king's brother (Prince Wilhelm), a warm friend of Stein, went to Paris to try to get better terms from Napoleon; but the attempt was made in vain. In the spring Stein went to negotiate with Daru, Napoleon's lieutenant at Berlin; but all was in vain. In September, 1808, however, Napoleon, by the Convention of Paris, fixed his demands at 140,000,000 francs, afterwards reduced to 120,000,000 (4,800,000*l.*) on the intercession of the Czar. He was to retain the fortresses of Glogau, Stettin, and Cüstrin until the money was paid, and Prussia was to limit her army to 42,000 men. But French troops, to the number of 150,000, occupied Prussia until they were wanted for the Peninsular War

in the autumn of 1808 ; and the other terms of the Convention were still unperformed by France when she dragged Prussia with her into the war against Russia in 1812.

Stein in October, 1807, entered upon a ministry which, though it lasted but thirteen months, during which the country was held by the foreigner, has proved perhaps the most fruitful period of Prussian history. It changed the mode of government ; it paved the way for all the improvements of our own day ; and it created the spirit which drove out the foreign oppressor five years after its own extinction. Among his colleagues the most distinguished was Gerhard von Scharnhorst, a Hannoverian, who entered the Prussian service in 1801 at the age of forty-six. He distinguished himself as a soldier, but still more as a military scientist. Under him was Gneisenau, who was born in 1760. He had recently come into very high estimation by his brilliant defence of Colberg. This feat led to his appointment to the Military Reorganisation Commission, and to his friendship with Blücher, to whom he acted as chief of the staff during the campaigns of 1813-15. More immediately under Stein worked Schön and Neibuhr. The former was a Prussian official of some standing and of good service, who is best known to the outside world as claiming the suggestion or first idea of all that Stein did. Niebuhr was a Dane, and was at Copenhagen during the bombardment by Nelson in 1801. He was director of the Copenhagen Bank, when in 1806 he was invited to undertake that of Berlin. He accepted the offer, and became a member of the Immediate Commission. He took no leading part in political matters, but was, and remained for life, a warm friend of Stein. To his reputation as a historian we need make no reference. It is not a little curious to note that scarcely any of the leading men in the Prussian service at this time were Prussians by birth. Stein was a Franconian ; Hardenberg and Scharnhorst, Hannoverians ; Niebuhr, a Dane ; Blücher, a Mecklenburger ; Gneisenau, a Saxon.

Stein's first great act was the Edict of Emancipation, which was signed in the very month of his entering upon his ministry. This important document entirely abolished personal serfdom in the kingdom ; created peasant proprietorships in East and West Prussia, cancelled the barbarous distinctions which divided land into nobles', citizens', and peasants' holdings, and forbade the sale of them from one class into another ; and removed a similar caste limitation which had hitherto restricted nobles, citizens, and peasants respectively to certain occupations.

But 1807 was hardly a year for internal reforms in Prussia. The great preoccupation of every statesman was necessarily the question of getting rid of the French, or at least of escaping further oppression from them. And accordingly we find that

Stein himself regards the insurrection of Spain in May, 1808, after the forced abdication at Bayonne, as the turning-point in his ministry and life-work. The example of resistance to the tyrant which was afforded by the Spaniards was a deep lesson to the thoughtful patriots of Germany. Not that the latter country was in a position to drive the French out at once. Napoleon had taken care to keep a tight hold on the country by means of his armies. But the fact of Spanish rebellion, and of Napoleon's inability to suppress it, set men thinking on the causes which enabled a comparatively small, untrained, and undisciplined population to do what vast military States had failed to do. The great point of difference between Spain and Germany was on the point of unity. As Professor Seeley well says, the Spanish State and Spain were the same thing; but there was only a collection of States in Germany. The Spaniards were all of one religion, while the Germans formed two great sections in this respect. All that a Spaniard was proud of made him proud of Spain and helped the State; but the things which a German admired—the new literature, the Court of Weimar, the wars of Friedrich II.—tended in no way to strengthen any State; and so while all enthusiasm in Spain could be turned against the foreign foe, German enthusiasm was waste power.

Stein thought at first that Germany would after a time rise in rebellion, and herself oust the oppressor. With this view, there could be no better plan of helping the cause than that of developing public spirit. Stein knew well that Prussia could only recover herself by means of the people; and the problem before him was, first to make the people alive to the necessity of action, and then to make them capable of action. Of secret societies he had no opinion; not only was he not (as has been asserted) the founder of the *Tugendbund*, he was not even a member of that association. It was by larger measures that he hoped to create an independent nation.

Early in 1808 he abolished all monopolies that affected the food of the people. He commenced and started fairly a still more important movement, that of the thorough Reform of the Administration. Stein's chief contributions to this great task were the bringing of the ministers into proper relations with the sovereign, and with each other: the programme (never quite carried out) of the Council of State, consisting of the Princes of the Blood, the Ministers, and certain other persons chosen by the King; the abolition of the *Kriegs- und Domänenkammer*, and the erection of new District Governments, and the separation of the Judicial power from the Administrative.

The second great Reform of Stein's ministry was that of the Military System, and was mainly due to Scharnhorst. Before

Jena the army was raised by conscription, based on the theory that it is the duty of all to defend the country. The conscription, however, was only partial. Escape by money payment was tolerated, and whole trades and even districts were exempted. Friedrich II. had restricted the rank of officer to the noble class, although at the beginning of the eighteenth century half of the officers had been non-noble. The result of this change was that the officers became neglectful of professional knowledge, and deficient in culture generally. Indeed, it would seem that it was Scharnhorst who discovered the value of professional skill in an officer. His chief improvements were the abolition of exemptions, the prohibition of all degrading punishments, and the devising a system by which a part of the army would leave the colours every year, so that the country would soon contain a considerable force of trained men. He sketched out a system of Landwehr or militia, but this was not carried out until 1813, and then not according to his plan, by which the reserve would have been a separate body, not consisting (as is now the case) of men who had passed through the regular army. Lastly, he impressed upon the nation the necessity of training the young in the use of arms, a lesson which Napoleon himself had taught. Military exercises were practised in all schools, and this gave Prussia the admirable young officers of 1813-14. These military reforms were not carried out all at once, but were spread over Scharnhorst's ministry, which lasted until 1810.

The remaining great change made by Stein was the Reform of the Municipalities. In no country had the municipalities attained so much power as under the German Empire, where the Hansa once contained eighty-five towns. Their constitutions were, however, antiquated, and the rights of citizenship were held by far too small a class. Stein now extended these rights to all who owned land or pursued certain occupations in the towns, and formed representative corporations somewhat on the English model. His municipal laws required thorough revision and alteration before they were a quarter of a century old; but they were a mighty beginning of independence and freedom, and their spirit has always prevailed.

It may be said briefly of the whole tendency of Stein's legislation that he saw that the hearty co-operation of the people was indispensable for the existence of the Prussian State, and that, with a view of making that co-operation thorough and perfect, it was necessary for the State to take the people into partnership.

Meanwhile the rising at Madrid in May, 1808, had revived or strengthened the hopes of all far-sighted foes of the despotism which seemed likely to enslave all civilisation. Stein, as has

been already hinted, was one of the first to see the immense value of this movement. In a memorandum to the king, of the 11th August, he wrote:—

“ We must keep alive in the nation the feeling of discontent with oppression and with the dependence on a foreign insolent people, which grows daily more inconsiderate. We must keep it familiar with the thought of self-help, of the sacrifice of life and property, which without this will soon be a resource and a prey of the conquering nation. We must spread certain ideas as to how to stir up and conduct, to extend and inspire an insurrection. The plan of operation would have to be settled with Austria; the support in money and weapons, and in case of failure, the safety of the Royal family, with England. For we must keep the possibility of failure clearly in view. and consider well that the Power which we attack is great, and the mind that leads it is mighty, and that the struggle is begun less with regard to the probability of success than to the certainty that without it destruction is inevitable, and that it is more in accordance with our duty to our contemporaries and to posterity, and more glorious for king and nation to die with arms in our hands than patiently to suffer ourselves to be enchained and imprisoned. We must make ourselves familiar with the thought of privation of every kind, and with that of death.”

The king's only hope was in Russia, though he had seen, in 1807, how little reliance could be placed in the aid of that Power. Stein, on the other hand, was the most German of German patriots. “ The war for the liberation of Germany,” he said, “ must be waged by Germans.” Moreover, he had at this time no great idea of the strength of Russia, or of the Emperor's character. He writes:—

“ That thinly-peopled country, devoid of industry, will make but a feeble resistance; and a country ruled by a weak, sensual prince, intimidated by the failure of a number of schemes, abandoned as lightly as they were undertaken, through the agency of a stupid, awkward, corrupt, and meddlesome bureaucracy, a country where the great mass of the nation are slaves—such a country will not long maintain the fight against civilised Europe.”

Stein, then, relied upon Austria. Indeed, he was always well disposed to that Power; and a real supremacy of Germany in her hands would have been as satisfactory to him as the supremacy of Prussia. His bugbear was the selfishness of the small princes, whom he wished to see swallowed up in a united State. And it was only because he saw in Prussia the elements of a great controlling Power that he entered her service. He was early acquainted with Austria's preparations for the war against France of 1809; and he hoped everything from it. If, as appeared probable, France compelled Prussia to lend her an army-corps, “ we must,” he said, “ so arrange that it may join

the Austrians at the right moment, and oppose the general foe." In this suggestion is a foreshadowing of Yorck's noble treachery at Taugoggen, and of the somewhat less admirable conduct of the Bavarians and Saxons later in the same year, 1813.

Stein was appointed to attend the great meeting at Erfurt, in September, 1808. Just as he was about to leave Königsberg on the 21st, the Paris *Moniteur* of September 8th arrived. It contained the following passage:—

“Un assesseur Prussien, nommé Koppe, était désigné comme un agent d'intrigues. Le Maréchal Soult ayant été dans le cas de le faire arrêter et conduire à Spandau, on a saisi ses papiers où l'on a trouvé l'original de la lettre qu'on va lire.

“Nous croyons devoir la publier comme un monument des causes de la prospérité et de la chute des empires. Elle révèle la manière de pensée du ministère Prussien, et elle fait connaître particulièrement M. de Stein, qui a pendant longtemps exercé le ministère, et qui est aujourd'hui presque exclusivement chargé de la direction des affaires. On plaindra le roi de Prusse d'avoir des ministres aussi malhabiles que pervers.”

Then follows in German, with a French translation appended, the text of a letter which Stein had with careless zeal addressed on the 15th August to the Prince von Sayn-Wittgenstein. In it occur these sentences:—

“The indignation in Germany waxes daily, and it is well to foster it and to work on men. I wish that the communications in Hesse and Westphalia were kept up, and that people would prepare themselves for certain eventualities. . . . The affairs of Spain make a very lively impression. They prove what we ought to have seen long ago. It would be well to spread the news of them prudently.”

This publication fell like a bomb into the Prussian camp, and Stein's visit to Erfurt was at once given up. Immediately on its appearance the French Government forced on the Russian representatives at Paris the treaty to which allusion has already been made. Stein at once offered his resignation, and there were plenty of curs about the Court to bark at the great man's heels—as is always the case. The king, however, retained him. Napoleon, for some reason which is not clear—probably, as Professor Seeley suggests, because he did not feel quite strong enough at the moment—did not at once demand his dismissal. The Russian Emperor thought that Napoleon would object to Stein as Chief Minister, but would tolerate him as Finance Minister, in the hope of getting the Prussian indemnity more easily; but this is improbable. Indeed, a letter from Napoleon to Soult, of the 10th September, distinctly says: *J'ai demandé que M. Stein fût chassé du Ministère, sans quoi le roi de Prusse*

ne rentrera pas chez lui. In October it began to be certain that Stein must retire. The French officials in Prussia and the Prussian malcontents were incessantly agitating against him. Stein himself recommended the division of his own powers, and the appointment of Count Dohna-Schlobitten as Minister of the Interior, and of Schön as Finance Minister. It was impossible to call in Hardenberg openly, as Napoleon had insisted on his expulsion from the ministry only a year and a half before; but the king consulted him by letter on their candidatures. Hardenberg proposed Altenstein in place of Schön; and finally Dohna-Schlobitten and Altenstein were appointed. Beyme was made High Chancellor, or head of the Department of Justice. This man regretted Stein's fall sincerely. It should be borne in mind, too, that Stein opposed Beyme only as Cabinet Secretary, and was probably now satisfied to see him a responsible minister.

Stein's last days as minister were occupied in the drawing up of a manly Political Testament in the form of a Farewell Address to the higher State officials. In this he urged a reform of the nobility, universal military service, the improvement of the clerical order, a sounder system of education, and other useful changes. But its most important passage is the following:—

“The next step appears to be a universal National Representation. The right and power of our king has been sacred to me, and may it remain so to us. But that this unlimited power may work the good that is in it, it seemed to me necessary to give the supreme power a means whereby it may learn the wishes of the people, and give life to its own decisions. When all share in State matters is taken from the people, when even the management of its local affairs is taken from it, it soon gets to regard the Government either with indifference, or in some cases as its foe. Hence the resistance, or at least want of hearty will, in sacrifice for the existence of the State.”

Stein quitted office on the 24th November. On the 5th of the following month he left Königsberg for Berlin, on his way to his Nassau estate. The war in Spain, and the opposition threatened by Austria, had caused most of the French troops to be withdrawn, and those which were left to be posted in the fortresses. Berlin had been evacuated a few days before the arrival of Stein, who purposed remaining in the capital until the middle of January. He received much sympathy on his retirement. The Princess Wilhelm wished to go into retirement in consequence. Stein dissuaded her, and said:—

“I have received from persons from whom I had no reason to expect it, the most touching proofs of faithful devotion and love to the good cause, and to myself. Assuredly the efforts of the good and strong are not lost; it is still true that—

“ ‘The firm patriot . . .
 Who made the welfare of mankind his care,
 Though still by faction, vice, and fortune crossed,
 Shall find the generous labour was not lost.’ ”

Cato, by ADDISON.

Stein's residence in Berlin was cut short by the arrival of a new French minister early in January, 1809, who brought with him the following document, which, by the way, is not printed in the Napoleon correspondence:—

“ DÉCRET IMPÉRIAL.

“ 1. Le nommé Stein cherchant à exciter des troubles en Allemagne est déclaré ennemi de la France et de la Confédération du Rhin.

“ 2. Les biens que le dit Stein posséderait, soit en France, soit dans les pays de la Confédération du Rhin, seront séquestrés. Le dit Stein sera saisi de sa personne partout où il pourra être atteint par nos troupes ou celles de nos alliés.

“ En notre camp impérial de Madrid, le 16 Décembre, 1802.

“(Signé) NAPOLÉON.”

Stein at once wrote to the king asking him to procure for him the Czar's intercession with Napoleon, and also to authorise him to enter the Russian service. In the night of the 5th he fled, and arrived at Prague on the 16th.

For nearly four years Stein drops out of European history. He had to look on in helpless misery while everything went contrary to his dearest wishes. His reforms were delayed or feebly carried out in Prussia. The king could not be spurred into joining Austria in the war. English help, that might have done much in North Germany, was wasted at Walcheren. Austria was beaten again into a disastrous peace. And, finally, Napoleon apparently perpetuated his power by his marriage with the daughter of the Cæsars.

In June, 1810, Hardenberg was recalled to power in Prussia. In less than a year afterwards the annexation of the Duchy of Oldenberg by France, and the modification of the Continental System by Russia, had made a war between those Powers more than probable. Presently arose for Prussia the question whether she would side with Russia or with France. The former was a friend, but a friend who might be unfortunate: the latter was the terrible master who, in case of his success, would punish severely any delinquency. The Czar stated that his strategy would be that of Wellington in the Peninsula—to retreat, to draw out and exhaust the French by long marches up to impregnable positions. This would indeed expose Prussian territory, but a couple of strong fortified camps at Pillau and Colberg would at once protect the country, and occupy a considerable part of Napoleon's forces. It would be, on the other hand, a great advantage to the French if the war began at the Russian frontier,

and not in Prussia. Having a choice of policies, Friedrich Wilhelm naturally preferred the course which was less wise and honourable. He offered France his aid in return for the cancelling of the oppressive treaty. This Napoleon refused; but negotiations were renewed in October, 1811. Finally, in February, 1812, he intimidated Prussia into an alliance, restoring to her Glogau, and allowing her a larger army, but stipulating for a contingent from that army, a free passage through her territory in case of war, and strict carrying out of the Continental System. Once more the king's weak indecision had brought him to the wrong side, and his kingdom to humiliation.

The outbreak of war between France and Russia brought Stein again to the front. But the real life-work of the great statesman may be said to have ended with his brief year of supreme office. In that time he had made or initiated so many most important organic reforms, that he may be justly styled the author or suggester of almost all that is sound in the Prussian system of our day; and he had awakened a passionate desire for union and liberation in his countrymen. The latter may appear to Englishmen or Frenchmen to be no great achievement; but let it be borne in mind that the Germans had never yet existed in the form of a really homogeneous nation, and that the great writers of the new literature, Goethe above all, were careless of liberty, or even of the throwing off of the foreign yoke. Even Schiller's patriotic plays, the "Jungfrau von Orleans" and "Wilhelm Tell," for instance, show a spirit of respect for established legal order, for rights of kings or Imperial briefs, more marked than any claim which they make for freedom for the Man or independence for the Nation. Stein and Fichte may almost be said to be the inventors of patriotism in Germany. Many other great minds—as Scharnhorst, for instance—thought as they did, and used their influence as they did. But no others had the same opportunity for working directly on the popular mind. These then were Stein's greatest achievements. In the years of actual struggle and triumph, he was only one of many excellent men who were carrying out ideas that were mainly his. He was, it is true, as the unofficial minister of a foreign sovereign, in a position of exceptional delicacy and difficulty; and when he had borne up his feeble or dreamy chief into victory and triumph, he received the usual guerdon of ingratitude and neglect. But good work done in modest silence, and injustice borne with dignity, are hardly qualities which fill the world with a man's name.

When the Russian Emperor found himself in actual danger of being invaded, he wrote to Stein as to one of the chiefs in the cause of national independence against Napoleon:—

"I invite you most pressingly to impart your thoughts to me, whether in writing by a sure hand, or orally by coming to me at Wilna. Count Lieven will give you a passport for the purpose. No doubt your presence in Bohemia might be of great use, since you are posted, so to speak, in the rear of the French armies. But it is as good as certain that Austria's weakness will range her under the French standard, and this might endanger your safety, or at least that of your correspondence. . . . It is not necessary to assure you that you will be received in Russia with open arms."

Stein started for Wilna at once. He refused office in Russia, but became the trusted unofficial adviser and friend of the Czar, over whom he acquired immense influence. He of course heartily supported every measure of resistance. A powerful section in Russia, notably the minister Romanzow, was anxious to make peace after the first French victories. But Stein contributed greatly to the Czar's determination to draw the French further into the interior, and to his firmness in writing, after the burning of Moscow, to the Crown Prince of Sweden that "he and his people were more than resolved to bury themselves under the ruins of the Empire rather than come to terms with the new Attila." When the French retreat began, the Empress-mother, a princess of Wirtemberg, who had been of the peace party, declared that she would be ashamed of being a German if one man of the French army were allowed to recross the Rhine. Stein's reply was severe, and it exhibits his patriotic feeling and old opinion of the smaller princes. Turning pale with indignation, he said:—

"Your Majesty is wrong to say this, and before these Russians, who owe so much to Germany. You should not say 'you would be ashamed of the Germans,' but should name your kinsmen the German princes. I lived on the Rhine from 1792 to 1796. The brave German people were not to blame. If they could have been trusted, or been properly used, no Frenchman would ever have come over the Elbe, far less over the Weichsel and Dnieper."

The Empress took the reproach in good part. "You are right, Baron," she replied; "I thank you for the lesson."

While in Russia, Stein, with the assistance of Arndt, formed a German Committee, which did its utmost to stimulate and concentrate the spirit of resistance in Germany. A less successful plan was that of forming a German legion out of the prisoners taken from the forced German contingent in Napoleon's armies. This failed chiefly from the fact (which has been paralleled very recently) that the prisoners mostly perished miserably in the hands of their Russian captors. Arndt, who had felt it desirable to take refuge in Russia when the French armies were advancing through Germany, remained Stein's life-long friend.

With the evacuation of Russian territory by the French, the peace party at St Petersburg revived their efforts to bring about a pacification. Stein, however, succeeded in persuading Alexander to assume the position of liberator of Europe. As a first step, a proclamation was published inviting the Germans to range themselves under the banner of Russia, whose first object would be the reconquest of the freedom of Germany. In November, 1812, Stein presented a memoir to the Czar, proposing that he should urge the King of Prussia to dismiss his present ministers, and that he should dismiss his own minister, Romanzow. He also suggested that none of the dispossessed minor princes should be restored. He hoped for the landing of an English force in North Germany; but he was not able to make much of Lord Cathcart, our minister at St Petersburg. "He is a mixture," he said, "of military pedantry and courtier-like reserve, and reminds one of old Field-Marshal Kalkstein, who locked three doors before asking whether the king had gone from Berlin to Potsdam!"

In the retreat from Russia, the Prussian contingent, which had remained in Courland in Macdonald's division, became of great importance. It consisted of eighteen thousand fresh men commanded by Yorck. The Russians plied this commander with invitations to come over to them. He declined to act upon these, but referred to Berlin for instructions. Friedrich Wilhelm III., as might almost be guessed, fell back upon that familiar stratagem of the irresolute coward in moments of difficulty—he sent no reply. On the 26th of December, Alexander sent word to Yorck that he was resolved not to lay down his arms until he had restored Prussia to her position of 1805. Yorck no longer hesitated; he separated himself from the French, and, on the 30th, signed the Convention of Tauroggen, which made his army neutral, and allowed a passage to the Russians. This step was a bold and decisive incident in the war; practically it precipitated, what was still doubtful, the alliance of Prussia with Russia. It was the more striking as Yorck had hitherto belonged to the military aristocratic party, and was bitterly opposed to the patriotic views of Stein. In reporting his action, he wrote to the king that "he would await death on the scaffold as calmly as on the battle-field, on which he had grown grey." Even now King Friedrich Wilhelm would not be saved. He ordered Yorck before a court-martial, directed the new commander to join Murat's forces, and sent Count Hatzfeld to Paris to offer Napoleon thirty thousand men. Stein, however, still persevered, and led Alexander with him. Having been appointed by the Czar to be his plenipotentiary-commissioner in Germany, he caused the

Estates of East Prussia to meet at Königsberg. This Assembly voted fifteen thousand reserve men, twenty thousand *Landwehr*; and finally authorised the calling out of the *Landsturm*; the faithful Arndt published a pamphlet explaining to the people what the two new terms signified. This was the crowning triumph of Stein's work, when he had induced the people to help themselves; and this was the origin of the Prussian *Landwehr*.

The king became more and more wrong-headed as his course was made clearer to him. The conduct of Yorck hurt his pride and notions of obedience; while Stein's calling together of the Estates seemed a dangerous and revolutionary step. At last, however, the force of circumstances drove him reluctant into the right path. In January he left Berlin for Breslau; in the next month he had learned to approve Yorck's conduct, and appointed him to chief command. He was still afraid of his people, and was unwilling to call out the *Landwehr*; or take any step tending to a popular Government. At the end of February, however, Stein arrived at Breslau, and in one interview seems to have convinced the king. He was immediately after stricken down by typhus, and lay three weeks in a miserable attic, neglected by all, except such tried friends as the Prince and Princess Wilhelm, Scharnhorst, and Blücher. On the 15th March the Czar arrived, and his first visit was made to Stein's attic, where he kissed the statesman before all the courtiers, who, we may be sure, regarded Stein with very different eyes after this compliment. Two days later appeared the famous address, *An mein Volk*. With this Stein's great plan of liberating his country may be said to have been achieved. The nation rose: the king accepted the help of the people, and the *Landwehr* was formed. The king had a motto placed on the Prussian uniform: *Mit Gott für König und Vaterland*—a phrase good enough, though it assumes a tone of selfishness when one learns that it was a substitute for Stein's more manly *Wehrlos, Ehrlos*. The history of 1813-14 is merely a record of triumphs gained by following Stein's counsels. He was at Vienna during the Congress unofficially, in attendance upon the Czar, who followed his opinions in all German matters. We need only note that Stein, in his zeal for German unity, desired the revival of the imperial crown.

As soon as peace was finally restored, the Emperor Alexander naturally dropped Stein. When Russia was entering upon the death-struggle with Napoleon, it was, as Professor Seeley well observes, important to "tear Germany out of his hands, and to secure its resources for her own cause." For that purpose Stein was useful; and, so long as he was useful, Alexander

cherished him. But when the hard work was over, Stein was a dangerous stirrer-up of the people, and was thrown away like a squeezed orange, and Frau von Krüdener was a more congenial counsellor. In regarding this imperial dreamer with good impulses, the remark of Napoleon, after their first meeting at Tilsit, should be remembered: *C'est un Grec du bas empire.* It was proposed at Vienna to endow Stein with the valuable estate of Johannisberg on the Rhine, near Bingen. But the proposal fell through, and Metternich received the splendid dotation. In Prussia, which he had served so well, we might have expected to see Stein in power again. But no. The king could never forget the assembling of the Estates at Königsberg, nor the being forced himself into measures that were at once large and wise and successful; Hardenberg, the Chancellor, did not care to have so great a rival near him; and the French party at Berlin, always powerful, encouraged these dislikes. In 1816 Stein was nominated to the first class of the Order of the Black Eagle, and that was his chief and only reward from Prussia.

Stein's life during the miserable period of reaction in Germany was that of a country gentleman of culture who takes a strong interest in politics. He wrote on the questions of the day, always in a strong, healthy, liberal sense, although he was an aristocrat in feeling as well as by birth. His pamphlets had influence, but not influence of the immediate kind. He instituted about 1819, after much thought and effort, a Society for the Culture of Early German History, which resulted in the world-famous publication, the *Monumenta Germaniæ historica*, first edited by Pertz, the director of the society, and the biographer of Stein. In 1822, on the death of Hardenberg, it was hoped that Stein, then aged sixty-five, would be called to power; but King Friedrich Wilhelm chose Count Lottum, of whom not one in ten of our readers has ever heard. The old statesman occupied part of his declining years in writing an autobiography. In 1826 he was named Marshal of the Provincial Estates of Westphalia, where he distinguished himself by a brusque severity that was occasionally almost brutal. He was, to quote Professor Seeley's word, "startled" by the July revolution of 1830, of which Niebuhr has been said to have died. In 1831, on the 21st June, Stein was seized with a severe cold. Eight days later he summoned all his house-folk round his bed, and gave them a solemn farewell; and a few hours afterwards sank calmly into the eternal sleep.

In this hurried survey of Stein's career we have purposely given the chief part of our attention to the two great years of his life—the years 1807-8 and 1813-14—the years in which his

real work was done ; the rest of his life is worth study only as the life of every upright man is worth study. Professor Seeley, the newest authority upon Stein, has followed the plan only in part. His book (which we have in the main followed) is, as we have already said, too long, and it might well have been shortened by devoting fewer pages to the events of those years which are really unimportant in Stein's life. The work strikes us as being singularly unscientific for the production of a Professor. It is stingy in dates, it is contemptuous of chronological order, without substituting any distinctly better system, and it does not boast the shadow of a claim to style. Not the least of crimes in a reviewer's eyes is the absence of an index. The Professor has, it is true, avoided this crime, but his index is almost purely an *index nominum propriorum*, and consequently not of very great use. Referring to the word "Germany," we find a column after column of numerical references to pages without further guide. Now this is absolutely useless. It is, however, fair to say that some of the leading names are furnished with explanatory references. Notwithstanding these minor defects, Professor Seeley's book evinces a deep and reasonable appreciation of facts, and a judgment which is almost invariably just, although we think he hardly shows due severity to Friedrich Wilhelm III., and is too considerate towards Alexander I. : the former monarch a George III. without the honest courage of the English king ; and Alexander, an impulsive dreamer of benevolent reform, who showed himself not less ungrateful, and even more selfish (politically) than George IV. himself. We have no doubt that this work will be the chief book on Stein in England, and will be largely read in Germany for many a long year.

Stein's life is a worthy example to all. He was a man to whom duty was the most important consideration in life. Intellectually he was the man who, in the time of the deepest degradation of his country, alone had a hope of recovery, accurately foresaw the manner in which it must be accomplished, and knew that real prosperity could come only by unity. He exposed the truth in a way which brought on him constant annoyance and persecution, the ingratitude of the king whom he tried to save, and finally the violence of that king's enemies. He had—after having been dictator of an important State—to live for years in obscurity, and for awhile almost in want. And after seeing the greatest successes follow the execution of his plans he had to retire into the life of a country gentleman. There was, however, no bitterness in him, sharp as his tongue occasionally was. By birth a petty sovereign, he was the most active of the foes of the selfish petty princes of his day ; and was

the most thorough and trustful friend of the people. In spite of this, he always remained an aristocrat at heart. Standing on so high an eminence, he was not a man to have confidential friends. He died scarcely more wealthy than he was born. These are great qualities, and are more than enough to recommend the life and memory of Stein to the admiration of a nation which, without thought of party or policy, honours and loves the names of William Pitt, and Arthur, first Duke of Wellington.

ART. IV.—POLISH LITERATURE.

1. *Monumenta Poloniæ Historica*. Edited by BIEŁOWSKI. 2 vols. Lemberg: 1864-1872.
2. *Biblioteka Pisarzy Polskich (Library of Polish Authors)*. Now in course of publication. Leipzig.
3. *Wspomnienia o Adamie Mickiewiczu, przez A. Niewiarowicza (Recollections of Adam Mickiewicz. By A. NIEWIAROWICZ.)* Lemberg: 1878.

CAN we hope, even for a short time, to arrest the attention of our readers by a sketch of the prominent features and chief authors of Polish literature? Much has been written (declamatory and otherwise) on the sufferings of the Poles, and there was good reason for the sympathy which their sad fate elicited throughout Europe. Little or nothing, however, of a substantial kind has been done for them. During the latter part of the last century, and at the time of the futile rebellions of 1830 and 1863, their frantic appeals for aid were met with mere expressions of pity, and they sank at last more hopelessly under the yoke of their conquerors. Nor must we forget that, with a great many persons in our own country and other parts of western Europe, till the outbreak of the Crimean war, the Emperor Nicholas was regarded with curious veneration as the great embodiment of the principles of law and order and Conservatism. It would occupy our pages too much, if we were to fill them with extracts from old Tory journals and magazines, in which the Northern autocrat is bespattered with the most fulsome eulogy. But all this was to be changed, and the same party has become very eloquent upon the wrongs of unfortunate Poland, if only as a means of stirring up a scandal and a shame against our new rivals, who bid fair to be our hereditary enemies, the Russians. We thank them

heartily for their philanthropy, but they must pardon Liberals of old standing, who never particularly admired any of these proceedings, if they are somewhat surprised at the sudden conversion. Mr. Gladstone has done a real service by calling attention to this transmutation in a recent number of the *Nineteenth Century*. But our business is with literature and not with politics.

The Polish language has always been a great stumbling-block to Englishmen; its conglomerations of consonants, and (supposed) harshness, have become a by-word among us, and the cause of a great deal of misdirected waggishness.* The very names even of the leading authors who have written in Polish are unknown. Perhaps we must consider a native a prejudiced writer on such a subject, but if we wish for a vigorous defence of the language let us listen to the eloquent words of Casimir Brodzinski, himself a poet of no mean order. "Let," he says, "the Pole smile with manly pride when the inhabitant of the banks of the Tiber or Seine calls his language rude; let him hear with keen satisfaction and the dignity of a judge the stranger who painfully struggles with the Polish pronunciation, like a Sybarite trying to lift an old Roman coat of armour, or when he struggles to articulate the language of men with the weak accent of children. While courage shall not perish in our nation, while our manners shall not have become degraded, let us not disavow this manly roughness of our language. It has also its harmony, its melody, but it is the murmur of an oak of 300 years, and not the plaintive and feeble cry of a reed, swayed by every wind." When a tablet was affixed on the house at Rome in which Mickiewicz had lodged, what condescending explanations were vouchsafed by the newspapers! The fact that such a man had existed—a man whom Goethe had considered one of the greatest of modern poets—was, indeed, a discovery. But how many Englishmen had ever heard of him or of such writers as Niemcewicz, Slowacki, and Zaleski?

Does a person unacquainted with Polish wish to understand what Poland has accomplished in the way of literature, he must turn to the colourless versions of Sir John Bowring published nearly sixty years ago. The saying, "*finis Poloniæ*," falsely

* The following rules for the pronunciation of some of the Polish letters may be useful to the English reader—

c = ts.

cz = ch.

sz = sh.

In nearly every instance the accent is on the penult.

ascribed by the French romancer to Kosciuszko, might with truth be written upon the records of European literature as far as the sympathy of western scholars has been elicited for the writers of this truly unfortunate country.

The voice of Poland is not yet, however, silent, and a language still spoken by nearly ten millions probably has a future. Perhaps, after all, the Pole has more to dread from the German than from his brother Slavonians. Polish is being faster eliminated from the Grand Duchy of Posen than from Galicia and Russian Poland. It is not recognised as an official language in the former country any more than in the territories appropriated by the 'Moskals,' but the Germans alone have been guilty of the insolence and bad taste of changing the names of many Polish towns and villages, which had become historical, into such monstrosities as Bismarcksdorf, Weissenburg, and Sedan.

A recent writer in the *Bohemian Journal* has noticed the gradual receding of the Polish language from Lithuania, where we must remember that it was rather superinduced as the idiom of the upper classes and culture, and was never on the lips of the people properly so-called. The Lithuanian language, which must always possess a great fascination for the student of Comparative Philology, has not risen above the dignity of the tongue of peasants. Before this country was attached to Poland, the White-Russian was the official language, and in this the laws of the land were promulgated.

We cannot promise our readers the same feast of popular poetry among the Poles as they will find in other Slavonic countries. Legendary lays in the style of the Russian *bylini* are wholly wanting, but something of the sort undoubtedly existed in the earlier times. Just as Macaulay detected and restored to something like its original shape a lyric fragment in a Latin chronicler, so a curious reader may find from the poetical colouring of the page many a lay imbedded in the prosaic writings of Gallus, Kadlubek, and Dlugosz.

Wiszniewski, in his "History of Polish Literature," has collected several of these allusions, and Gallus, the old Latin chronicler of the twelfth century, gives a long translation of a poem written on Boleslas the Brave,* which we will not inflict upon our readers, however interesting it might prove to the antiquarian. Some old Polish songs of the 16th century are printed in Wojcicki's "Library of Ancient Writers," but the

* We chose the form more current in England, instead of the original Boleslaw. Mr. Tennyson has a fine sonnet, unfortunately suppressed, in which he has introduced the name,

most complete work is that of Oskar Kolberg, the publication of which was commenced at Warsaw, in 1857. This bids fair to be an exhaustive collection of Polish songs, proverbs, traditions, &c., and is well worth the attention of all those who busy themselves with folk-lore, the last new science, invented by Mr. Thoms. Before dismissing this subject of popular literature, allusion may be made to the "Songs of the Polish People of Upper Silesia," edited by Julius Roger, Breslau, 1863. There is also a collection of National Tales, Proverbs, &c., of Galicia, published by Baracz, and the "Aberglauben aus Masuren," by Töppen, will be found interesting.

Nor must we forget the works of Oleska, and Zegota Paul on Galician popular poetry.

For convenience, following the order of the native critics, we shall divide our notice of Polish authors into historical periods.

1. From the introduction of Christianity to the times of Casimir the Great, A.D. 1333.

During this period but little literature written in the Polish language has come down to us. The use of Latin seems to have begun very early among this people, probably introduced by the foreign ecclesiastics, with whom the country was flooded. The earliest specimens of the Polish language is the so-called Psalter of Queen Margaret, discovered in 1826, at the convent of St. Florian, near Linz, in Austria, which dates from the middle of the fourteenth century. It was edited by Dunin-Borkowski, at Vienna, in 1834. Connected with this period is the ancient Polish hymn or war-song (for it was a mixture of both), attributed to St. Adalbert of Prague, a great apostle among the Slavs. This is the *Piesu Boga Rodzica*, an address to the Virgin Mary, which is said to have been always sung by the Poles when advancing to battle. It will be found prefixed to the "Historical Songs" of Niemcewicz, and has been translated after a fashion by Bowring ("Specimens of the Polish Poets," p. 12). Rakowiecki, however, is inclined to think that this production dates from a period not earlier than the fourteenth century. But the whole history of the celebrated song has been fully handled by Nehring in the "Archiv für Slavische Philologie" (vol. i. p. 73). The oldest known text of it is in a manuscript of 1408, preserved in the Biblioteka Jagiellonska at Cracow. Janko von Melstin, the Castellan of Cracow, left a sum of money to the Church of All Saints, at Cracow, to provide for the singing of this song on certain occasions. In the deed of gift it is entitled, *Salutaris illa et plena caelestibus mysteriis cantilena, Boga Rodzicza Dziewiczca*.

In a manuscript of 1456 we have another copy of the song,

with the addition of six verses. The first printed form of it appears in 1506 in Laski's "Collection of Polish Laws." The Legend, which assigns its composition to St. Adalbert, was gradually springing up, "*Prima omnium devotissima et tanquam vates regni Poloniae cancio seu canticum Boga Rodsicza manibus et oraculo St. Adalberti scripta.*" This poem always enjoyed great popularity among the Poles. As a curious instance, we might quote the entry in the account-book of Sigismund I., preserved among the National Archives at Warsaw: *Iustico qui cantabat Bogo Rodsicza coram domino principe, ad mandatum S. M. dedi 3 grossos.* The old historian Dlugosz had long before called it *patrium carmen*. The result of Professor Nehring's investigations is that the song was probably modelled upon Bohemian hymns, and he cites some from which particular expressions have been taken. We have thought it allowable to discuss at some length the origin of this remarkable poem, which has exercised such a talismanic influence upon the Poles, and concerning which there is no account in the English language which can be relied upon. And here we may find a convenient place for mentioning the fragments of Polish manuscripts which careful antiquaries have succeeded in discovering, hidden as they were in public or private libraries, sometimes even fastened in the binding of a book, as has been found in the case of several precious Bohemian pages. Two fragments were published by Dr. Celichowski in 1875; the same scholar also printed at Posen the Latin-Polish vocabulary appended to the "*Jus Magdeburgicum*," dating from the fourteenth century. This "*Jus Magdeburgicum*," was the code of laws by which the German artisans in the large towns were governed, for we must not forget that the trade of Poland was chiefly in the hands of foreigners.* The so-called Bible of Queen Sophia, or Bible of Szaroszpatak, has been edited by Malecki. Mention of this remarkable book was made in the description of a tour by Count Teleky; this attracted the attention of Dobrovsky, the eminent Slavist, who brought it to the notice of Bandtkie, author of a "*History of Polish Literature*;" scholars, however, did not occupy themselves with it till it was again mentioned in the second edition of Dobrovsky's "*Slavin*," edited by Hanka. The Bible is imperfect, and only

* This probably explains the language of Boorde: "Theyr rayment and apparel is made after the High Doche fashion, with two wrynckles and a plyght: theyr spech is corrupt Doche." See Boorde's "*Instruction of Knowledge*," p. 169: Reprint of the Early English Text Society, edited by Mr. Furnivall, with notes full of his own quaint erudition about sixteenth century matters.

contains the early books—*e.g.*, the Pentateuch, Joshua, Ruth, Kings, &c. This Bible is said to have been written for Sophia, the fourth wife of Jagiello, about the year 1455, but the tradition is, perhaps, not very well founded. Besides the Psalter previously mentioned, the memoirs of a Janissary, and the chronicle of Chwałczewski, it forms the most valuable memorial of the Polish language, as it existed before the sixteenth century. A few others may be mentioned, the Prayer-book of Waczaw, edited by Alexander Prezdziecki; Gloger has printed the fragment of a Sermon on Marriage (Ulamek starozyt Nego kazania, o malzenstwie), a Letter of Saint Bernard has appeared by Kluczycki, notice of some Polish glosses, and verses in three Latin manuscripts by Szujski; notice by Ketrynski of a manuscript of Polish Sermons, &c. Altogether, we can say that the number of Polish manuscripts written before the sixteenth century, necessarily small, has been greatly augmented by discoveries within the last few years.

We shall allow ourselves to digress occasionally by mentioning those Polish authors who have made use of Latin, and to this period we must assign Martin Gallus, supposed by many to have been a Frenchman, in consequence of his name. This, however, has been disputed by Lelewel, who considers that it was probably merely a translation of some such name as kura into Latin. He lived between 1110 and 1135, and has left a chronicle written in Latin in a style unusually crabbed.* It is, however, a curious production and invaluable, as containing the earliest forms of the many grotesque legends with which Polish history is so thickly garnished. To this must be added the chronicles written by Matthew Cholewa and Vincent Kadlubek or Kadlubko (perhaps a corrupt version of the German Gottlieb), two bishops of Cracow, and that of Bogufal, bishop of Posen; all made use of Latin, just as was customary with our own mediæval chroniclers. In England the influence of a healthy spirit of nationality succeeded in shaking off the pedantries of monkish compilers on the one hand, and the spurious French of the school of "Stratford-atte-Bow" on the other; but the use of the classic tongues was firmly engrafted in the Polish people by the multitude of foreign ecclesiastics who inundated the country. No Robert Grossetête, as in England, appealed against them, no statutes of provisors or præmunire limited their numbers and authority. All compositions written in a foreign language are at best sickly exotics; and we may safely say that had Gibbon carried out his original

* Mickiewicz finds occasion to praise the descriptive powers of this writer.

intention of writing his work in French, he himself would have been as great a loser as the English language in being deprived of so noble a monument. It is the schoolmaster alone who can burst into raptures over those pieces of ingenious dovetailing and dexterously-fitted mosaics, which are called Latin verse and Latin prose in this country.

The unfortunate tendency of the Poles to copy other people, even at the period of their greatest prosperity, when, if ever, a national spirit asserts itself, is seen in the number of foreign words introduced into the language, terms of trade from the German, of fashion from the French, and of science from the Latin. One of the quaintest pages of the historian De Thou is that in which he describes the entry of the Polish Embassy into Paris to offer the crown to Henri de Valois. The inquisitive courtiers of the capital were as much astonished at the elegant French and Latin of the strangers as they were at the peculiar costumes, their closely-cropped heads, and the quivers of arrows at their backs. The Polish Jesuits, as we shall find afterwards, employed a very vicious style in their numerous sermons, orations, and works of devotion, and turning the language from its natural channels tried to force its constructions into analogies with the classical idioms. The encouragement of this hybridism continued from the time of Sobieski till the extinction of the monarchy, the kings of the house of Saxony, ending with the brutally coarse Augustus III., being absolutely ignorant of the language themselves and in no way encouraging it. The cultivation of Polish was never more active than when the country had been dismembered; the fugitives, who probably now found their native tongue to be their greatest bond of union, busied themselves in developing it, and the works of Lelewel, Niemcewicz, Mickiewicz, and Zaleski were produced.

2. Even the second period (from Casimir, called the Great, to Sigismund I.), A.D. 1333 to A.D. 1506, shows but little literature in the native language, although great historical events were taking place in Poland. The Government was consolidated; the University of Cracow was founded in 1347, being the oldest of all those of Northern Europe. Although shorn of all its earlier glories it still exists, and may be the ark for the preservation of the native language.

In 1386 Lithuania was joined to Poland by the marriage of its Prince Jagiello with the fair Hedwig, who consented to the union on political grounds, but did not give her "hand with her heart in it." That had previously been transferred to a scion of the house of Austria. Terrible stories are told us of the savage hirsuteness and heathen habits of this said Jagiello,

who, however, founded a great line in his new Polish kingdom, succeeding upon the old dynasty of the Piasts, and with the last of his race, Sigismund Augustus II., the glory of Poland culminated. It was to decline thenceforward steadily under the pernicious influence of the constant elections—scenes of fierce party strife and bloodshed,—the *pacta conventa*, and, most of all, the *liberum veto*. In the year 1488 the first printing press was set up in Cracow, which was long far more the capital of the kingdom than Warsaw, and contains the tombs of its greatest monarchs. The feelings of the stranger are, indeed, melancholy when he contemplates these memorials of bygone grandeur. There, among others, lie Sigismund I., who nearly lost a crown through his love for the ill-starred Barbara Radzivil; and John Casimir, who, wearied of the turmoils of state, abdicated, that he might end his days as a French monk; there are to be found interred the timid Michael Korybut, who is said to have wept when the crown had been forced upon him by his fellow-nobles; and, under a monument of black marble, bedecked with kneeling and chained Turks, that glory of Eastern Europe and *malleus Ottomanorum*—John Sobieski.

The press at which this first book was printed was that of John Haller, who was probably, as his name seems to imply, a German. The writings in Polish during this period, as previously stated, are exceedingly meagre. A few hymns—the doctrines of Wickliffe and Protestantism were gaining ground among them as among their brother Czechs—and some statutes are all that have come down. In a law of Casimir IV., in 1442, we have some curious old forms, showing how much nearer the Polish language at that time was to the Ecclesiastical Slavonic. We have no room here for philological disquisitions, and will merely remark, *en passant*, that Polish alone of the modern Slavonic tongues has preserved the nasals, which existed in the earliest known form of this family of languages. Writers in Latin abounded at this time; of these the most celebrated was Jan Dlugoz (Latinised into Longinus, and we must remember that every man turned his name into Latin then), bishop of Lemberg (Pol. Lwow), now capital of the Austrian province of Galicia. His history is very valuable for its matter, and is by no means wanting in beauties of style. Polish authors despaired of composing history in their native tongue, and at this time the same opinion appears to have been prevalent in England.

3. With the third period (from Sigismund I. to the establishment of the schools of the Jesuits at Cracow, A.D. 1505 to A.D. 1622), Polish literature in the more complete sense of the

expression begins. This may be styled the golden age of Polish history: the country seemed to have a great future before it and to bid fair to become the dominant Power of Eastern Europe. Under the first Sigismund, Poland was the land of religious toleration, and many Sectarrians found refuge in the country, including the Socini. This state of things was soon, however, to pass away under the great Jesuit reaction.* The whole Bible, translated by Leonard, was published at Cracow in 1561. The spread of education was now more and more manifest, but it was confined to the clergy and nobility, the peasantry everywhere remained in the grossest ignorance. Great progress was made in science, and Poland produced her one *universal* man of genius, Copernicus, a native of Thorn, of whom Germany has in vain attempted to rob her. The growth of the native language was still depressed by the influence of Latin, which was extensively employed both in historical compositions and poetry. The reputation of Casimir Sarbiewski (or, in the Latinised form, Sarbiovius) has been spread through almost the whole of Europe. His lines are frequently quoted by persons who have little or no idea of the nationality of their author. But of all writers in Latin it is probable that Martin Kromer (1512-1589) has gained the greatest reputation. His book "De Origine et Rebus Gestis Polonorum, Libri xxx." (the Latinity of which might be compared without disadvantage to that of Livy or Tacitus), gives a complete view of Polish history from the earliest times to the end of the reign of Sigismund I. It is needless to say that in a work written at such a time a thoroughly critical spirit cannot be expected, and accordingly all the untrustworthy, but still very amusing, legends of early Polish history are related with the same minuteness and picturesqueness with which Livy describes the death of Servius Tullius, or the warlike achievements of Coriolanus. The tendency also, in imitating classical authors, to put speeches into the mouths of the chief actors is to be deprecated. To this must be added Kromer's "Description of the Kingdom of Poland," full of curious accounts of Polish manners, &c.

In 1828 was printed at Warsaw, in the "Collection of Polish Authors" (*Zbior Pisarzow Polzskich*), a manuscript supposed to have been written about 1500, entitled "Memoirs of a Polish Janissary" (*Pamietuiki Janczara Polaka*), to which allusion has been made previously. The story is interesting, and

* See Ranke's "History of the Popes," and the "History of the Reformation in Poland," by Count Valerian Krasinski.

contains some important historical details, which have been cited by Mickiewicz in his lectures, but it cannot be compared in point of curiosity with the "Adventures of Baron Wratislaw of Mitrowic," of which a translation has appeared from the original Bohemian into English. The earliest Polish poet is Rej of Naglowic: most of his works are of a religious character, and would probably be more interesting to the antiquarian than the student of poetry. The influence of the Renaissance was fully felt even in remote Poland. Jan Kochanowski, called the Prince of Polish poets, was born in 1530. His culture was foreign, chiefly acquired in Italy and at the University of Padua. He gave his countrymen versions of Homer, Horace, and Cicero, and of the so-called Anacreontic odes, which enjoyed such a popularity for many centuries, and passed for genuine productions of the Teian Bard. His "Treny," or lamentations on the death of a favourite daughter, who died in childhood, are much praised by Mickiewicz in his Lectures on Slavonic Literature. Kochanowski still keeps his popularity among his countrymen, and many of his best lines have passed into proverbs. One of them is quoted in a letter which the uxorious Sobieski wrote to his wife, the fair Frenchwoman who changed the destinies of Europe, giving her an account of the glorious battle in which the Turks were driven from Vienna.* To Kochanowski the Poles owe their first drama, "The Return of the Grecian Ambassadors" (*Odprawa poslow Greekich*); and besides his Polish poems, he was author of some elegies and epistles in Latin, one of which is amusing as satirising the French and Henri de Valois. Most readers have heard how the cruel poltroon fled from Cracow, pursued by the nobles of his court with cries of "Serenissima Majestas, cur fugis?" and never slackened rein till he saw himself safe beyond the frontier. Kochanowski writes *Gallo crocizanti*:—

"Et tamen hanc poteris mecum requiescere noctem
Nec dubiis vitam committere, Galle, tenebris,
State viri: quæ causa fugæ? non Trinacris hæc est
Ora, nec infames funesto vespere terræ
Sarmatia est quam, Galle, fugis, fidissima tellus
Hospitibus."

As this is the last time we shall have an opportunity of speaking about the Polish authors who wrote in Latin, we will

* These letters, of which French and German translations exist, are exceedingly interesting. (See the version of Oechse, published at Heilbronn in 1827.)

not pass by unmentioned Peter Czopek, who composed a good Latin poem *in laudem cerevisiæ*, of which the following verse shall suffice as a specimen :—

“ Per te tristis hilarescit
Saltat claudus, parvus crescit,
Per te pauper mox ditescit
Subditus fit dominus.”*

The Kochanowskis were a poetical family: Andrew, the brother of John, translated the *Æneid* of Virgil, and his nephew Peter, the epics of Tasso and Ariosto. Szymonowicz (whose name has been Latinized into Simonides, 1554–1624), and Zimorowicz (1629), were two celebrated writers of Bucolics. The former is very much praised by Mickiewicz in his lectures: he considers him the second best writer of pastoral poetry after Theocritus. According to this critic, he greatly surpassed Virgil, who had no dramatic talent, which Szymonowicz has, and is also a better painter of Nature. He is certainly free from the strange jumbles of the Latin poet, who is always mixing up the mountain scenery of Arcadia with the flat plains of Mantua. The most celebrated of his poems are “The Pair of Lovers” and “The Reapers.” In the latter the refrain of the song is very elegant:

“ Słoneczko, słiczne oko, dnia oko pieknego.”
Sun, beautiful eye, eye of the fair day.

The condition, however, of the Polish peasants was too miserable to admit of their being easily made subjects for bucolic poetry, and probably the artificial pastoral as a form of literature is now completely dead throughout Europe. It departed with the eighteenth century, with the petite Trianon and the goats and milkmaids of poor Marie Antoinette. If we wish to enjoy a pastoral now, it must be of the realistic type, such as the “Northern Farmer,” of Mr. Tennyson, or the Dorsetshire poems, of Mr. Barnes. The rural productions of the ingenious gentlemen of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries must now in most cases rest undisturbed upon the shelves.

In the tenth century we find mention of plays being first acted in Poland; to celebrate the marriage of Jan Zamoycki and Katherine Radziwill, on the 12th January, 1578, the drama of Jan Kochanowski, previously alluded to, was represented, and in the year 1598, on the marriage of the bigoted Sigis-

* We feel tempted to compare the capital song on Ale, “I cannot eat but little meat,” generally attributed to Bishop Still, the author of “Gammer Gurton’s Needle,” but shown by the indefatigable Dyce, in his Notes to his edition of Skelton, to be much earlier.

mund III. with Anne of Austria, a comedy called the "Labyrinth" was played. We must follow our usual plan in these articles, and only mention typical writers. Any attempt to give a full list of Polish authors would swell these pages far beyond orthodox limits. Klonowicz, called the Sarmatian Ovid* (born 1551, died 1608), was greatly admired by his countrymen, and is still esteemed a classic. Rhetoric and pulpit-eloquence, as may easily be imagined, were greatly fostered by the Jesuits. Among the most successful cultivators of these forms of literature was Peter Skarga, the Court preacher of Sigismund III., who earned the appellation of the Polish Chrysostom. Skarga has left a host of sermons and religious works behind him, among which may be mentioned "Lives of the Saints," "Discourses for Sundays and Saints' Days," "Discourses on the Seven Sacraments," &c. For a glowing eulogy of him, see the Lectures of Mickiewicz. He expressly praises his sermons preached before the "Diet," in which he appears as a true patriot. On account of his freedom of speech, he is said to have been many times in danger of his life.

The writing of history in Latin was still actively prosecuted: in addition to Kromer we have Wapowski, Guagnini (an Italian, in the Polish form Gwagnin), and Piasecki. The history of Lithuania was written by a Jesuit, Koialowicz, and is a work which may still be consulted with pleasure and advantage, both from the elegance of the style and the many important facts preserved by the author. The ethnology of Koialowicz is no doubt frequently unsound, a fault which cannot be wondered at if we remember the time at which the book was written. The first historical work composed in Polish was the "Kronika Polska" of Bielski, reprinted at Warsaw in 1829. This was a very considerable production for these days, and England, we must remember, could not at that time boast of a national historian, unless we wish to see one in Holinshed, Hall, or Grafton.

4. As a fourth period, we will take that which elapsed from the rise of the power of the Jesuits till the final dismemberment of Poland in 1795. The influence of classical literature during the earlier part of this division was at its height, slightly modified by Italian: during the latter part of the time French was all-powerful, as throughout Europe. A turgid style prevailed in every species of composition, and reached

These parallels are made very freely, but "Qu'en dirait l'autre?" as Beranger said, when some one called him the French Horace.

its climax in the otherwise glorious days of John Sobieski. The education of the country was now entirely in the hands of the Jesuits.

Foreign elements were very rife throughout the country during the whole of this period. In the earlier part there were frequent immigrations of Scotchmen, who have left their names in the country (as in Russia). Among others we have Knox, Herbert, Fox, and Gordon, just as in Russia we have Bruces, Bests, Carmichaels, and Hamiltons.* We get curious glimpses of the everyday life of the Poles in such works as Bernard Connor's "History of Poland," published in 1698. This is a very curious book: the frontispiece represents the assembling of the Polish Diet, which appears in most cases to have been, as Carlyle somewhere terms it, a veritable Donnybrook Fair. But we have here no room for history, and must pass by the *pacta conventa* and *liberum veto*. The anarchy of Poland was destined to become a by-word among nations. A few glimpses at the mode of life of the inhabitants of the country will be curious. The following picture of a Polish feast is extracted from "An Account of Poland," by Monsieur Hauteville (1698):—

"Every person of quality has a hall in his house, which they call the banqueting hall, in which there is a place for a side-table, surrounded with balusters. This side-table, from which the cloth is never taken off till it be very dirty, is covered with abundance of plate, and over it is a place for the music, which is usually composed of violins and organs. Those who are invited to the feast bring their footmen with them, and as soon as they are seated at the table, every one of them cuts off one half of his bread, which he gives with a plate full of meat to his servant, who, after he has shared with his comrade, stands behind his master and eats it. If the master calls twice for a glass of wine or other liquor, the servant brings as much more, and drinks in the same glass with his master without rinsing it. Though there is a great deal of meat brought to the table, there is nothing carried back to the kitchen, not even of the last course; for the servants seize upon all the meat, and their ladies make each of them carry a napkin to bring away the dry sweet-meats or fruits that are brought to the table. After they have done feasting they usually go to dance."

As we finish these remarks upon Polish life and government, we are reminded that the illustrious author of the "Life of

* A very curious document was published a short time ago in the "Russian Antiquary" (*Rousskaia Starina*), being the permission of the Emperor Alexis Mikhailovich to several Scotchmen to leave his service and return to their own country. The terrible Dalziel, immortalised by Scott, was among the number.

Frederick the Great," the champion of subordination, is very severe upon the unfortunate Poles in his immortal work; but he has additional reasons for being so, seeing that the iniquitous plan for the division of Poland proceeded from his idol—the man of the iron-gauntlet and bad French rhymes. The indignation felt in England at these proceedings of Frederick is clearly shown in Lind's "Letters from Poland," an interesting contemporary work, which we have found invaluable in explaining the condition of affairs at the time.* Neither can we honestly recommend the Poles to follow the great historian's advice, and Germanise themselves as soon as possible. We should have expected that the tenacity with which Scotchmen cling to their own nationality would make them a little more tolerant of the same feeling in others.

A great deal of literature was produced during this period, but none of a high character. About the middle of last century the most prominent Polish poet was Bishop Krasicki, the friend of Frederick the Great, and a prominent member of the King's Literary Club at Sans Souci. Krasicki attempted an epic, at a period of society probably the most unfavourable for epic composition ever known, for it was, we must remember, the age of the *Henriade*, and Voltaire was the great poet of Europe, forsooth! It must be confessed that the "War of Chocim," written to celebrate a Polish victory in the earlier part of the seventeenth century, is at best but a dull affair; dull, however, as it is, it is made even more pale and colourless in the tame version of some parts given by Sir John Bowring in his "Specimens of Polish Poets." The mock heroics of Krasicki are, to say the least, amusing: poems in the style of the "Rape of the Lock" are more likely to be genuine productions in the eighteenth century than an epic. The Muse which had sung of country life and great national struggles was silent, and in her place throughout Europe was the modish muse of the towns, the muse which produced the *Art of Cookery*, the *Art of Dancing*, and the *Art of Walking the Streets*. Polish critics profess to find the writings of the sportive Bishop eminently national in tone, but into these niceties of criticism it is impossible for a foreigner to follow them. Besides his epic we have his mock-heroic poem, entitled "Myszczis," where he describes how rats ate up the Polish king Popiel, a legend found in all the early Polish chronicles, and substantially the same as the story of Bishop Halto, which forms the subject of one of Southey's most

* "Letters concerning the Present State of Poland." London, 1778.

spirited ballads. His "Monachomachia" is in six cantos, and is by some considered his masterpiece. He is said to have written it at the suggestion of Frederick the Great, who told him that he had assigned to him at Sans Souci the room which Voltaire had occupied, so that his poetical genius might be quickened! Here, perhaps, we may mention the solitary Polish poetess of eminence, Elizabeth Druzbacka (1695-1760), whose writings show a feeling for Nature, and considerable taste, at a time when verse-making of the most artificial type was prevalent throughout the country. The portrait prefixed to the Leipzig edition of her works is a very striking one, representing a handsome intellectual-looking woman, dressed in the garb of some religious order.

The whole period of the Saxon kings (1698-1763), was one of degradation, but material prosperity was not altogether wanting, and this is remembered in the well-known Polish proverb:—

" Za krola Sasa,
Jedz, pij, popuszczaj pasa,
A Za krola Sobka
Nie bylo w polu snopka."

In the time of the Saxon king,
Eat, drink, loosen the girdle,
But in the time of King Sobko (Sobieski)
There was not a sheaf of wheat in the fields.

The disturbed state of the country in the time of Sobieski can be easily explained by his frequent wars, and it must be acknowledged that the internal condition of Poland was one of complete anarchy. The excesses of a barbarous and selfish aristocracy had reached their height, and all good government was paralysed. In 1668, John Casimir, worn out with anxiety, had abdicated, and in his pathetic speech to the Diet, which is still preserved, had prophesied only too truly the evils which were to come upon the country. Sobieski, a patriot and fine courageous soldier, had neither peace in the meetings of the Diet, owing to the jealousy of the nobles, nor in the domestic circle, owing to the brawls of his "charming" Marie with her children.

So low had Polish literature sunk towards the end of the eighteenth century, that even translations of the feeble and insipid Delille—a kind of French Hayley—were in vogue among them. During this period Wegierski enjoyed a considerable reputation among his countrymen for his satirical writings. He appears to have been a kind of Polish Churchill, and, like his English parallel, to have died young. In times of great national disaster he deserves to be remem-

bered as a genuine patriot. The great laureate of the Court of Stanislaus Augustus was Trembecki (1722-1812), whose sympathies were too much with the Russian invaders of his country.

With these authors the old pseudo-classical period may be said to close. The influence of the French had reigned paramount throughout Europe for more than a century: it was now destined to fall. Schiller could soon afterwards say to Goethe, when he brought the Mahomet of Voltaire upon the German stage—

“Du, den die Kunst, die göttliche, schon lange
Mit ihrer reinen Priesterbinde ziert,
Du opferst auf zertrümmerten Altären
Der Aftermuse, die wir nicht mehr ehren?”

The Polish monarchy, after the threefold annexation by Russia, Prussia, and Austria, in 1795, was at an end. The weak and vacillating Stanislaus Poniatowski was then compelled to abdicate, and afterwards retired to St. Petersburg, where he spent the rest of his days in contempt. Many stories are told of the indignities put upon him by the capricious Paul; but some of these anecdotes have been shown to be incorrect, and that Paul, in the midst of his eccentricities, could be capable of a generous action, is shown in his conduct to Kosciuszko. A very interesting picture of the last days of Poland, and also of her last monarch, is given in “Coxe’s Travels.”

5. The fifth period must include the time from the fall of the Polish monarchy to our own day. Some of the most distinguished Polish writers have rendered this epoch of exile and proscription celebrated. Among these must be mentioned Julian Ursin Niemcewicz, born in Lithuania in 1758, died at Paris in 1841. Niemcewicz was not merely a poet. As a prototype of Körner and Petöfi he fought bravely in the wars of his country as the adjutant of Kosciuszko, and went into captivity with him after Maciejowice, the Polish Cheronea. His most celebrated production is the “Collection of Historical Songs” (*Spiewy Historyczne*), a series of lyrical compositions, in which the chief heroes of Polish history are introduced. The poet dwells with delight upon the golden age of Sigismund I., the reign of Stephen Batory and Sobieski. With the last of these, as with the fall of Polish grandeur, the collection closes; one piece only being added by way of supplement, entitled, “The Funeral of Prince Joseph Poniatowski,” who was one of Napoleon’s marshals,

and, as everybody knows, was drowned in 1813 in the waters of the Elster, after the Battle of Leipzig.

The reputation, however, of Niemcewicz, considerable at the commencement of his own period, was destined to be far surpassed by that of Mickiewicz, confessedly one of the greatest of all Slavonic poets; Pushkin alone disputes the palm with him.

Adam Mickiewicz was born at Nowogrodok, near Wilno, in Lithuania, in 1798: his father belonging to the *szlachta*, or lesser nobility, had an estate at this place. He was educated at the University of Wilno, and spent some time at St. Petersburg, where he made the acquaintance of many of the leading Russian *literati*. He afterwards obtained leave to travel, but had made up his mind never to return to Russia, and spent the rest of his life in exile, and chiefly at Paris. Of all the writings of Mickiewicz, his lyrical pieces strike us as the most beautiful, and show the language in its strength and grace. His works are but little known except to his own countrymen, and there was both pathos and irony in the expression used by a Polish lady to a foreigner, "Nous avons notre Mickiewicz à nous." As yet, no translation into English has appeared, as far as we are aware, of any production of the poet. There is a somewhat tame version in French prose by a compatriot, Christian Ostrowski, and Mickiewicz is said to have winced at the travesty of himself, which had been accomplished by an honest admirer. A very brief glance will show how inadequate the language is to express the fiery vigour of a genuine Polish lyric. His ballads are full of interest; their colouring is entirely national, treating of Lithuanian superstitions, as in *Switezianka*, or wild adventures among the Cossacks of the Ukraine, as in *Czaty* (the Ambuscade).

The influence of the romantic school was now at its height throughout Europe; the torch had been kindled by Percy, in the "Reliques," and Scott, in the "Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border." The impression produced by these collections was first shown in Germany by the writings of Bürger, and afterwards by Goethe and Schiller; and the soil of Poland was full of legend and picturesque histories, which only awaited the coming poet to put them into shape. But it took a long time to make these subjects fashionable; the battle of the Classicists and Romancists had to be fought out in Poland, as well as in other countries. The last to adopt the new creed was France. She had long dictated a poetic code to Europe, but the revolution was finally accomplished by Victor Hugo. Shakspeare ceased to be the "sauvage ivre" of Voltaire.

The sonnet was just introduced into Polish poetry by Mickiewicz, a fact alluded to with graceful words of compli-

ment by Pushkin, in one of his poems. The Crimean sonnets are exquisitely-finished compositions; the three most beautiful, in our opinion, are "The Storm," "Bakche-Sarai," and "The Grave of the Countess Potocka." The last two pieces are written on the Palace of the Khans of the Crimea, and the story of the Polish captive detained there, which forms the subject of Pushkin's fine poem "Bakchi Saraiski Fontan" (The Fountain of Bakchisarai). In "Konrad Wallenrod," a narrative poem detailing the battles of the Prussian knights with the heathen Lithuanians, Mickiewicz disguised under a thin veil a representation of the sanguinary passages of arms and burning hatred which had characterised the long feuds of the Russians and Poles. The objects of the poem, evident to some, escaped the Muscovite censors, and it was suffered to appear at St. Petersburg, where Mickiewicz was then residing.* Almost every style of metre is employed in it with equal facility; the few songs interspersed are models of consummate grace and finish. We have tried our hand at some, and shall here find room for one, as our readers might like a specimen of a Polish lyric; but our space will permit one only:—

WILIA.†

"Our Wilia, the mother of wild forest torrents,
Rolls sands of pure gold 'neath her clear azure currents;
But purer in heart is our Litva's fair daughter,
And brighter in cheek as she drinks of the water.
'Mid the sweet vales of Kovno our Wilia is flowing
Around her narcissi and tulips are growing.
But gayer than roses or tulips' false splendour,
At the Litvinka's feet are the youths that attend her.
These vales which the flowers with their soft beauty cover,
How Wilia despises for Niemen her lover!
The Litvinka‡ is dull, and she slights every maiden,
For a youth that's a stranger her heart is love-laden.
Niemen with arms of wild power, as a giant
On its cold wintry breast its young lover doth pillow,
Then hurries her onward triumphant defiant
And sinks with her lost in the sea's madden'd billow.
And thee, sweet Litvinka, the harsh fates shall sever
From thy dear native vales, the wild haunts of thy gladness,
Absorbed in the gulf of oblivion's dark river,
Thou shalt perish alone! thou shalt fade in thy sadness.

* The very motto was significant—"Dovete adunque sapere come sono due generazioni da combattere . . . bisogna essere volpe e leone"

† A river of Lithuania, which flows by Kovno and empties itself into the Niemen.

‡ The Lithuanian girl.

Madden'd stream—madden'd heart, 'tis in vain one deploreth,
 Wilia speeds and the maid with love's fierce spell is taken.
 Wilia is lost in the Niemen she adoreth,
 And the maiden laments, in the forest forsaken ! ”

A slight sketch of the plot of this remarkable poem, which is very little known in this country, may not be unwelcome to our readers. It opens with some spirited hexameters, narrating an expedition of the German knights to the banks of the Niemen. The time for the election of a new Grand Master has arrived, and the majority of the Order demand the nomination of Konrad Wallenrod, a mysterious man, who, although possessing great talent as a commander, is liable to occasional fits of melancholy. Konrad is elected, but all are disappointed in him, he spends his time indolently, and most of his expeditions result in disasters. Meanwhile he is constantly having secret meetings with a lady, who is living among the Lithuanians. After having ruined the cause of the Teutonic knights, and when he is on the point of being put to death, he takes poison and dies with the avowal that he is a Lithuanian who has disguised himself, and has sought this means of avenging his country.

The story is unknown to many of the old writers (*e.g.*, Hartknoch “Alt und Neues Preussen,” 1684, who treats of Wallenrod, among the other knights, and gives his portrait), but some of them speak of him as a man to be abhorred; one says, “Er starb in Raserey ohne letzte Oehlung, ohne Priostersegen.” As a Lithuanian by birth, Mickiewicz naturally turned to the legends of his own country, and in the beautiful poem of “Grazyna” we have another piece on the wars between the knights and their heathen adversaries. This heroine, without the knowledge of her husband, goes disguised in armour and rescues him when on the point of being slain by the German knights. She herself, however, is mortally wounded, and her body is brought to the Castle. Preparations are made for burning the remains, and at the same time, according to the terrible custom prevailing among the Lithuanians, the captive chief of the Teutonic knights is brought to be consumed to ashes, still alive on horseback, with all his arms, having been bound with three cords to a tree.* The Prince discovers that the mysterious stranger is his own wife, and leaps into the flames.

“Rzekł, biezy na stos, up ada na Zwokach,
 Ginie w plomieniach; i dymu oblokach.”

He spoke, flew to the pyre, fell on the remains,
 And perished in the flames and cloud of smoke.

* Mickiewicz, in his notes, quotes a curious passage from the Latin chronicler, Strykowski, who speaks of a victory gained by the Lithuanians

The poem of "Grazyna" is said by Ostrowski to have inspired the brave Emilia Plater, who was the heroine of the Revolution of 1830, and after having fought in the ranks of the insurgents, found a grave in the forests of Lithuania.

One of the longest and most celebrated pieces of Mickiewicz is his "Pan Tadeusz," by many considered to be his *chef d'œuvre*, written in the year 1834. A curious picture is here given of Lithuania on the eve of Napoleon's great expedition to Russia in 1812. The poem is full of local colouring, and is worth hundreds of the productions of the Polish poets, while under the influence of the so-called classical school and the rhetorical teaching of the Jesuits. To Mickiewicz it was a labour of love to describe the habits and scenes of his native country, Lithuania, which he was never to revisit. The life of the author was, on the whole, singularly unhappy. For some time he occupied the chair of Slavonic Philosophy in the "Collège de France," but ultimately resigned, after having brought ridicule upon himself by his so-called Messianism. He seems to have dreamed that the regenerator of Europe would be found in the Emperor Napoleon III., and one of his last compositions is said to have been an ode in his honour. Some curious sketches of the latter part of the life of Mickiewicz will be found in Herzen's "Memoirs," which appeared at intervals in Russian in the *Polar Star* (*Poliarnaja Zvezda*) published in London. In 1855, he died suddenly at Constantinople, whither he had been sent to assist in raising a Polish legion, to take service against the Russians during the Crimean war. We have already spoken of the tablet which was lately erected in Rome to the memory of Mickiewicz, on which occasion a very eloquent tribute to his genius and patriotism was paid by Count Mamiani.

Since the death of the great poet, the Romantic school of which he may be said to have been almost the founder, has been further developed by the so-called Ukraine poets, especially Zaleski, Malczewski, Goszczynski, Padura, and Slowacki.

and Samogitians over the knights in 1315, when Gerard Rudda the starosta of the province of Sanbia was burnt alive on horseback clad in armour. The custom of burning the dead prevailed among the Lithuanians till the introduction of Christianity. That it was a usage among the ancient Slavonians we know from Ivan Fozlan. We may remind our readers, while speaking of the Lithuanian wars, that Henry IV. of England, before he came to the throne, fought on the side of the Teutonic knights. These battles were much talked of in England during the time, no doubt, and will explain the adventures of Chaucer's knight:—

"In Lettow had he reised, and in Ruse.
He had travelled in Lithuania and Russia."

The first is the writer of a poem of great elegance, "The Spirit of the Steppe" (*Duch od Stepu*). The inspiration is altogether from the Ukraine, one of the most picturesque parts of Russia, which has been praised in such enthusiastic terms by Gogol:—

"Me also has my mother, the Ukraine,
Me her son
Cradled in song on her bosom,
The enchantress."*

The "Marya" of Malczewski is very much admired by the Poles, and has gone through many editions. It is a narrative poem in the style of Byron, like the "Fountain of Bakchisarai," and the "Prisoner of the Caucasus," of Pushkin. The opening is spirited, but we must not expect our readers to form an idea of a building from a solitary brick:—

"Hey! Kossak on thy steed so fleet, say whither art thou speeding,
Wilt thou hunt the hare thou see'st that o'er the steppe is bounding,
Wilt thou in the play of thought sport awhile with freedom."

The conclusion is pathetic, and the harmony of the Polish verses—for these Slavonic languages are wonderfully onomatopœic—is in strict accordance with the thought.

"It is silent where the three graves show their sad and lonely hillocks,
It is gloomy now and desert amid the stormy Ukraine."

A poem of the same kind is the "Tower of Kaniow" (*Zamek Kaniowski*), by Goszczynski.

Padura has won fame as a poet, both in Polish and Ruthenish, or Red-Russian. His songs have earned a great reputation among his own countrymen. Of the Red-Russian we shall take occasion to say a few words towards the close of our article. Slowacki, who died at Paris in 1849, is one of the most admired of the modern Polish poets. A certain imitation of Byron may be perceived in his writings, but we must remember that the Englishman had much to do with the formation of the modern Romantic School throughout Europe, and although more recent poets have effaced his memory in England, his influence upon the Continent is still all-powerful. The fire and vigour shown in his best pieces, and his freedom from our sectarianism and other insularities, have made him

"I mnie matka—Ukraina,
I mnie matka swego syna,
Upowila w piesz u lona,
Czarodziejka."

the most known of English poets of this century out of his own country, and he will probably remain so in spite of the praiseworthy attempts of some enthusiasts to spread the influence of Wordsworth beyond the channel. Byron is now decidedly unfashionable in England, amid the universal culture of mediævalism, but he could not have been a mean poet who kindled such admiration in Goethe, and whose genius inspired such poets as Alfred de Musset, Pushkin, Lermontov, and Mickiewicz.

Many of the productions of Constantine Gaszynski are of considerable merit, especially his sonnets, which he has modelled upon those of Mickiewicz. On the whole the sonnet seems a much greater success in Polish than in Russian—Pushkin's are few, and not very good. Another poet of considerable eminence is Lenartowicz, who, we believe, is still living, and resides at Florence. His poem on the "Nightingale" (Slowik) is a proof of the extraordinary power of the Polish language in onomatopœia. It is a veritable philological curiosity. Hyacinth Przybylski was an indefatigable author and translator—a kind of Polish Zhukovski. Among his productions are versions of Ovid's "Tristia," the *Lusiad* of Camoens, Milton's "Paradise Lost," and a translation into hexameters of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. In a previous article in this Review we alluded to the Russian translation of the "*Iliad*" by Guedich. The Slavonic races have completely nationalized the hexameter, which has never been successful in our language, probably owing to its want of spondees. Sigismund Krasinski wrote the "Undivine Comedy" (*Nieboska Komedja*), and a very remarkable piece entitled "Resurrectoris." We will conclude our notice of Polish poets by mentioning Wladyslaw (Ladislaus) Syrokonla, who wrote under the *nom de plume* of Kondratowicz, and died in 1862. His poem, "The Daughter of the Piasts" (*Cora Piastow*) is very celebrated among his countrymen. Some of his pieces show a tender feeling towards the unfortunate peasants in these Slavonic countries, reminding us of the lyrics of the Russians Nikitin and Nekrasov.

Polish prose has perhaps not been so successfully cultivated in modern times as poetry. It would, however, be unpardonable to omit the name of Lelewel, who occupies a very high place as a historian. We have already glanced at the writers on Polish history in Latin; of these there are a goodly number, and they must be consulted by all those who wish to examine the *origines* of the country. Before the time of Lelewel the most popular history of Poland was that by Waga, which is at best a mere compilation. Lelewel was originally a professor at Wilno, and while there Mickiewicz addressed a beautiful

ode to him, but becoming involved in the political troubles of the year 1830, he was compelled to spend the rest of his days in exile, chiefly in Paris and Brussels. His "History of Poland," of which there is a good translation into French, is divided into the following parts, the titles of which are significant: Poland conquering, Poland divided, Poland flourishing, and Poland in its decadence. By these headings the tale of the unhappy country is but too accurately told. Valuable chapters are added on the laws and social development of the nation, and the growth of the literature. Besides this history of Poland, he published a work on the Lithuanians, "A Glance at the Antiquity of the Lithuanian People:" Wilno, 1808. His other historical works on general subjects will probably not be so welcome to the reader who is acquainted with the extensive literatures of Western Europe. Lelewel for some time occupied the chair of Modern History at the University of Brussels, afterwards worthily filled by the learned Professor Altneyer, a personal friend of the Polish writer.* Lelewel was compelled, however, to resign his post for political reasons, and passed many years of his life in great poverty. He died at Paris, about fifteen years ago. A very valuable work is the "Monumenta Poloniæ Historica," edited at Lemberg by Bielowski, of which two volumes have appeared. Here we have reprints of most of the early chroniclers. Bielowski died a year or so ago. The latest history of Poland is that by Röpell and Caro.

Learned works on the subjects of the Lithuanians have also appeared by Narbutt, "Memorials of Lithuanian History:" Wilno, 1840, and also by Kraszewski in his "Litwa," where the mythology, traditions, and customs of the Lithuanians are treated of at considerable length. The book, however, is not altogether critical; but we must remember that at the time when it was written linguistic studies did not enjoy the same scientific method which they do now. Kraszewski has also earned a reputation as a poet. We have no space here for a disquisition upon the Lithuanian language, which is connected very closely with the old Slavonic. Its importance has been fully discussed by Schleicher, Kurschat, and Leskien. The Dainos or national songs, which have but little poetical merit, have been edited by Rhesa, and in a subsequent edition by Nesselmann. The last-named also published anew "The

* From this gentleman we heard interesting details of the last days of the historian Lelewel. He preserved many reliques of the Polish Rebellion of 1830; some of the revolutionary flags and important official documents. We do not know what has become of these.

Seasons" of Donaleitis (or Donalitijs), composed in hexameters about the middle of last century. The great importance of the Lithuanian language to all students of Comparative Philology will not be denied. A list of all the words which have been handed down from the old Prussiau language has been published by Nesselmann in his work "*Thesaurus Linguae Prussiae*," but it has been objected to as uncritical. The only fragments of this language which have been preserved are contained in a translation of Luther's Catechism, and a few vocabularies. The Lettish language (of which there is an excellent grammar by Bielenstein) exhibits both in its phonology and inflexions a later form than the Lithuanian. Its literature is exceeding meagre, consisting mostly of popular songs. We have previously alluded to the union of Poland and Lithuania by the marriage of the Princess Hedvig with Jagiello: the alliance of the countries was further strengthened by the union of Lublin, 1568. The Lithuanians never became completely Polonized: their country, however, gave some of the best citizens to the State, among others Kosciuszko, Mickiewicz, and Lelewel. At the present time the Russians have succeeded in almost entirely effacing the Polish language from Lithuania. It is now rarely heard either at Wilno or Kowno.* Works upon Polish law are not wanting. Rakowicki edited the old Russian Code (*Rousskaia Pravda*) with a critico-historical introduction; but the most complete work on Slavonic jurisprudence is that by Professor Maciejowski. Among the early Slavs we find trial by ordeal and trial by wager of battle in full vigour.

The philology of the Polish language has latterly been treated in a thoroughly scientific manner in the works of A. Malecki and Fr. Malinowski. The grammars written by these two learned Poles have thrown the earlier ones completely into the shade. The old forms of the language and its dialectology have been fully investigated by Baudoin de Courtenay and Semenowitsch. The great lexicon by Linde is a work of extraordinary merit. Two editions have appeared in six volumes quarto. Not only does it give a complete history of each Polish word, but comparisons are also inserted with all

* We get some curious stories about the Lithuanians in Herberstein's quaint book, "*De Rebus Muscoviticis*." Although partially converted to Christianity, they continued some of their heathen customs till a comparatively late period, among others that of the worship of the lizard. Many amusing details will be found in the "*Lites ac Res gestae inter Polonos Ordinemque Cruciferorum*," of which three volumes (4to) were published at Posen in 1855-56.

the leading Slavonic languages. The author, Samuel Gottlieb Linde (1771-1847), was a native of Thorn, and of Swedish descent. We must not forget the long connexion which existed between Poland and Sweden, especially close during the reign of Sigismund III., who removed the capital from Cracow to Warsaw that he might be nearer to his Swedish dominions.

The four centres of Polish literature, which, in spite of the attempts which have been made to denationalise the country, is fairly active, are Cracow, Posen, Lemberg, and Warsaw. Of these, Cracow appears the most fertile. A few years ago, a cheap edition of the leading Polish classics, admirably adapted for dissemination among the people, was published there under the title of "Biblioteka Polska." On the whole, Cracow shows a great deal of vitality, and is an interesting city. Created a Free State in 1815, it was by some unaccountable neglect of the other European Powers suffered to be annexed by Austria in 1846. Some good Polish works have been issued at Posen, but it is becoming terribly Germanised, and no part of the original kingdom of Poland has undergone so much change as this. At Lemberg, the capital of Austrian Galicia, there is an active Polish press. Here appeared the "Monumenta Poloniæ Historica" of Bielowski, previously alluded to; but the Polish language has to struggle with the Red-Russian or Ruthenian, a language or dialect which for all practical purposes is the same as the Southern or Little Russian. Indeed, Koulisch, in his "Essays on Southern Russia," identifies them. There is a nascent literature in this language which was begun by Kotliarevski, in his travestie of the "Æneid," published in 1798, and has been still further developed in the writings of Taras Shevchenko, the peasant poet, so celebrated in Southern Russia, and the novelist, Madame Eugénie Markevich, who writes under the pseudonym of Marko Vovchok. The well-known author, Sacher Masoch, is also a native of Galicia. We may perhaps turn to the subject of this South-Russian literature in a subsequent article.

Affairs have been somewhat melancholy at Warsaw since the last insurrection: the University has become entirely Russianised, and its proceedings are published in Russian, but Polish works of great merit still occasionally issue from the press, among others the Biblioteka Warszawska.

The Polish language is still spoken by 9,500,000 persons, the distribution being as follows:—

In Russia	4,640,000.
In Austria	2,444,200.
In Prussia	2,405,800.
In Turkey	10,000.*

While Poland was an independent kingdom, we shall see that the Polish nationality had to struggle with many foreign elements, a fact which perhaps helps to explain its easy disintegration. Thus, the language of the greater part of Lithuania was not Polish, and there seems to have been always much jealousy between the two divisions of the country; the Cossacks and Ruthenians spoke a language of their own, and German, as previously mentioned, was prevalent in the large towns.

The Cossacks were at an earlier period divided into two great branches, those of the Don, and those of the Dnieper. The former were incorporated with Russia as early as the days of Ivan the Terrible; the latter, long nominally subject to the Poles, broke out into rebellion under Bogdan Khmelnitzki about the middle of the seventeenth century, who, finding that he could not make head against the Polish generals, went over with all his followers to Alexis Mikhailovich, the father of Peter the Great. The Western Cossacks established themselves on some islands of the Dnieper, and formed a kind of Military Republic called a Sech. Their numbers were recruited from renegade Poles, Little Russians and Tatars, and their subjection to Poland was little more than nominal. The Poles invariably treated them with contempt, and severely punished their rebellions.

A curious illustration of the estimation in which they were held is furnished by Legnich, "*Jus Publicum Regni Poloni;*" after telling us that the soldiers had wished to have a vote in the elections of the kings, but had been repulsed, he adds further, † "*Cosaci qui in iisdem a. 1632 comitiis, idem quod militis expe-
tebant non sine indignatione audiebantur, quod ex infimâ plebe
colluvies nobilibus æquari vellet. Hoc illis dato responso, quod
neque ad electionem, neque ad ulla publica consilia pertine-
rent, sed esse Senatorum et nobilitatis de Republicâ agere.*" The Cossacks were treated with great severity by Peter the Great, especially after their Hetman Mazepa had joined Charles XII. in his invasion of Russia. The Hetmanship was abolished by Catherine II.

* We take our figures from the latest authorities as given in the *Revue Slave*. Warsaw, 1878. Vol. i. p. 78.

† Vol. i. p. 98.

But to return to Poland: all things in it were, as the ancients said, "præcipitia ad exitium:" the country had no natural frontiers, and was surrounded on all sides by powerful enemies, the two most deadly of whom were the Russians, who were anxious to extend themselves towards the West, and the Prussians, who were covetous of the northern coast-line, and especially of the port of Danzig. A true middle-class did not exist, the burgher element being chiefly recruited from foreigners; there was nothing but a selfish and turbulent aristocracy of ecclesiastics and palatines, possessed of despotic power in their own territories, and at an infinite distance below them a miserable body of serfs, who had no right of appeal against the tyranny of their masters.

Hauteville's account of 1698 was substantially true till the dissolution of the kingdom.* "To settle a peasant upon a piece of land or in a village, the lord causes a cottage of wood to be built for him, and gives him two little horses, one cow, some hens, geese, and rye, to subsist upon for a year. In the meantime he appoints a certain piece of ground in the village, which the peasant is obliged to till for his landlord, and upon which he is to maintain himself for the future; for all the goods of the village belong to the lord. *The settling of a peasant costs a gentleman nothing but the price which he pays for him*; because the other peasants of the village build the house, and furnish the cattle, poultry, and all that he gives to his new subject, who, with his wife and children, is obliged to work four days in the week for his master, and to spend the other two days in tilling the ground which is given him for his subsistence." They were constantly exposed to the personal violence of their masters, and had, as we are assured in the accounts of those who visited the country during the time of its independence, a hopeless and down-trodden look. Meanwhile, in the palaces of their masters, the wildest luxury reigned, and half-Asiatic barbarism was but thinly veneered by the French politeness which the fashionable Pole acquired in his travels.

This account of the miserable state of the Polish peasantry is fully corroborated by the interesting travels of Archdeacon Coxe. During the eighteenth century the Polish serfs had sunk to the lowest depths of debasement. They knew nothing of the State or their Governors, and it was a matter of indifference to them whether their masters obeyed the head of a Polish Republic, a Russian Empress, or a German King.†

* P. 171.

† Von Sybel's "French Revolution" (English Translation), vol. ii. p. 407.

How great was the political corruption of the aristocracy we can see by such works as "The Fall of Poland," by Soloviov, the Russian historian. The attempt made by a few patriots to stem the tide was useless, and in 1795, as all the world knows, Poland had ceased to exist as an independent country.

ART. V.—OUR SOUTH AFRICAN COLONIES.

1. *Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute*, 1876, 1877, 1878, 1879.
2. *My Command in South Africa*, 1874-1878. By GENERAL SIR ARTHUR THURLOW CUNYNGHAME, G.C.B.
3. *Handbooks of South Africa and the Transvaal*. S. W. Silver & Co.

THE terrible disaster in Zululand which has lately befallen our usually victorious troops, has roused the whole nation to desire to know more of a people and a country perhaps hitherto too slightly regarded. We are so apt to consider a war with barbarous tribes on the frontiers of our remote colonies as a matter of small moment, and to look upon victory as certain, that the news of the massacre of eight hundred of our gallant troops (including forty-nine officers and the men belonging to the Natal forces) by a horde of naked savages, took every one by surprise, and created more alarm than the slaughter of thousands would have caused in open battle against a civilised foe. As a consequence we may fairly assume that thousands have turned to the map of Africa, with a desire to understand the position of the various British colonies and the independent and semi-independent native states intermingled with them, which have hitherto been to them names only, and have read, with an interest altogether new, the history of the savage despot who is causing us so much uneasiness and annoyance, although mainly indebted to us for the power he has so grievously misused. Yet multitudes will still talk vaguely of "The War at the Cape," and look upon Zulus, Hottentots, Kaffirs, Bushmen, Fingoes, and other names so frequently mentioned, as denoting merely different tribes of those black sons of Ham, to whom Africa has been given as an

inheritance, regarding probably our occupation of territory therein as an unjustifiable aggression, deserving of the chastisement we have received.

This would seem, therefore, a fitting time to draw the attention of the public more closely to these valuable possessions of the British Crown, to point out their political and commercial importance, to show as succinctly as possible the various steps by which we have become possessed of the different territories now forming the South African Colonies; to give a sketch of the different races and tribes forming the aboriginal population and our mode of dealing with them, and to cast a glance at the future, which without prophetic knowledge may be predicted as in store for lands so richly endowed by Nature.

By universal consent, Great Britain is looked upon as likely to become the dominant Power over the whole of the vast African Continent; to her has been assigned the task of opening up to commerce and civilisation that which has been not inaptly named "The Dark Continent." It is probable that the prominence assumed by this country in the matter of the abolition of the slave trade, which has always had its head-quarters in Africa, gave the first impetus to that movement which has increased so rapidly of late, having for its object the civilisation of the black races, and the reclamation of vast tracts long believed to be hopelessly barren. For this purpose, British gold and British daring have been unsparingly taxed; we have waged successful wars in Abyssinia on the East, and Ashantee on the West coast. Livingstone, Cameron, and Stanley have risked their lives in exploring countries as little known as the polar regions, and it has been gravely proposed to flood the great Sahara so as to make of it a great inland salt lake, as it probably has been ere now in the world's history, and thus to carry fertilization and commerce into the most sterile tract of the whole continent; whilst railways and steamboats are projected to and upon Lake Nyassa to convey the produce of the interior to the coast. Already the scene of Livingstone's labours bids fair to become a flourishing colony, whilst rumours of the cession of Delagoa Bay by the Portuguese have also been rife. A glance on the map will show, that our possessions on the east, west, and south of the continent are increasing rapidly, and if to these we add our recently acquired interest in the Suez Canal, the vast region of the Transvaal, the unhealthy but important station of Cape Coast Castle, and the coast-line from the Orange River to Walwich Bay, we shall see that our interests in Africa are already enormous, whilst the value of the various stations on the coast to us as a naval Power can hardly be over-estimated.

It might indeed seem as though the value of the Cape, once the only route to India, had decreased since the opening of the overland route, and later of the Suez Canal, has shortened so greatly the distance between the British islands and the Indian Empire, but it has been ably pointed out that should there arise at any time a European war, whereby the passage of the Mediterranean should become difficult or dangerous to merchantmen, the Cape would again become the only route available; and in the still further possible though improbable event of our loss of Gibraltar by conquest or by cession, through the suicidal policy of some future economic, unpatriotic Government, and the consequent closing to us of the gates of the Mediterranean, it would become our chief rallying point and naval station, whence our fleets might sally forth to sweep the foe from the two oceans, and regain the proud position for a moment lost. That it should, therefore, ever be allowed to pass into adverse hands is impossible, unless we are content to yield at once our ancient fame and our very existence as a naval and commercial Power.

When we come to the question of the commercial value of any of our colonies, whether they are worth keeping as regards their monetary value to the mother-country, it may safely be assumed that a new colony can seldom make both ends meet, but in proportion as it becomes settled it begins to pay as a speculation. The expenses of government and of defence may be for a time a drain upon the Imperial exchequer, but unless, as in the present case, wars should arise with powerful neighbours, the balance between profit and loss is soon struck, and the colony not only becomes self-supporting, but opens up a new field for the commerce of the old country, supplying it in return with articles of necessity or luxury. The growth of most of our colonies is truly surprising, and that of Cape Colony is no exception to the rule. Lieutenant-General Bisset, C.B., in a Paper upon South Africa, read before the Royal Colonial Institute in 1876, says:—

“When I tell you that the revenue of the Cape in 1836 was only 180,000*l.*, that in 1873 it had risen to 1,280,000*l.*, and will this year exceed 2,000,000*l.*, I am sure I need not add how prosperous that colony is at the present moment. The exports were, in 1856, 1,300,000*l.*; in 1873, 4,000,000*l.*; in 1874, 4,500,000*l.*; and will this year exceed 5,000,000*l.*”

The imports for 1874 are given in “*Silver’s Handbook to South Africa*” as 5,558,215*l.*, being an increase of 428,150*l.* in the course of one year, the exports having likewise increased 377,528*l.* in the same period. The exports include aloes, argol, copper ore, corn, cotton, ostrich feathers, cured fish, dried fruit,

angora hair, ox hides, horns, horses, ivory, diamonds, skins, brandy, wine; and last, but most important, wool, the value of which, exported in the year above named, 1874, was 2,878,571*l.* The imports of course take in almost all manufactured goods such as are unattainable in a new country. Agricultural implements, ale and beer, wearing apparel, coffee, corn, cotton goods, gunpowder, guns, hardware, haberdashery, iron, leather manufactures, linen goods, rice, saddlery and harness, silk manufactures, spirits, sugar, tea, tobacco, wine, wood, woollen stuffs, &c. And this trade is carried on by vessels numbered at 568 entered outwards, and 535 entered inwards in 1874, with a tonnage respectively of 326,909 for the first, and 308,927 for the last named, the coasting trade representing 890 vessels with a tonnage of 364,946 for exports and 891 vessels with a tonnage of 177,563 for imports in the same year,* the revenue during the same period being 1,538,551*l.*, and the expenditure 1,357,454*l.*† The latest returns show an increase in the value of exports for the Michaelmas quarter of last year from 927,131*l.* in 1877 to 992,562*l.*, and this notwithstanding the severe drought which entirely prevented the export of corn, meal, wine, and fruits; the imports for the same quarter stand at 1,707,810*l.*, as against 1,535,488*l.* for the same period of 1877,‡ and a still further increase of 304,151*l.* in imports, and 54,631*l.* in export for the quarter ending Dec. 31st, 1878.§

If we take the younger colony of Natal, for the defence of which we are now called upon to expend so much in blood and treasure, and which doubtless many of the economic school will declare to be not worth the outlay, we find the same constant increase in the value of exports and imports, the former having risen from 203,000*l.* in 1866 to 835,643*l.* in 1875, and the latter from 263,000*l.* to 1,268,838*l.* in the same period; but Natal includes among its exports the products of a tropical clime, such as sugar, coffee, cotton, arrowroot, as well as gold, ivory and diamonds; but in both colonies the export which has most largely increased in value is that of ostrich feathers, which in Natal, from 2510*l.* in 1862, had risen in ten years to 9745*l.* in 1872, and has since then largely increased,|| for ostrich farming has now become a staple industry of South Africa.

* See Silver's "Handbook to South Africa," p. 298-300.

† "Colonies and India," December 21st, 1878.

‡ "South Africa and her Colonies. Proceedings of Royal Colonial Institute, 1876."

§ *Port Elizabeth Telegraph*, Jan. 31st, 1879.

|| For the quarter ending Dec. 31st last, this export amounted to 142,161*l.* in the Cape Colony.

"Taking the year 1874" [says General Bisset in the Paper already quoted], "which was not considered a favourable one, the English farmers in Natal raised 100,000 muids of maize, over 10,000 tons of sugar, 1,200,000 lbs. of coffee, and 70,000 lbs. tobacco; whilst the natives produced 366,557 muids of maize, 140,000 of millet, 41,000 of sweet potatoes, 1800 cwt. of coffee, and 527 tons of sugar; the natives cultivating in all 141,000 acres of land. The average yield of sugar, taking the whole country, is $1\frac{1}{4}$ tons per acre. The 'stock' in the colony in 1874 was somewhat as follows:—In possession of Europeans—14,000 horses, 126,000 cattle, 250,000 sheep, 32,000 angora goats, 25,000 common goats; while the natives possessed 10,000 horses, 376,000 cattle [about one to each soul], 50,000 sheep, 173,000 goats, and 3000 pigs. The shipping entered for Natal during that year was 173 vessels, with a tonnage of 64,156 tons, 130 of the ships being English. The value of exports for the year was 770,000*l.* With regard to the pasture lands, as you see by the stock, it is suited for every description of useful animals, the uplands being best suited for wool, sheep, and other small stock; and I have myself no doubt that a belt of country between the coast and up country will yet be a great cotton-producing tract. On the coast the vegetation is so great that cotton produces 'bolls' all the year round, and is therefore not a paying crop, owing to the continued labour of picking." In truth, General Bisset regards Natal as the "gem of South Africa," and says, "it only requires railroads and means of transport to make it one of the most productive export countries in the world."

The remainder of the South African colonies, with the exception of the Transvaal, are smaller and less important than Cape Colony and Natal; all show more or less of progress and elasticity, but in all probability the Transvaal is destined at no distant date to excel them all, not only on account of its mineral wealth, which would appear to be enormous, including vast gold-fields, iron, copper, coal, cobalt, silver, tin, and lead; but also because it is so admirably adapted for agricultural purposes, both as regards the cultivation of grain and the rearing of stock, since it is generally well watered or capable of irrigation, well wooded in parts, containing much hill and upland, not only healthy for Europeans, but extremely fertile, producing abundance of corn, fruit and vegetables, whilst grass is plentiful enough to sustain large flocks and herds. Time and money, however, will be needed before the vast resources of this great territory can be developed and rendered commercially valuable, for roads and railways cannot be constructed in a day; and it has no port, the nearest, Delagoa Bay, being still in possession of the Portuguese.

It is impossible to look at a map of South Africa without feeling convinced that it must eventually become a homogeneous dominion or confederation of states, extending at least from the Limpopo River on the east, to the mouth of the Orange River,

the present boundary of the Cape Colony on the west. This great group of states consists at present of Cape Colony, embracing the extreme south and western portion, having on the north, beyond the Orange River, Griqualand West with its diamond fields, and the Orange Free State; and on the east Basutoland, East Griqualand, and Kaffraria, dividing it from Natal, all formerly under native chiefs, but which have gradually become absorbed, and may now be considered as under British rule; then comes Natal, stretching from the sea to the Transvaal on the north, and bounded on the east by Zululand, from which it is divided by the Tugela River, the scene of the recent disaster, and having, on the north-west, the Orange Free State. The Transvaal, situated to the north of the Orange Free State and Natal, extends northwards to the Limpopo River, but is cut off from the south-eastern coast by that large tract of land occupied by the Zulus, Amazwazis, and other independent tribes, at the best of times unquiet neighbours, but lately a source of menace and danger, not to the Transvaal only, but to Natal.

The history of these several states is curious and interesting, full of tragic and heroic episodes, wherein various races have borne a part; the white settlers acting sometimes wisely, sometimes foolishly, with alternations of forbearance and cruelty towards the natives, leading to wars and bloodshed, ending invariably in conquest and annexation of territory, but not, as in some other colonies, to the extermination of the aborigines; although even here, *two* of the weakest of the races with which we have come in contact have well-nigh perished, but the Kaffir tribes are too numerous and vigorous to be thus exterminated; they thrive and multiply, whether under the mild rule of the white man, or the savage despotism of their native chiefs,* and could they be brought under the discipline of civilised life, would serve to enrich the land by their labour, and render it one of the most productive countries in the world.

In all the various extensions of territory in South Africa, the Dutch have been our pioneers. We found them established in Cape Colony, which they had occupied for one hundred and fifty years, when called in to quell an insurrection there in 1795, at which date the first English governor was appointed, although the British Government did not take formal possession of the colony till 1806, and it was not formally ceded by the Dutch Government until the Treaty of Paris in 1815. It may there-

* Mr. Robinson says: "Thirty years ago there were not more than 70,000 Kaffirs in Natal. In the space of one generation they have quadrupled. Refugees have flocked from all quarters into the peaceable British Colony."—*Glimpses of Natal: "Proceedings Royal Colonial Institute," 1878.*

fore be supposed that a large Dutch element is still to be found in the colony, even although the old Republican spirit has ever impelled the early Dutch settlers and their descendants to move themselves from the jurisdiction of that which they regard as an alien, and in some cases an usurping, Power. And it is to this constant desire for independence that must be ascribed the great extension of European dominion in South Africa. Given over by their own Government to British rule, a portion of the Dutch Boers were sure to see wrong and robbery in every act of the new authorities. To rebel was useless, but they were free to leave that which they could no longer look upon as a home, and to find for themselves new tracts where they might follow their own will uncontrolled by British law. The first great migration took place in 1833, in consequence of the forced emancipation of slaves. The number of slaves at that time in Cape Colony was 35,745, which were valued at 3,000,000*l.*, as compensation for which the British Government offered 1,200,000*l.* The slave owners being obliged to accept this, and to give up entirely the valuable property they had so long held, naturally looked upon the new law with extreme disfavour, as in truth sheer robbery, and the case was made worse by the money thus paid to them being in Treasury Bonds which they were unable readily to convert into cash, and the value of which designing agents purposely depreciated in order to buy them up at half their real value. The Boers, therefore, feeling that it was in vain to look for justice from their new masters, forsook their homes in thousands, and for three or four years wandered about beyond the British frontier seeking for suitable lauds upon which to form a new settlement and establish for themselves a Republic.

Their first resting-place was Natal. Here, however, the arm of the British Government was again stretched out to forbid the realisation of their hopes; Sir George Napier, then governor of Cape Colony, claimed them as still British subjects, and despatched British troops to Natal to control their movements, and particularly to watch over their treatment of the natives. The Boers resisted the small force of 300 or 400 men sent against them, but reinforcements arriving by sea when this force was reduced to the last extremity, they were forced to submit, and Natal was proclaimed British territory in 1843. Some of the emigrants, tired of wandering, settled down quietly under the British yoke, but many made a fresh trek, this time to the Transvaal, where, after various disputes and attempts at rebellion, they were at length, in 1852, permitted to establish the Republic they had so long desired, a Republic destined to be of short duration, since in 1876 the British Government was called in to protect them from foes with whom they were unable to

cope, and the whole of the vast territory they had seized and partially reclaimed was yielded reluctantly to the very Power to escape from which they had braved so many perils and shed so much of their best blood. The story of this "Great Trek," as it has been called, is a story perhaps unequalled in the world's history of a band of men voluntarily leaving the lands they had made fertile by their labour, the homes which were theirs by every right, with all the comforts and advantages of civilised life,* in order to make for themselves a new home in the howling wilderness, in the midst of beasts of prey and vast hordes of powerful and vindictive natives threatening them with total annihilation; repeating this singular act of renunciation again and again, subjecting themselves to destruction and their wives and little children to unheard-of hardships and perils, for the sake of an ideal liberty to be lost as soon as found.

Their short-lived successes are indeed astonishing when we consider the vast amount of territory they brought under nominal control, the tremendous odds against which they fought unaided, and the terrible disasters they endured and retrieved, for these men did not go forth like Jacob to deprive a brother of his birthright by plausible words and conciliatory acts, but with the avowed design of wresting lands from powerful and warlike tribes, and of making slaves of those who opposed them, and in pursuance of this design they performed deeds of heroic daring almost incredible; undismayed by defeats and massacres which would seem enough to have daunted the bravest—for it was against the terrible Zulus, the very people who have so recently annihilated a British regiment armed with the Martini-Henry rifle, that Pretorius led a band of 600 men, and boldly crossing the Tugela avenged the treacherous massacre of many of his people by the rout and slaughter of 3000 of the tribe of the great chief Dingaan, and this with the sword alone; for ammunition failing, Pretorius and his band rushed from behind the shelter of their waggons and utterly defeated the enemy with the loss of only four men. The massacre thus avenged had indeed been terrible, for Dingaan had received in an apparently friendly manner Retief, one of the Dutch leaders, who, with about 70 men, had gone to restore some cattle they had recaptured from a hostile tribe at war with Dingaan, and to receive from the Zulu king the reward promised—a grant of land in Natal—when, whilst feasting without suspicion in the king's kraal, the treacherous savage set his warriors upon the unarmed guests, and murdered them every one, following

* In one case a fine farm was sold by its owner for a roll of moleskin and a bag of coffee; and often the price demanded for large lands and comfortable homesteads was not more than 5% to 10%.

up this ruthless act by one of still greater barbarity ; for hastening to the camp of his victims, the Zulus massacred all who had been left there—men, women, and children—a few only escaping to tell the tale. The place where these terrible occurrences took place was called by the Dutch “Weenen” (weeping), and it will be found on the map at a short distance from Rorke’s Drift, the scene of the late heroic defence.

As we read the story of this migration of the Boers with its many perils and hardships, reverses, and brilliant victories at the last, which we give as we have culled them from “Silver’s Handbook to the Transvaal,” and a Paper entitled “Glimpses of Natal,” by Mr. John Robinson, to be found in vol. ix. of the “Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute,” we cannot help feeling strong sympathy with the valiant band who, believing themselves to be Heaven-directed, went forth to find a home among the heathen or to perish in the attempt ; and it is with strong indignation that we read of the manner in which they were deprived of the fruits of their hard-earned victory by the British Government, at the bidding of a few English adventurers. It was doubtless a politic step on the part of Sir George Napier to annex a territory so fertile and productive as Natal under the plea that the Boers were still British subjects, that their occupation of Natal was unwarrantable, and their slaughter of the Zulus endangered the peace of South Africa ; but to the Dutch the proclamation of the governor must have sounded like the trumpet of the oppressor proclaiming the right of *might* ; and we can neither feel surprise at the resistance they offered to the decree, nor that Pretorius, outlawed in consequence of this armed resistance to a claim which he in his turn deemed unwarrantable, should have gathered around him a band of his fellow-emigrants and once more wandered away out of the reach of British law.

In the Transvaal, where many bands of the emigrants had already settled, he was gladly received ; and when in 1852 the British Government were at length induced to yield to the designs of these long-persecuted people, and to suffer them to proclaim a Republic, Pretorius seems to have been looked upon as head-man or governor, and at his death, only a year after, his son became the first president of the new Republic, the chief town of which received the appropriate name of Pretoria. The sequel we have already told, and it is fresh in the memory of all. The sons of the valiant Boers of the Great Trek seemed to have lost all their fathers’ courage and daring, and to have been on the very verge of annihilation by the natives, when the British were called to the rescue, acquiring thereby a valuable territory at the price of wars not yet concluded, and an expenditure of blood and treasure to be estimated only by the historian of the future.

It must, however, be allowed that all our recent acquisitions in South Africa have been forced upon us by the march of events, over which we have had no control. The Dutch pioneers, admirable in many respects, especially as regards their courageous perseverance under difficulties, had yet a mode of exasperating the native races with whom they came in contact, and in South Africa this means peril to all white settlers of whatever nationality. Their religion led them to look upon the black heathens as the natural slaves of the sons of Japhet, and, as we have seen, it was the emancipation which caused the Great Trek. We may, therefore, readily believe that whenever they obtained the upper hand, the servitude imposed upon the conquered assumed the form of slavery, and although the name was suppressed in obedience to the law of Europe, the institution remained in full force. It was the custom to kill the men of a tribe and to inboek the children thus orphaned; these inboeked (bound) or adopted children growing up as slaves, and being treated as such, without the power of gaining the knowledge that they were unjustly detained, remained in the house of bondage, where they were not, as a rule, unkindly treated, but only forced to do the work imposed upon them by their masters, and to accept such remuneration as these should deem it right to give, and being often sold or bartered away at the master's pleasure.* It was by these and other acts of oppression that the emigrant Boers made themselves obnoxious to the natives.

"From the Roggeveld and the Nieuveld to the north" [says Mr. Sampson, writing in "The Colonies"† as to the early policy of the Dutch settlers] "Bushmen and Hottentot fell on the Boer, murdering, burning, and carrying off his cattle. From the east came the Kaffir Brumtjes Hoogte and the Fish River. To all the Boer opposed one system of defence. He did not inquire to whom the soil belonged: he troubled about no means for civilising the Kaffir, *veni, vidi, vici* was his laconic motto. But to protect himself he instituted a system which for its purpose was one of the simplest and most practical known in South Africa. There was no such thing as boundary between the races; the Boer assumed the whole land his. Whenever, therefore, a cattle theft occurred, the field cornet of the district where the theft took place called together a certain number of the inhabitants, and with their 'commando,' as it was termed, entered Kaffirland in pursuit. The party did not rest until the cattle were re-taken and the thief or thieves punished. The Boer took into his hand the stern law of summary justice. He did not make treaties with the native;

* For particulars the reader is referred to Sir A. Cunynghame's "My Command in South Africa," p. 220 et seq.

† "The Colonies and India," February 15th, 1879. "Kafir Wars, their Origin and History," by Victor Sampson, B.A., Cape University.

he knew they would or could not be observed, but he exercised to the bitter end the right of following and regaining his own laid hands, as the Roman priests expressed it, on his property, and vindicated his right against every man. Excesses were no doubt committed, but not such as characterised the English system thirty years later."

Here we have an outline of the Dutch policy towards the natives, it was that of aggression, the law that "might is right," and it answered admirably for a time, for under it, as we have seen, the Boers possessed themselves of all the vast tracts which we have since been called upon to take under our protection; but as the natives increased in power and numbers, the conflicts between them and their would-be masters became more frequent and obstinate, until in the struggle in the Transvaal, in which, whilst fighting against Secocœni's tribe, they were menaced also by Cetewayo and the Zulus, the Boers found themselves utterly unable to cope with their adversaries, and in order to escape defeat at the hands of Secocœni, against whom they had declared war, and probably a humiliating retrocession of territory, disastrous alike to themselves and to European *prestige* and civilisation, gave themselves over to the Power they had so long evaded. It cannot be supposed that the transfer of the Transvaal to Great Britain was accepted willingly by all the Boers; the majority, indeed, saw in it a disagreeable necessity, a bitter pill to be swallowed as best they might. But a powerful minority opposed the measure, and still remain sullen though passive, and prepared at any moment once more to "trek"* beyond our boundaries, and again to seize and hold for themselves such lands as may seem suitable for their purpose. Had not bankruptcy been added to ill-success in the field, there can be no doubt that they would have continued the struggle to the bitter end, but with an empty exchequer, it was impossible to subsidize the levies which could have been readily drawn from the Orange Free State, and when President Burgers returned from his unsuccessful expedition to Europe, where he had hoped to obtain a loan, the wiser of the Boers felt that their only hope lay in placing their country under British rule.

Whether we were equally wise in accepting the offered transfer with all the responsibilities it entailed is perhaps questionable. It is quite certain that with Natal on our hands, and its vast hordes of natives, having mostly affinities with the Zulus, we

* Sir Arthur Cunyugame details the manner in which the Transvaal Boers at this time sold their valuable property for bags of coffee in order to be ready to trek again at a moment's notice. See "My Command in South Africa," p. 247.

could not suffer Cetewayo and his formidable warriors to overrun and, to use their own expression, "eat up" either Secoceni or their neighbours the Boers in the Transvaal. It may be assumed that the whole of the South African Colonies would have risen *en masse* to prevent such a calamity, which, whilst menacing their own existence, would also have been felt as a loss of kindred, for it must be borne in mind, that by far the larger portion of the European population of the Cape Colony and Natal are of Dutch extraction, having ties of consanguinity or friendship with the Trek Boers of the Orange Free State and the Transvaal; the names, language, manners and customs throughout all the South African Colonies being still far more Dutch than English. The only alternatives open to us, therefore, as rulers of the Cape Colony and Natal were either to help the Boers with men and money to resist the Kaffirs, with whom we were then at peace, whilst leaving them still independent, or to take over the whole country as offered, and by substituting the British Government for the Dutch Republic ward off the impending danger, and roll back the tide of war, securing, perhaps, a lasting peace. The latter was the course adopted; and if we bear in mind the aggressive tendencies of the Boers, and their consequent perpetual quarrels with the natives, it would appear to have been the more humane and politic measure, since by it we might hope to check the Boers, who had thus become our subjects, whilst holding Cetewayo also, who professed to be our friend, a little under control. The policy seemed at first successful, but we had robbed the old lion of his prey, and what could we expect but that he would turn to rend us. The annexation of the Transvaal took place in October, 1876, and the reason for it is thus given in the proclamation of Sir Theophilus Shepstone:—

"Whereas the inherent weakness of this Government and State; from causes above alluded to, and briefly set forth, and the fact that the past policy of the Republic has not only failed to conciliate the friendship and goodwill, but has forfeited the respect of the overwhelming native populations within and beyond its boundaries, which together probably exceed one and a half millions, render it certain that the Transvaal will be the first to suffer from the consequences of a pressure that has already reduced its political life to so feeble a condition: and whereas the ravaging of an adjoining friendly state by warlike savage tribes cannot for a moment be contemplated by her Majesty's Government without the most earnest and painful solicitude, both on account of the miseries which such an event must inflict upon the inhabitants of the Transvaal, and because of the peril and insecurity to which it would expose her Majesty's possessions and subjects in South Africa; and seeing that the circumstances of the case have, from the inherent weakness of the country already touched upon, become so grave that

neither this country nor the British colonies in South Africa can be saved except by the extension over this State of her Majesty's authority and protection by means of which alone oneness of purpose and action can be secured, and a fair prospect of peace and prosperity in the future be established," &c. &c.

That Cetewayo, whilst professing himself satisfied at the change of Government in the Transvaal, was secretly angry there can be little doubt. To Mr. Fynney he said—

"I am pleased that Somsen (Sir T. Shepstone) has sent you to let me know that the lands of the Transvaal Boers have now become part of the lands of the Queen of England. . . . I heard that the Boers were not treating him properly, and that they intended to put him into a corner. If they had done so I should not have waited for anything more. Had but one shot been fired, I should have said, 'What more do I wait for, they have touched my father.' I should have poured my people over the land, and I can tell you, son of Mr. Fynney, the whole land would have burned with fire. I knew all about the soldiers being on their way up, but I would have asked Somsen to allow the soldiers to stand on one side for just a little time, only a little, and see what my men could do. It would have been unnecessary for the Queen's people to trouble. My men were all ready."

And at the same interview he begs Mr. Fynney to ask "Somsen" to allow him "to make one little raid, only one small swoop." That Cetewayo had made up his mind to fight, is evidenced not only by Official Papers, but by the reports of missionaries. The *Net* gives an account of Cetewayo's coronation in 1873, from the pen of Mr. Robertson, long resident among the Zulus, and in high favour with the king.

"On the 1st of September the host of Zulu warriors, armed to the teeth and bearing each a shield, were drawn up in an immense circle, into the centre of which marched our little army, headed by Mr. Shepstone, who read aloud the statutes and conditions under which the crown of Zululand became the possession of Ketchwayo. Some of these are said to be that the English are to take a large strip of disputed territory between Zululand and the Transvaal, so that the former may be in more security from the latter;* that the Zulus are to grant a free passage through their land for Amatonga people to labour in Natal;

* This strip of territory is that which was recently awarded to the Zulus by the decision of the Commissioners, but the truth of Sir Bartle Frere's assertion that, in asking the British Government to take this portion, Cetewayo desired to play off the English against the Dutch, is evidenced by the fact that no sooner did it really become British territory by the annexation of the Transvaal, than Cetewayo proceeded to acts of violence in this very part, and advanced a claim to other territory beyond the Pongolo River never before disputed.

and, best of all, that the Zulus are to have a fair trial of their offences, and not to be killed without the consent of the king."

"Ketchwayo is a fine majestic looking fellow, an exquisite model, in fact, of the noble savage,"* adds the writer of the newspaper account; and in another place Mr. Robertson says of him "he has not denied me a single request since the day I first saw him;" but in 1877, a year after the annexation, the same missionary paper, the *Net*, says, "We were prepared by the last letter we published from Mr. Robertson to hear that the native converts had left Kwamagwaza, the missionary station in Zululand given by Cetewayo. The migration* began on the 16th July." He says, "What we are afraid of is the Zulus taking alarm. They are alarmed already. The causes of alarm are many. First and foremost they do not know what next to expect from their own king. Next a report has got abroad that Sir T. Shepstone is coming with a bad disease among them; that the English are going to make them pay taxes; and lastly, the road which has lately been made from Fort Buckingham to the Tugela has alarmed them much." Farther on we read, "Mr. Robertson thinks that had they not gone of their own accord, Ketchwayo would have used one or other of the three witchcraft accusations to hasten their movements."†

Thus, it will be seen that even in 1877 things had assumed so threatening an aspect that the missionaries and their converts had to retreat somewhat precipitately from Zululand; whilst in 1878 we read, "We hardly know what to say about Zululand. The newspaper reports are, we think, more and more warlike, and the condition of things is one of armed peace and mutual suspicion. All the white people have left the Zulu border with the exception of the Germans at Luneburg.‡ And on October 21st Mr. Carlson writes—"The Swazies are beginning to play the same game as the Zulus, with regard to the boundary line, giving notice to the white people's Kaffirs to move away, as the king wants to build his kraal there."§

The Rev. Joel Jackson, Missionary to the Amazwasi, wrote on November 26th, 1877:—"A son of the chief of this part has just been to see me, and he assures me that the Zulus certainly mean to fight with the English and that I may prepare for such an event. I said to him, 'But suppose the English will not fight.' 'They must either fight or leave the country,' was his reply. The reason why people are so anxious at present is not only on account of these rumours, but because about 5000 Zulus

* The *Net*, December, 1873.

† *Ibid.* October 1st, 1878.

‡ *Ibid.* October 1st, 1877.

§ *Ibid.* February 1st, 1879.

went a few days ago to build a military road at Luneburg, the German settlement, on the north side of the Pongolo River."*

We have given these extracts as independent witnesses to the truth of Sir Bartle Frere's assertion, that war was inevitable; and in truth if we consider dispassionately the situation of the two parties, we shall see that it must necessarily have been so. On the one side, we see a savage despot with a well-disciplined army, cooped up in his own land, forbidden to "wash his assegais" in the blood of those he looked upon as his natural enemies. "It is the custom of our country," says Cetewayo, "when a new king is placed over the nation, to wash their spears, and it has been done in the case of all former kings of Zululand. I am no king, but sit in a heap; I cannot be king till I have washed my assegais." On the other side, we see a handful of foreigners, pretending to control the actions and improve the morality of this warlike monarch, ruling over legions outnumbering ours by, at least, ten to one. Can we be surprised that in reviewing his young warriors, so anxious to "wash their assegais" and to prove by their prowess in battle their fitness for the wives politically withheld from them, he should have formed, as Mr. Fynney says, "a very exaggerated idea both of his power, the number of his warriors, and their ability as such," and that he should come to regard himself as equal, if not superior in power, to the Governor of Natal, forgetting the time when he had humbly sued for a representative of her Majesty to place the crown upon his head, promising reforms which he never intended to carry out. To the remonstrances of the Governor of Natal he therefore returns the haughty answer:—

"Did I ever tell Shepstone? Did he tell the white people that I made such an arrangement? Because if he did he has deceived them. I do kill, but do not consider yet I have done anything in the way of killing. Why do the white people start at nothing? I have not yet begun; I have yet to kill—it is the custom of our nation, and I shall not depart from it. Why does the Governor of Natal speak to me about my laws? Do I go to Natal and dictate to him about his laws? I shall not agree to any laws or rules from Natal, and by so doing throw the great kraal which I govern into the water. My

* A somewhat serious affair is reported in the *Eastern Province Herald*, Feb. 11, 1879, from the Diamond Fields, where two German missionaries have been arraigned by Colonel Warren for promoting and fostering sedition and rebellion. It would seem that these two missionaries placed themselves at the head of some Korannas and claimed the whole district of Bloemhof. They openly defied the British Government, and one of them having informed the Korannas of the late disaster in Zululand, the Korannas took up arms and were with difficulty dispersed by Major Rolleston, one of their number being shot and Mr. O'Reilly wounded in the affray.

people will not listen unless they are^{*} killed, and while wishing to be friends with the English I do not agree to give over my people to be governed by laws sent to me by them. Have I not asked the English Government to allow me to wash my spears since the death of my father Umpani, and they have kept playing with me all this time and treating me like a child? Go back and tell the English that I shall now act on my own account, and if they wish me to agree to their laws I shall leave and become a wanderer; but before I go it will be seen, as I shall not go before I have acted. Go back and tell the white man this, and let them hear it well. The Governor of Natal and I are equal. He is Governor of Natal and I am Governor here."

From this there can be no doubt that the Zulu monarch had been measuring his strength, and felt himself powerful enough to drive the white man out of Natal and the Transvaal where, as computed by numbers, they were but as a handful; and in order to ensure success he begins by fomenting disturbances among other allied Kaffir tribes.

"It is not the Transvaal only," writes Sir Bartle Frere, "that looks to the solution of the Zulu question as deciding the issues of war or peace. From every part of South Africa during the past two years we have had the same symptoms of unrest and of a growing disposition on the part of the natives to try, by more or less decided wagers of battle, whether the white man still retains his supremacy, or whether it has not passed with the white man's weapons into the hands of the more numerous native races. It is not in this colony alone, but wherever the Kaffir races are to be found—from the Fish River to the Limpopo, and from the Lower Orange River to Delagoa Bay—that the influence of the Zulu King has been found at work fostering and directing this spirit."

In order more fully to understand the position of affairs and the necessity for prompt action in the matter of this war, which many writers have condemned as unnecessary and unjust, let us for a moment transfer in imagination the scene of operation to our own land. Let us suppose Wales—a country not very dissimilar from Zululand either in position or natural features—to be an independent kingdom, ruled over by Cetewayo, with a well disciplined army of 40,000 or 60,000 stalwart warriors, averaging six feet in height, strong, active, and well-armed with breechloaders and assegais. Let us further suppose the Zulu King to have claimed Monmouthshire and Herefordshire as far as the Wye, and that his claim has been allowed because that part of the country was formerly included in Wales, and that thereupon he proceeds further to claim the land lying between the Wye and the Severn, and to enforce his claim by raids upon the peaceful inhabitants. We must also imagine Cornwall to be in

possession of a kindred race,* and notoriously disaffected, and Chester to be filled with Zulu refugees, outnumbering the English by many thousands; that the whole of the Northern, Midland, and Southern counties swarm with Kaffir races of doubtful loyalty, with whom Cetewayo is known to be tampering; and that the Irish in the Midland counties should think it a fit time to demand Home Rule. Here we have a fair outline of the position of affairs in South Africa, and our first observation will be that the Zulu King, hemmed in in Africa as he would be in Wales by British territory (excepting the Portuguese colony of Delagoa Bay) and by the sea, can have no use for his 40,000 warriors excepting to make war upon us, and that, therefore, the apparently unreasonable demand of Sir Bartle Frere for the disbandment of this fine army was in reality, as he says, a measure necessitated by self-defence. Whether it would have been possible to have warded off the inevitable conflict for three or four months, in order to receive definite instructions from the Home Government, must remain doubtful; but if we place ourselves in the position of the colonists, we shall certainly agree with them, as reported by the *Daily News*, "That it was high time for hostilities to commence, and that the only thing for which Sir Bartle Frere could be blamed was that he had not acted with sufficient haste in the matter."* The outcry which has been raised against Sir Bartle Frere since the Isandula disaster illustrates the truth of the proverb that "Nothing succeeds like success." Had Lord Chelmsford's march been an uninterrupted triumph nothing but laudation would have followed both him and the High Commissioner, who, before this untoward event, was allowed emphatically to be the "right man in the right place." We have no desire to take up the cudgels on behalf of Sir Bartle Frere, but, in view of the hard things which have been said of him, it may be as well to recall to our readers' notice what was the general opinion at the time of his appointment. The *South African Mail*, of February 7th, says:—"Sir Bartle Frere's appointment is hailed with great satisfaction throughout the length and breadth of the land. He comes as an able administrator to an undeveloped country, where wise measures connected with immigration and extensive public works are absolutely necessary; but above all he comes to save the entire country from serious danger and constant vexatious warfare." The *Cape Argus* says:—"The appointment of an officer specially selected to put an end to the slave trade on the East Coast is a guarantee that England will not desert her traditional policy where the coloured races are concerned." The *Cape*

* Report in the *Guardian*, February 26th, 1879.

Standard Mail writes:—"As the advocate of a conciliatory policy Sir Bartle Frere is the best man we can get." Yet this is the man who is now accused of rushing into war with a light heart in order to gain popularity at the expense of the British taxpayer! "There would," says a little Opposition paper, the *Somerset and Bedford Courant*, "be a just Nemesis if that Governor who dismissed his ministry because they wished to punish rebels taken in arms with death, and to allow the colonists to carry on the war in their own way, should have to succumb to an explosion of Exeter Hall wrath at his doing what his masters wished him to do, but not what they ordered him." It may, however, be observed that those who know the colonies and Cetewayo best are the first to exonerate Sir Bartle Frere, and to allow the necessity of the war. Among these we may name Sir Arthur Cunynghame, the Venerable Dr. Moffat, Sir Henry Barkly, the Rev. Horace Waller, the Hon. Cecil Ashley, Mr. J. Patterson, of Port Elizabeth, Sir F. Fowell Buxton,* and Lord Carnarvon, who, greatly as they may differ in politics, have all come forward to testify to the high character of Sir Bartle Frere, to his aversion for tyranny and bloodshed, and his desire for peace and the welfare of the colonies he has been sent to rule. The choice lay between immediate war, the employment of a constant army of occupation, to guard the extended border between Zululand, Natal, and the Transvaal, and to watch over the disaffected natives within the colonies, constantly looking to Cetewayo as the invincible champion of their race; or the abandonment of Natal and the Transvaal to a barbaric despot, leaving many thousands of our white brethren to the tender mercies of the savage who murders his own subjects indiscriminately, and would be only too glad to drive the white men to the sea, when scattered, weak, and forsaken by those who were bound to defend them. Had any attempt of this kind occurred, any successful raid even, who would have been blamed by every one but Sir Bartle Frere?

Here we must pause to explain briefly how the Zulu monarch has acquired the supremacy he claims over other chiefs, and to say a few words as to the natives of South Africa, and our policy towards them; but before entering upon this part of our subject it may be well to glance lightly at the Orange Free State, which, although not a British colony, is yet so intimately connected with the other South African States that it cannot well be omitted in treating of them.

The Orange Free State, then, is a large tract of country, enclosed on all sides by the British colonies, bounded on the south

* See "Colonies in India," March 1st, 1879. Discussion on Mr. Noble's Paper.

by the Orange River, and on the north by the Vaal. It was here that a few of the emigrant Boers established themselves after the Great Trek, whilst the larger portion of their companions passed over the Drakensberg mountains, which form the eastern boundary of the State into Natal, and others crossed the Vaal and became the first settlers in the Transvaal. These early settlers found the land occupied by several different tribes of natives, and saw that it was a fertile land, abounding also in game. It was not, however, till after two or three collisions with the British Government that it was allowed to retain its adopted Republican form of Government;* but since 1852 it has been free from British rule and on friendly terms with the surrounding states, excepting in 1867, when the discovery of diamonds in Griqualand West led to a territorial dispute, which was at length amicably settled by the President, Mr. Brand (who is a son of the Speaker of the Cape House of Parliament), himself visiting England. It was at one time joined to the Transvaal under the Presidentship of Pretorius, but the connection did not last long; it probably owes its comparative immunity from wars with the natives to its position in the midst of British territory, which prevents aggression on the part of the Boers, and raids from the natives, who are under British rule; nevertheless, it has not been free from wars, after one of which a large portion of Basutoland was added to its territories. It is pleasing to find that at the present juncture the Orange Free State is sending volunteers to help the British forces in Natal.

The great and burning question in South Africa has always been the "native question;" for there the natives do not melt away before the white man as they have done in so many instances, but multiply exceedingly to our great embarrassment. This, however, applies chiefly to the Kaffir races; for when the Cape was first colonised the natives consisted largely of Bushmen and Hottentots; the former were probably remnants of the aborigines, a small, weak race, even then on the point of extinction; the Hottentots would appear to have been a mixture between the Bushman and the negro. Of these two races Mr. Noble says:—

"The Bushmen have dwindled down to a few thousands, and these are chiefly northward of the Orange River. Of the Hottentots, some families, like the Namaquas or Red Nation, who claim to be pure

* It is related that Pretorius, when President of the Orange Free State, rode to Graham's Town from Bloemfontein to confer with the Lieutenant-Governor, in order to the peaceable solution of pending difficulties, but being informed that the Governor was at breakfast and could not see him, returned as he came.

aboriginals, also migrated to the north-west, in Great Namaqualand, but numbers of them, who upon our first occupation of the country were congregated in certain stations and localities within the colony, under the influence of the missionaries, have become intermixed with and absorbed in our labouring class, and are useful members of society."*

The Kaffirs were certainly not aborigines; they came from the north. The excellent history of the Kaffir race, given on Smith's war map, points out their likeness to the brown people found painted on the walls of Egyptian tombs, as fighting with the Egyptians, or as prisoners in their hands; and they would certainly seem to have much in common with the Abyssinians, and also with the Arabs, particularly as regards manners, customs, and traditions, but their physical type has probably become greatly modified in the course of their migrations. They are now a fine, tall, active race, of a rich brown colour, with black woolly hair, but with only a slight resemblance to the negro in feature. They practice circumcision, and their huts are of the beehive shape, made of a framework of bent sticks, fastened together at the top, wattled and thatched, and then covered with closely-woven mats, the door being a small opening through which it is necessary to crawl. The military kraals, of which we have lately heard so much, consist of a number of these huts placed in a circle round an enclosure containing the cattle, the whole being guarded by an external wall or hedge of thorns and prickly pear, extremely difficult to penetrate.

These people appear, according to Mr. Noble, "to have crossed the Kei River, and invaded the country of the Hottentots about 1650, just about the same time that the early Dutch settlers landed at the Cape." "They may be divided into three branches—the Amakosa, or Kaffir Proper, the Amazulu, and the Bechuanas;" but these are subdivided into numerous tribes, bearing the names of the chiefs who founded them, and happily, for us, constantly at enmity with each other. The now powerful Zulus were formerly a petty tribe, owning as ruler Jobe, chief of the Umtetwas; and the military system by which they have become so powerful was learnt in the Cape colony, and introduced among them by a banished chieftain, who afterwards returned and became the head of his tribe (the Umtetwas), being described by them as a "mighty man and beast," because he was the first man they had seen riding upon a horse. This chief, Dingiswayo, or the Wanderer, established a formidable army of trained soldiers, but was at length defeated and put to

* "British South Africa," by John Noble, Clerk to the Legislative Assembly, Cape Town.

death; his system of organisation was carried on and perfected by Chaka, the Zulu chief, who, likewise a banished man, long served under Dingiswayo.* This is the chief whom Cetewayo has taken as his model; he first ravaged the country north of the Tugela, and then turned upon Natal, sparing neither man, woman, nor child. The peaceable tribes fled before him, suffering fearful privations in their flight; some became cannibals, and in their turn slew in order to devour. "In less than ten years," says General Bisset, "Chaka depopulated more than two-thirds of the whole of the country now constituting Natal, and in 1828 had become the undisputed sovereign of all South-eastern Africa, from the Umzimvubu, or St. John's River, to King George's River, far north of Delagoa Bay, including a large portion of what is now Orange Free State and Transvaal, and also of the tribe and territory of his former patron and master, Dingiswayo. Among the tribes dispossessed and driven out by this cruel barbarian, were the Fingoes, an inferior Kaffir tribe, who thus became slaves, or dogs as the name implies, to other Kaffir races, until released from bondage by the English, and located in Cape Colony, where they have proved themselves a loyal, industrious, thriving people. "At that time (1835)," says Mr. Noble, "they were a poor people, numbering only 16,800 souls; at the taking of the last census of the Colony in 1875, they formed an aggregate population of 73,506, and many of them are industrious and respectable native farmers, owning acres of cultivated lands, square houses, waggons, and flocks and herds of sheep and cattle."†

The Basutos are another tribe who have thriven amazingly under British rule. They had been so harried by powerful neighbours as to have been forced to cannibalism to avoid starvation, until in 1868 their old chief Moshesh begged so earnestly that "he and his people should be allowed to rest under the large folds of the British flag" that they were proclaimed British subjects and their territory British territory. "Since then," adds Mr. Noble, "civilisation has made marked advance among them. Commerce and agriculture have gone hand in hand with Christianity and cleanliness. Not less than 2000 bales of wool and 100,000 muids of grain have been exported in one year from Basutoland to the neighbouring markets (chiefly the Diamond

* "South Africa and her Colonies." Lieut.-General Bisset, C.B., Royal Colonial Institute, 1876.

† "British South Africa," by John Noble, Clerk L.A., Royal Colonial Institute, February, 1879.

It must be noted that within the Cape Colony the natives are content and loyal, being free from any disabilities on account of colour, and many of them rising to positions of trust.

Fields), whilst merchandise to the value of 200,000*l.* has been imported. When it is considered that the population is almost wholly aboriginal these facts augur brightly for the future."

It is, indeed, well for us that we have secured the loyalty and goodwill of *some* of the swarming multitudes which people our South African colonies, for should these combine with the fierce and lawless myriads of Zululand, and the tribes beyond our boundaries north and east, and rise against us, there would be small hope for the sparse and widely-scattered European population, even though each village should contain a Pretorius.

"Look at the masses of the native population," says Mr. Noble, "which swarm in that magnificent country stretching eastward from Albany right on to the Kei, and from the Indian Ocean north to the Stormberg and Drakensberg. There are very little short of a quarter of a million in these frontier districts. Between the Kei River and the frontier of Natal, again, there is fully half a million. In Natal there are near 300,000; in Zululand at least an equal number; the Transvaal and on its borders as many again. And if we turn westward to Damaraland we shall find at least 120,000."*

The census of 1865, the first taken in the Cape Colony, gave the numbers as: Europeans, 187,439—these include Dutch, English, Germans, French, and Portuguese; Hottentots, 81,598; Kaffirs, 164,466; and other native tribes, including Fingoes, Bechnanas, Bushmen and Malays, 132,655. In British Kaffraria, Europeans, 5847; natives, 64,230. In Natal the numbers are given as 20,000 whites, 300,000 blacks, 12,000 coolies. The proportions between blacks and whites in the Transvaal, including the Gold Fields, are given as 40,000 of the latter to 250,000 of the former, but the exact number cannot be known. In the Orange Free State alone do the numbers approach to an equality. Of the 45,000 given as the population, more than one-half are said to be of European descent, chiefly Dutch. A private letter from the Transvaal says, "Nothing going on here but wars with the natives. If all the black tribes were to combine, there is no telling what they might do, for the odds against the white population in numbers is enormous; in one part of the Transvaal, called Zoutpansberg, there are 400,000 Kaffirs, and only about 150 white people, but providentially the different tribes are always at enmity with each other and fighting, and for this fact, and this alone, can you say, the white men hold their ground in savage Africa." That the whites should hold their own and, moreover, that they should continue to advance and to convert the black races from primitive savagery to at

* Noble's "British South Africa." Royal Colonial Institute, February, 1879.

least semi-civilisation, such as that developed in the Fingoes and Basutos, is not only a political necessity and a law of Nature, consequent upon the greater adaptability and power of resistance acquired by the white man through many centuries of civilisation, enabling him to triumph over the superior physical strength and the enormous odds in numbers of the blacks, but it is also necessary in the cause of humanity. In order to prove this we must turn once more to the history of the Zulus and of our enemy Cetewayo, and this we will give in the words of Mr. Noble :—

“The colonists of Natal, however, had some assurance for the good behaviour of the native population in their midst, from the circumstance of their being refugees, who at least valued the security of life and property they enjoyed as compared with their country across the frontier in Zululand. But yearly the condition of affairs in the adjacent territory itself was becoming more and more alarming. Panda, the chief who had been placed over Zululand by the emigrant Boers, when they deposed Dingaan, the author of the Weenen massacre, was, during his long reign of thirty-two years, in amicable relationship with the colonists. He had a friendly feeling towards the white man, who had been the immediate means of his getting to the throne. But his eldest son, Cetywayo, from the time of his coming of age, showed much of the barbaric character of his uncle Chaka, who, between 1800 and 1828, had made his conquering power felt from the Limpopo to Kaffraria, and threatened at one time even to sweep all along the coast from Natal to the Cape of Good Hope. Proud of the tradition of his family and the deeds of Chaka, young Cetywayo gathered around him a following of young men of the tribe, eager to seek a renewal of these times of booty and conquest. Jealous of one of his brothers being favoured by his father, he assembled a force to attack him, and in December, 1856, fought a battle on the banks of the Zugla, in which Umbellum and six other sons of Panda were killed, together with great numbers of their followers, whose bodies were to be seen for days afterwards floating down the blood-stained stream. From this time Cetywayo was virtually at the head of the Zulu tribe, although Panda only died in 1872.”

Then follows the account of the coronation and pledges for good government, and Mr. Noble proceeds :—

“How these pledges have been violated is now well known. To Mr. Fynney, who visited him in 1877, he said he never ordered the killing of his people until after a trial. ‘Trial,’ said one of the Zulus whom Mr. Fynney had got to converse with him, ‘yes, a trial of bullets.’ Others said, ‘Yes, we got a trial, but that means surrounding the kraal at daybreak and shooting us down like cattle.’ A year ago he gave orders that the soldiers of one of his regiments were to marry. They were old and middle-aged men, and many of the girls who had

been selected for them were discovered plotting with younger lovers to evade the king's command. In a fury he began an indiscriminate slaughter, not only of the delinquents but of their parents and other relatives, and when remonstrated with by the Natal authorities he sent an angry and insolent message in reply."*

Surely it cannot be in the interests of humanity and civilisation to permit "this exquisite model of a noble savage," as the Natal papers called him at the time of his coronation, to develop still farther the bloodthirsty propensities of his savage nature. It is unfortunate, truly, that the *sword*, which has ever been the grand instrument of civilisation, should be equally necessary in this nineteenth century; but so it is, and in this case it is sharpened by the instinct of self-preservation, and we trust will not fail once for all to establish the supremacy of the white race. That once secured, it will behove the Colonial and Home Governments to devise a plan whereby these numerous and powerful tribes may be made loyal subjects amenable to law and discipline, and willing to aid in the development of their magnificent and fertile land.

Vacillation is looked upon by all natives as a sign of weakness, and unfortunately there has been much of this apparent in our former dealings with South African races. One Governor has made a decree which his successor has annulled, or the laws made in the colony for the government of the natives have been abrogated by the Home Government, and matters have been further complicated by the different modes of dealing with the natives adopted by the several Independent States into which South Africa has hitherto been divided. But statesmen are beginning slowly to perceive that our colonies should not be governed according to party politics, but must rather be ruled in accordance with eternal principles of right and justice. Above all, there must be no retrograde movement. no class legislation, the laws made must be clearly for the benefit of black and white alike. Hitherto, our legislators have been too apt to listen to the pseudo-humanitarianism of Exeter Hall, and to legislate *solely* for the *supposed* benefit of the natives, and the evils of this system have been forcibly portrayed by all who know the colonies, and the dangers to which the colonists are subjected by apparent timidity, and too great an amount of liberty afforded to

* "British South Africa," by John Noble, clerk L.A., Cape Colony, Royal Colonial Institute, February, 1879. For further particulars as to the sanguinary character of Cetewayo from the beginning, the reader is referred to "African Hunting from Natal to the Zambesi, 1852 to 1860," by Wm. Charles Baldwin, Esq., F.R.G.S. (Bentley, 1863).

barbarous and still hostile hordes. Here is an extract from the *Mission Field*, a paper not likely to be hostile to the natives. The writer says :—

“The charge that is brought against the recent policy towards the natives is, that it has been too easy and indulgent. . . . Under this régime it is said that the tribes have grown strong numerically, and being in great measure untouched by the civilising and religious agencies, upon which the colonists frowned, and in whose working they took little or no interest, they rose at length upon the merest pretext, or upon no pretext at all.” . . . “The chief Kreli has, it must be remembered, been banished before. It was he who instigated his people to destroy their cattle and leave their fields bare in 1856 and 1857, and was then banished to the territory across the Bashee River, where he remained until the Government—with unwise clemency as the event proved—restored him to his chieftainship, and to a portion of the territory which he called his; and we left him and his people *utterly alone* to do among themselves as their savage will and pleasure should prompt.” In the same paper Bishop Callaway writes :—“I believe it is absolutely necessary to subdue the natives to order and obedience to law by physical means. They understand, and will submit to nothing else.”*

It is to our unwise concessions to the natives that most men of judgment attribute the various Kaffir wars which have from time to time deluged the country with blood, and imperilled the very existence of the South African Colonies. Almost all of them have begun by claims on neutral territory made by the Kaffirs, followed up by raids and thefts of cattle belonging to settlers. Of these wars Silver's "Handbook to South Africa" gives five, prior to the latest disturbances, which, beginning with the affair of Langalibalele, may be said to have continued and culminated in the present outbreak. The first of these, in 1811-12, was prior to the definite cession of the Cape Colony to England by the Treaty of Paris in 1815. It originated in an attempt to drive the Kaffirs from neutral territory, whence they committed innumerable depredations, and ended in driving them beyond the Great Fish River. The second war, in 1818, was caused by that which has been denominated the Somerset or patrol system, introduced by Lord Charles Somerset when Governor, who entered into the first treaty made between the English Government and the Kaffirs. Mr. Sampson gives a graphic account of this treaty, the reception of Gaika, the Kaffir chief, by Lord Charles Somerset, surrounded by regiments of the line, Cape mounted rifles and volunteers.

* *The Mission Field*, July 1st, 1878.

"As Gaika neared the tent Major Cuyler, Major Fraser, and Mr. Stockenstrom went to meet him. Immediately the Kaffir square broke into two lines, and, Gaika and Slambie advancing, they proceeded arm in arm with Major Cuyler and Major Fraser to the tent. The British officers in full uniform, linked with savages in skins and snakes' teeth, would have presented a striking picture to Dutch observers of the absurd policy towards the natives from thenceforth so often attempted by Great Britain. . . . On our part we recognised Gaika as paramount chief of Kafirland; Gaika promised on his side that whenever a cattle theft occurred we should be at liberty to follow the thief at once, and, failing to recover our property, seize an equal number from the nearest kraal to which the cattle were traced."*

It will readily be seen that this gave scope for great abuses, and, in short, an endeavour to recover stolen cattle was soon met by open resistance. The Kaffirs crossed the Great Fish River, and attacked Graham's Town, but although there were then only 300 or 400 Europeans in the town, they defeated the invaders with great loss, who soon after surrendered. Then came the great war of 1834-35, which began by a horde of 10,000 Kaffirs spreading themselves over the country. In one week 40 farmers were murdered, 450 farm-houses burnt, 4000 horses, 100,000 head of cattle, and 150,000 sheep carried off.

"Sir B. D'Urban," says General Bisset, "was at that time Governor of the colony, a far-seeing and humane statesman. The Kaffirs were punished, and in a measure conquered, for they had not up to that time become possessed of fire-arms, or were aware of their own power. Their country was taken possession of up to the Kei River, under the name of the province of Queen Adelaide, and held by military occupation; had this been continued the Kaffirs would have been civilised years ago."†

Unfortunately the Home Government under Lord Glenelg reversed all that Sir B. D'Urban had done, ordered the new province to be given up, and a piece of hitherto neutral territory yielded to the Kaffirs.

"These concessions were taken as weakness on our part, and were the cause of the two great Kaffir wars which followed. . . . One of the great military posts abandoned on the neutral territory, which had cost 60,000*l.*, fell to the possession of the chief Maccomo, who immediately sold it 'as it stood' to a trader for two cows, valued at the outside at 5*l.*"‡

* "Kaffir Wars: their Origin and History. The Colonies and India," February 15th, 1879.

† "South Africa and her Colonies." Proceedings Royal Colonial Institute, 1876.

‡ "South Africa and her Colonies." Lieut-General Bisset, C.B.

In 1846-7 another war broke out. "Whether or no the Kaffirs at all understood or appreciated the motives which dictated a policy of forbearance, it is certain they took every advantage of it, until at last their depredations became so daring that the colonists had no alternative between abandoning the country altogether, or proving at any cost that justice did not bear the sword in vain."* In the war which followed Kaffirland had to be re-taken, and held by a military force. In 1850 another war broke out, which cost the country 3,000,000*l.*, and the colonists were well-nigh ruined; but that, too, ended as all such wars have ended, and must end, in the triumph of the European, and large acquisitions of territory. The war of last year was waged ostensibly on behalf of our allies the Fingoes, but it was well known that the blow struck by the Kaffirs was aimed at the protectors, through the protected, and was designed as a trial of strength; for the Kaffirs, having acquired the use of fire-arms, now consider themselves quite equal to the English; in fact, Cetewayo told Mr. Fynney that his men were even better shots than the English. Secocœui's Kaffirs, however, did not show themselves more formidable with their new weapons than before, for it was remarked by many that they had never fought worse, and it remains to be seen whether Cetewayo's warriors armed with breech-loaders are more formidable than when they hurled the assegai. There can, however, be no doubt that the policy which allows these powerful tribes to possess themselves of such deadly weapons is highly to be deprecated. In the Cape Colony, indeed, a heavy penalty (we believe, 500*l.*) is exacted for selling a gun to a native, but in the other colonies no such law is in force, and at the Diamond Fields the trade in guns and ammunition is practically free; in truth, a gun is the only bribe whereby these stalwart Kaffirs can be induced to work, and thus thousands of guns have been placed in the hands of our enemies, besides an illicit traffic in the same, carried on by unscrupulous traders through the Bays of St. Lucia and Delagoa.

The war upon which we are now embarked, can only end in one way, the subjugation of Cetewayo, and the appropriation of his territory; but that done the more difficult task remains of so governing the vast and heterogeneous native elements within our South African Colonies, as to make of them loyal subjects and useful members of society. The first step towards this seems to be, the abolition of chieftainships, and encouraging *individual*, in place of *tribal*, rights in the land. Hitherto, the chiefs have been allowed to be the paramount authority in their tribe; but this has been found a fertile source of disaffection, for

* "Handbook to South Africa," p. 50.

by it the chiefs have acquired such a hold upon the tribe that a call from them will withdraw their tribesmen from the most profitable employment and the best of masters to carry war and devastation into the very locality where they have been sheltered.* It cannot, however, be supposed that the chiefs will calmly yield their authority; and, except in the case of war as at present, the process of extinction must be gradual, as also must be the suppression of the witch doctors and prophets who now hold so much influence over these native races, and who have led their devotees to such deeds of savage madness as that related of the Amaxosa, who, in 1857, in obedience to one of these prophets destroyed all their corn and cattle, believing that they would be miraculously restored to them, and render them so powerful as to be able to drive the white men into the sea. Instead of which 50,000 perished of hunger, notwithstanding all the efforts of Government, and more especially the liberally-dispensed private charity of the colonists, to avert the self-sought disaster. The next point to be achieved is the disarmament of the natives, a task of no ordinary difficulty, seeing that a gun is the great object of a Kaffir's ambition; nevertheless, the measure has been successfully carried out in the Cape Colony since the war of last year.

Compulsory education of the young is another means relied upon for the advancement of civilisation and pacification, and it is one which cannot fail to have great influence for good. Even now, the youthful Kaffir has advantages quite equal to those afforded to most English boys and girls, although, of course, these advantages cannot be enjoyed by all. In the various mission schools throughout the country, many yearly receive good sound instruction, with perhaps too much psalm singing; but the multiplication of such industrial-schools as that at Lovedale is highly desirable. Of this institution Sir Arthur Cunynghame gives a good description. The boys learn all useful trades, and particularly the use of the spade and the plough, implements peculiarly desirable for the Kaffir, who has not at present passed the pastoral stage, and thinks it beneath him to till the ground, leaving such agriculture as is necessary to the women. Hence arises the scarcity of labour experienced by the colonists in a land teeming with excellent material. To teach the young, therefore, to plough and sow, build, and work in iron, leather, cotton, or any other useful manual labour, is a most important part in that programme of development sketched out with the endeavour to civilise and train the Kaffir races.

* We have compared Zululand to Wales, and it is at least of interest to remember that the hardy descendants of the Ancient Britons, in that Principality, were never thoroughly subdued till deprived of their hereditary chiefs.

"It is now," says Sir Arthur Cunynghame, "beginning to be recognised that the true way to tame a savage is to make him a useful artisan;" and to show that the Cape House of Assembly are alive to the fact, he gives us the following decree:—

"It is the opinion of this House that there should be established in Basutoland an industrial training-school for the education of the Basutos and other natives in trades, handicrafts, and other occupations upon the system as far as possible of that adopted at the Lovedale Institution; and further, that while the surplus revenues of Basutoland justify a sufficient provision therefrom in aid of this establishment, every effort should be made to secure that the institution should be self-supporting."*

Meanwhile, during the time these necessary reforms are in progress, the chief duty of the Colonial Government will be to provide for its own safety in quelling such insurrections as will be sure to arise, especially in carrying out the decree for disarmament; one such is already reported, and more will undoubtedly follow; and necessary as the measure undoubtedly is, it seems hard upon apparently friendly natives, who have worked hard to procure the one coveted European weapon. It has, however, been proved that with the exception of Fingoes and Basutos, native levies cannot be trusted: they have been disbanded in the present war, and the tragic tale of the Hottentots withdrawn from servitude in the Cape Colony and located on the Kat River, who, as well as the Frontier Police (in the fourth Kaffir War), went over in a body to the enemy, has been often told. Yet, without making use of some native force, it would seem impossible for the colonists to undertake to keep in order the vast mass of disaffected natives in their midst; but by a judicious selection from friendly tribes, mingled with and officered by Europeans, this may possibly be managed. Mr. Noble gives us the measures for defence recently adopted by the Cape Parliament, and says—

"The war of last year found the Colony unfortunately unprepared in that respect, but the patriotism of the colonists, who volunteered to the front from nearly every part of the country, showed that material for a most efficient defence against all internal foes could be easily made available. The Defence measures since passed by Parliament gives Government the services of a burgher force, consisting of every adult member of the whole population, and they can be embodied in any lesser or larger number as may be thought necessary for active service within and beyond the borders. Besides these burghers there is a yeomanry force of 1800 Europeans; the old

Frontier Police Force, 1200 strong, is converted into a corps re-named the Cape Mounted Riflemen; and there are auxiliary forces, the volunteers."*

This would seem ample protection for the Cape Colony, but when we come to Natal and the vast Transvaal, with their overwhelming native population, it is obvious that much more is required; and this brings us to the question which has so long agitated the South African Colonies—that of Federation. Lord Carnarvon, when Colonial Secretary, persistently urged this measure, and, as is well known, sent out Mr. Froude to promulgate his views; but the country was not then ripe for a measure which, although obviously advantageous to the country in the long run, seemed likely to entail expense and trouble upon the older colonies, without corresponding advantages. Sir Arthur Cunynghame gives the pros and cons in this matter very lucidly; he points out the differences existing in the form of government of the various Colonies, and their reasons for desiring or rejecting Federation.

Of the Cape Colony a member of the Natal House of Assembly says—

"It looks to the north, and sees in the three States that lie there much, no doubt, that is attractive, but much that gives cause for doubt. It fears Natal with her natives, and shrinks from the Transvaal with her debt. It dreads, lest by uniting its fortune with ours, it should imperil or sacrifice the position it holds."†

And until lately each of the States had some reason for objecting to Federation. The recent wars, however, seem to have had the effect of changing the opinion of most of the States on this matter, and Mr. Noble says—

"There is another important matter which the present Cape Cabinet are prepared to forward—a union of the Colonies and States of South Africa—which nearly all parties have now come to admit is desirable. Differences of opinion, however, still exist as to the way in which it should be brought about. With some the favourite idea is a Confederation similar to that of Canada, on the lines of the South African Bill passed by the Imperial Parliament. Others, again, have adopted the idea of 'Unification,' which means that the old Colony should incorporate the younger ones, receiving into its Parliament a fair proportion of representatives from each, and increasing the powers of local bodies, such as Divisional Councils, to meet the reasonable wants of the remote provinces." But he adds:—"The native disturbances on our borders have awakened the apprehensions of many well-affected towards Confederation as to the responsibilities and difficulties

* "British South Africa."

† "My Command in Africa," p. 101.

involved in the measure, unless the Imperial Government becomes, for some time at least, a contributor of a certain number of troops for the defence of such settlements as Natal and the Transvaal.”*

Sir Arthur Cunynghame does not approve of union, but thinks the whole country should be divided into five States—the Cape Colony forming two, east and west, divided by a line running from Cape Francis to Hopetown, Griqualand West. Third, Natal, including all the land from St. John’s River, Kaffraria, recently taken over, to Zululand, and as much of the latter as must eventually be annexed. Fourth, the Transvaal. Fifth, Griqualand West, to which it is hoped the Orange Free State would soon request to be joined.† The Cape Colonists have incurred much obloquy for not being more ready to assist the Natalians and the Home Government during the present war; but it must be remembered that they have had the safety of their own frontier to provide for, as it is well known that Cetewayo’s machinations have caused much disaffection among other Kaffir tribes. It must, however, be recorded to their credit that immediately upon receipt of the news of the late terrible disaster, volunteers from Cape Town and Port Elizabeth went up immediately to King William’s Town to relieve the garrison there, and have further offered pecuniary aid, and to send volunteers even to Natal if needed.

The future development of these magnificent countries may be said to depend mainly upon three things—the pacification and civilisation of the natives; the influx of a large number of European immigrants; and an adequate supply of labour. Mr. Noble says—

“In connection with the re-settlement of the newly-extended territories in Kaffraria, it is intended to plant a number of European settlers in several suitable belts of country, and here and there among the different native locations; which will, by strengthening the white population, act as beneficially as any defensive force.”‡

This would, indeed, seem a suitable time for repeating the successful experiment of 1820. At that time much distress existed in England, and the Home Government, “not having the fear of political economists and *doctrinaire* politicians before its eyes, acted with a degree of common sense which one is sometimes tempted to envy in these more enlightened days. Parliament voted 50,000*l.* in order to send some of the able-bodied surplus population from the old country, where they were so much in the way, to the Cape Colony, where they were so much wanted.

* “British South Africa,”

† “My Command in South Africa,” pp. 102-107.

‡ “British South Africa.”

Ninety thousand applications were sent in, from which about 5000 had to be selected—farmers, tradesmen, half-pay officers, artisans, and labourers,* and this formed the nucleus whence arose the prosperous British Eastern Province Cape Colonists of to-day. They had, of course, hardships to endure, fights with the natives, with wild beasts, and with the forces of Nature; but they overcame them, and became “healthy, wealthy, and wise.” Surely, from our suffering and destitute surplus population of to-day, many thousands might be found to carry civilisation among the savages of Zululand and the Transvaal, and to open up the natural wealth and develop the pastoral, agricultural, and commercial capacities of that rich and magnificent country. The miner would find there an El Dorado indeed, for from Leydenberg to the Zambesi the land teems with mineral wealth. There is much probability that within this region lay the scriptural Ophir, with which the ruins seen by the traveller Mauch have been identified by many; but gold is not the sole source of mineral wealth, for almost every known mineral may be found there, and amongst them cobalt, a rare and valuable product, even now worked, according to Sir Arthur Cunynghame, at a profit of 4000*l.* a year to the owner of the mine, who bought it for a mere song from its Dutch owner. Then there are the diamond mines of Griqualand West, not yet exhausted, although probably quite sufficiently stocked with adventurers.

But the immense coal-fields of the Transvaal are destined, we believe, to be a source of wealth greater than its gold, silver, and gems, to the mother country, for should it be possible to acquire Delagoa Bay from the Portuguese, or to convert St. Lucia, which will probably be annexed, into a harbour of defence and a coaling station, all our South Pacific ironclads and merchant steamers might here be loaded with necessary supplies to enable them to carry their messages of peace or war to the remotest corners of the world. Vast stores of corn and wine, fruit, spices, cotton, sugar, perhaps also of tea, coffee, and silk, might here be produced and exported, besides flocks and herds innumerable; but this must be a work of time, and would require roads, railways, and particularly irrigation works, for the land is a thirsty land, and the central portion suffers severely from droughts, which, however, might be considerably obviated by the construction of dams and the cultivation of forest trees.

“One may wonder,” says Mr. Donald Currie, “that the bountiful showers which fall in Southern Africa are not collected and stored for the irrigation of the soil and the use of the flocks and

* “Handbook to South Africa,” p. 33.

herds of the inhabitants. I take it that all this will follow a larger immigration and the increase of enterprise and wealth ;” and he adds, “ No greater benefit can accrue for the future development of South Africa than from a well-organised, practical system of free or assisted immigration.”* That there are difficulties to be surmounted ere this can be accomplished must be allowed, one of which† is the immense land journey to be undertaken ere the emigrants could arrive at their destination, and which would also be an obstacle to the profitable export of their produce ; but railways are now planned and partially constructed from most of the ports, and that from Delagoa Bay to Pretoria would soon convey the traveller to the heart of the Transvaal. That the present war will both check emigration and retard the development of the country for a time is certain, but it will only be to enable both to advance again with redoubled energy when peace shall be re-established, although we fear it will be some time before European emigrants with wives and families will be induced to entrust themselves in any number within reach of the terrible Zulus, for it is not a pleasant feeling to know that at any moment colonists may be called upon to fly for life, and put all they value into *laager*, as it is called (that is, within a stockade), to resist a savage foe who may come down in thousands, therefore the pacification of the natives is the one thing necessary to secure the prosperity of Natal and the Transvaal. Failing a sufficiency of European immigrants to equalise in a measure the strength of the two races and diminish the risk of fresh outbreaks, the introduction of Indian coolies and Chinese has been advocated.†

“ To keep a check on the warlike tribes bordering on Natal and the Transvaal, it has been suggested that it would be desirable to establish a species of military colonies on the frontier. . . . European immigrants could not be obtained in sufficient number. . . . Chinese could be obtained by tens of thousands, and if accompanied by their wives and families they would be a most useful body of settlers. Their industry is proverbial. . . .

* “ Thoughts on the Present and Future of South Africa and Central and Eastern Africa,” by Donald Currie, Esq., C.M.G. Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute, vol. viii.

† A suggestion has appeared in some of the daily papers which appears worthy of consideration, which is that tracts of land in South Africa should be offered to young men who have failed to pass the requisite examinations for military appointments, upon condition of guarding the frontier, and these, indeed, might become the officers of Indian or Chinese military colonies and form a strong bulwark against native inroads. Sir George Campbell advocates the employment of Indian troops at the Cape, but to form a permanent Indian settlement would be better still.

organised and commanded by British officers they would be found no despicable soldiers. Assuredly they would be more than a match for any African natives. . . . Established as military colonists, periodically called out for duty and bound by the tenure of the land held by them to do military service when occasion required, upon reasonable payment, they would get rid of the difficulty we now labour under owing to the paucity of European settlers, and, in addition, would bring the country occupied by them into a high state of cultivation.*

Sir Arthur Cunyngame bears testimony to the usefulness of the Chinese as servants, notwithstanding the popular prejudice against them,† and his opinion is shared by many who have the best means of judging according to facts. But the Indian coolie is also destined to bear no inconsiderable part in the future of our colonies everywhere. "In 1859," says Mr. Robinson, "after much troublesome negotiation, Indian immigration (to Natal) was set on foot, and 6000 coolie labourers indentured to employers for a period of five years were introduced. The experiment was so successful that it has been twice repeated, and during last year about 4000 more of these people were landed in the Colony. . . . There will soon be about 15,000 of these industrious Asiatics working in order and amity on African soil and amongst African natives;" and this, Mr. Robinson goes on to show, is a benefit alike to the colonist and to the coolie, who frequently amasses 700*l.* or 800*l.*, buys land, and remains in the Colony when his term of indenture is over.‡ But it will be asked, why send for coolies, when there are already 300,000 natives, and these constantly increasing in the Colony? The reason is that these latter are too well off to work—they have their land and their herds, and will not work for wages, therefore to develop sugar growing, which is rapidly becoming a staple industry in Natal, Indian coolies have to be sought. This horde of natives belong, also, mostly to the warlike and powerful Zulu, refugees from Cetewayo's tyranny, forming a great peril for the 20,000 whites of Natal, for, as Dr. Dale has said, "They are nearly useless except to drink rum;" and the great difficulty which looms in the future for Natal is what to do with this great native population! Happily in the Transvaal, according to Mr. Fynney, the natives are of a different race, consisting "chiefly of Makatee tribes, peaceably disposed, docile, and fond of hunting, both men and women

* *The Colonies and India*, December 21st, 1878. (Leading Article.)

† "My Command in South Africa," p. 28.

‡ See "Glimpses of Natal," by John Robinson, Esq., M.L.S., of Natal. Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute, vol. ix.

cultivating the land—a thing very unusual amongst the natives of Southern Africa.”* Therefore, the frontier securely guarded, there would seem to exist no great impediment to the advancement of the Transvaal, which is probably destined, some-day, to become the granary and storehouse of South Africa, as well as a great health resort for European invalids, for it is allowed to possess a climate probably the finest in the world, where consumption and bronchitis are unknown, and this it owes to its great elevation, in a tropical climate, for the whole country consists of a table-land from 2000 to 8000 feet above sea level, and is mostly well watered, with a bracing climate, very dry in winter and not unpleasantly cold.†

We will conclude this Article in the words of Mr. Robinson, which seem to us to have in them much prophetic truth: “The annexation of the Transvaal has given a new complexion to the prospects of Southern Africa, and made infinitely more hopeful the chances of African civilisation. England, to whom Providence has manifestly confided the work of regenerating this old dark continent, has now before her an open field. No alien Government interposes a barrier in the way. From the shores of Natal to the banks of the Limpopo her flag waves without a rival, and many years will not elapse before it has been borne by the force of events, and the pressure of circumstances, to the valley of the Zambesi. The mission she has undertaken will compel her to move on. No other Power can take her place; no other Power ought to do it. It is for the world’s welfare, no less than for England’s interest, that her rule and her influence should prevail from Cape Town to Nyassa. . . . May we not hope, then, that the earlier toilers of Natal will find some fruition of their labours in the new era that has now set in, and that both England’s statesmen and the world’s citizens will rejoice over the policy which has built up a South African Dominion under the British Crown.”‡

* Paper read before the Royal Geographical Society, January 14th, 1878.

† *Ibid.*

‡ “Glimpses of Natal,” by John Robinson, M.L.C., of Natal. Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute, vol. ix.

ART. VI.—THE IMPERIAL POLICY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

1. *History of Afghanistan, from the Earliest Period to the Outbreak of the War of 1878.* By Colonel G. B. MALLESON, C.S.I. London: W. H. Allen & Co. 1878.
2. *The Eastern Question, from the Treaty of Paris, 1856, to the Second Afghan War.* By the DUKE OF ARGYLL. Strahan & Co.
3. *Imperial India.* By VAL. C. PRINSEP. Chapman & Hall.
4. *Narrative of a Journey through the Province of Kharassan, and on the North-west frontier of Afghanistan in 1875.* By Colonel C. M. MACGREGOR, C.S.I., C.I.E. 2 vols. Allen & Co.
5. *The Khedive and his Calumniators. The Finances of Egypt!* With a Cartoon by W. DALSTON. London: 1878.
6. *Sir Bartle Frere's Memorandum on the Suez Canal.*
7. *Sir Bartle Frere's Note of the 11th January, 1875.* (Published in the *Times* of November*14th, 1878.)
8. *Afghan Correspondence, 1878.*

WHEN a strategic, and even an Imperial necessity seems to be confronted by a moral impossibility, it is obvious which must give way. The strategic and Imperial necessity must wait, for honour is the greatest necessity of empire, and the best strategy is a conviction of our straightforwardness, trustworthiness, and honesty, worked into the heart of the world by our national history. This confidence, in our moral rectitude has been and is one of the greatest factors of our position. It must constantly happen in international affairs that the gravest question is, "What next, and next?" and concessions are granted or refused accordingly. When shares in the Suez Canal were offered first to Great Britain, it was not alone because of her longest purse. We have heard of Russia's "Khivan faith," in justification of our own scientific Indian frontier, and but for her mission to all European nationalities, France might long since have possessed the Rhine. The real necessity of a great Empire, it often becomes the interest of other States to yield, unless the one great condition precedent be wanting—confidence. What is truly the interest of a great and magnanimous community to acquire is, sooner or later, the interest also of the great world

that she should possess, if honour is known to guide her policy, and in such a case time and the spirit of political evolution must be left to solve the problem.

In the case of Egypt we find ourselves dealing with a weak State, which has made for us a highway to India; sold to us some of the shares in that highway, and invited us to rectify, if not to control her finances. Another weak State, Turkey, the suzerain of Egypt, has practically been fighting Russia for us, sustained by our counsel, influence, and gold; and one of the issues of the present difficulty is, that until Constantinople becomes the capitol of a strong federation of the Danubian provinces, or is otherwise independent, the pressure of our greatest possible foe is fended off from our most important thoroughfare in the Suez Isthmus.

Russia cannot break through the Dardanelles Straits, except with a great war. During a great war many things will happen; nor, at its close, will the interests of a State which, in international matters, is the strongest and richest in the world, go without due consideration. Meanwhile the scientific frontier acquired for India ought to give us time, although, perhaps, no more time than we want, for legal, just, and peaceful arrangements in Egypt.

Thus far is certain; for the rest we must wait. There are, for instance, the susceptibilities and interests of Italy and France, but against England these susceptibilities, often more dangerous than interest, will not be so readily aroused; and besides, means cannot but present themselves in the latter to allay the former.

War, purchase, compensation, equivalents, are means to political ends. War we should never willingly wage, but it is a spirit that will come without our calling, and it necessitates re-settlements; whilst purchases, compensations, equivalents, are as current as any other measures of value on the international exchange. It boots not to point out this or that equivalent, or to suggest that this or that may happen, because also it may not happen. The unforeseen always happens. The general principle of worldly change, and the fixed eternal principle and pressure of our individual imperial need, acting on the new wants for altered circumstances of the rest of the world, is enough.

The problem is, "Given certain great and pressing needs of the English Empire, by what political arrangements they can be provided for consistently with the honour and honesty of England?" The double principle of statemanship is "Catholic in conception, Conservative in action." Conservative not only of right, but mindful also and waiting for that

public opinion upon which public policy can now alone be based.

But to suggest that policy and to form that opinion, the conception must before all things be catholic and complete. It is necessary for all men to know and to show the absolute urgency of certain things, not only for the sake of Egypt, of Persia, and of the mighty unknown future of India, but also for the sake of that Anglo-Imperial confederation, without which we can hope neither to compete with other Powers nor to organise our own, and we make no apology for placing these considerations before our readers as clearly as we are able. It is our duty to stand not merely apart from mere Whig or Tory partisanship, but above it—supremely anxious for that supreme procession of energy, intellect, liberty, and law, which goes out from us over all the earth!

As we have pointed out on previous occasions the creation of the Suez Canal, whilst it destroyed the political primacy of Constantinople, altered also the strategical relations of the Great naval Powers, not only of Europe but of Asia and the world, and directly affects all the future conditions of Anglo-Indian policy, Empire, and trade. The Canal put into our hands a weapon which we must guard as our life and with our life. By it French genius enabled Africa to redress the balances of Asia against Russia; it constituted Alexandria the master-key of the strategy of three continents, affecting also, in no indirect manner, a fourth, and made possible to Englishmen now living the realisation of what lately seemed but a dream of the future—a confederation of the English Empire.

And did the Euphrates Valley line of the future already exist, the situation would be practically unchanged in time of war, for though Cyprus were a splendid entrepôt, and the importance of the Persian Gulf and its harbours infinitely enhanced; yet there is nothing in those regions to rival the position of Alexandria as port, arsenal, and fortress, with her double line of communications from sea to sea, and the highlands of Judea in which to shelter a covering army. The Euphrates line, and Alexandria with her rail and canal are both wanted. Each is desirable, and one of them indispensable to our sway.

The Suez dilemma still remains, for the Euphrates line is not yet made; but if the Euphrates line were made, the political dilemma would be still more emphatic: of two things, one, the Euphrates line will replace that of Suez, or it will not. If it will, then we should proceed to make it; if it will not, we should apply the same policy to Suez, and secure a short, safe, and clear thoroughfare for ourselves on our own element.

But, in truth, the continuity of water-passage is of immense value, and the conditions of the two lines are essentially different. The protection of Suez is an affair chiefly of navies, the protection of a Euphrates line would be one of armies. We should fight for the former on our own element, with access at both ends of a short line, and with the Judean highlands as a stronghold and a screen: the latter would be ten times as long, would, of course, secure no water-passage to India, and Asia would be more open to attack and less open to relief from ourselves.

The Suez arguments therefore remain; but if they did not they would only be transferred to the Euphrates Valley, whilst the political dilemma still fixes on the British nation the responsibility of an unsafe peace, and therefore of a comparatively fruitless war. Meanwhile the cardinal fallacies are, we trust, demonstrated: the one, that we can exist as an empire without the danger of empire; the other, that we can exist without a policy of empire. The first is the cant of ignorance, the second is the cant of hypocrisy. We must make our choice; we must either accept empire or we must renounce it, with all its consequences. If we are to have an empire in the East, we may be quite certain that any enemy of ours, the world over, who is able to injure us by attacking it, will do so. If we do not keep danger in our front we shall have chaos in our rear. But having withstood Russia in the Dardanelles, Russia, being human, will prepare a counter-stroke at Cabul. If our officers served against her in Turkey, naturally enough, as the *St. Petersburg Golos* lately said, their officers may some day observe the same severe neutrality in Afghanistan. And if, by our default, Russia once gets a lodgment in that "rocky bastion," which she can only regard as one of the approaches and escarpments of our Indian citadel, we ought to prepare at once to surrender that citadel, or else to turn her out of the bastion at the very first opportunity. Official Russia has and can have no business in Afghanistan except as our enemy, and as such would hasten to concede all the Ameer's stipulations against ourselves or the enemies of his own household. Our policy at Constantinople is, or ought to be made one with our policy for India, or else we have no business in either place. If we cannot conceive a policy of empire, and confront its dangers too, we cannot remain imperial. There will be many to say with the great Frenchman Thiers, "From the heights of Gibraltar, Malta, and even the Cape, the same flag waves. An immense tyranny pervades all seas." But the spirit in which all this must be met is that of the Roman:—

“ Danger knows full well,
That Cæsar is more dangerous than he.
We were two lions littered in one day,
And I the elder and more terrible.”

And the principle on which we must act, is the common sense and honest belief that this one empire was founded and built up by freemen. That wherever our flag waves, our rule is, or shall be made, a real and a mighty advance on all that have preceded it, and on those it has displaced. That not despotism, but the freedom and happiness, the manhood and citizenship of all subject races, is the natural and progressive result of our position and suzerainty.

Therefore it is, that whilst we recommend the minimum of action and interference with frontier tribes or nations, and the minimum acquisition of territory consistent with the defence of our position in India; we must see to it that this opportunity is not allowed to pass without securing that necessary minimum. The more moderate our demands the sterner should be their exaction, and the principle is obvious—that of getting real possession of the passes into India, and of establishing outposts which shall take certain possible attacks in flank or in rear.

At Kandahar the people recollect with gratitude Sir William Nott's occupation from 1838 to 1842. They are friendly, and the Ameer is weak there, for his “kingdom” is a loose agglomeration of jealous tribes; and, moreover, our trade relations with them have of late much increased. Then the Sulaiman range, from Dera Ismael Khan to Dara Ghazee Khan, could no longer shelter covert attacks on the Indus frontier; and if we hold Jelalabad we should control all the passes from Takht-i-Sulaiman to the Hindoo Koosh, on the confines of Cashmere—that is, every pass from Cabul to India, and we should be near enough to Cabul to control and protect an embassy there, if needful, and to influence all Afghanistan. There can further be no reason why we should not purchase from our friends, the Khyberese, the block of mountains which contains and encloses the Khyber Pass, including its western exit. Fortify the Pass, add it to our present Peshawur district, subsidise the present possessors of the Pass, and form with them a perpetual alliance. Although the policy of our Government in Afghanistan is not yet clearly defined, still, as far as it has gone, it appears to be absolutely the right policy; and in this connection Sir Henry Rawlinson's forecast is so suggestive and has been so completely justified by events, that we should consider it well, not only as to Afghan-

istan and the frontier question, but on Indian affairs generally. We quote the following from his "England and Russia in the East," the first paragraphs being from the prefaces to the third edition of that volume, published in 1875 and 1868:—

"As long as the great desert of Kharisin is interposed . . . so long the Afghans are safe, and we may pursue our administrative reforms in India without taking serious note of the affairs of our Northern neighbours; but if the Russian . . . frontier should be thus transferred from Krasnovodsh to Merv—no matter for what purpose, or on what provocation—then the position would be entirely altered, Afghanistan would be directly threatened.

"The necessity of replacing the old policy of masterly inaction by creating, without loss of time, a direct barrier in Afghanistan against further Russian encroachment.

"That the continued advance of Russia in Central Asia is as certain as the succession of day and night. . . . Russia will continue to push on towards India until arrested by a barrier which she can neither remove nor overstep (p. 350).

"The (Afghan) nation consists of a mere collection of tribes of unequal power and divergent habits. The feeling of patriotism, as known in Europe, cannot exist among the Afghans, for there is no common country. In its place is found a strong turbulent love of individual liberty. There is no natural or ethnical reason why Herat and Candahar should be attached to Cabul. Herat is inhabited by races entirely alien to the Afghans. While at Candahar, though the lands were parcelled out by Nadir Shah, in the middle of the last century, among the Duráni aristocracy, the peasantry are everywhere of Persian or Tagits, or Turkish descent, and have no community of feeling with the northern and eastern Afghans, who are the dominant party at Cabul, and especially opposed to the English alliance. I see little prospect of any settled government in the country during Shir Ali's tenure of power. Frontier raids—passes, closed to trade—many injuries and indignities received (pp. 370, 1).

"Our position in India is strong and flourishing. The social condition of the people is rapidly improving. The revenue is increasing; new paths of industry are being opened up. The interest of governors and governed are being identified. Education is spreading, crime being repressed, and justice administered. *All we want is rest; this is precisely what we are not likely to obtain.* The Power which scares away our confidence, and obliges us to embark on the troubled waters of political strife is Russia. The continuous advance of Russia towards India is certain, and we must prepare, therefore, for the contact (pp. 371, 2).

"Knowing, as I do, the western Afghans to be the most contemptible of enemies, and hardly, therefore, caring to consider the possibility of a skirmish in the Bolán or Khojah Passes, the only defensible positions on the line from Scinde to Herat, I still feel

satisfied that we should generally receive the warm support of the great mass of the population in the districts that we traversed. Mindful of past benefits, hopeful of future favours, they would bring in their camels, and empty their granaries to supply our wants. The only parties from whom we should experience ill-will would be the priesthood and a few of the Durani chiefs" (pp. 381, 2).

And Sir Henry Rawlinson quotes Dr. Bellew's work, "From the Indus to the Tigris," thus:—

"The discontent of the people is universal, and many a secret prayer is offered up for the speedy return of the British, and many a sigh expresses the regret that they ever left the country. Our just rule and humanity, our care of the friendless sick, our charitable treatment of the poor, and the wealth we scattered amongst the people are remembered with gratitude, and eager is the hope of our return."

And the Duke of Argyll states (p. 385) that—

"The Government never seem to have bestowed a thought upon the just importance which Sir H. Rawlinson set upon the Persian Mission as the agency through which all possible Russian movements in that direction can be most effectually watched, and without the knowledge of which, if it is well organised, it is impossible that any movement towards the capture of such a place as Herat could be made without months, or, perhaps, years of warring."

In analysing the Afghan correspondence the Duke admits (p. 312) that the Ameer's alarming talk about the advance of Russia "overshot the mark, and showed what his game was—to work on our alarm. He even went the length of implying that the security of the Afghan border was more our affair than his. He trades upon our fear of Russia." He again demanded a dynastic guarantee, and suggested the setting apart of property, either in India or Europe, for his support, as a personal security in case of misfortune, and wished us to organise the Afghan troops, and to send large amounts of money, with great numbers of guns and stores. In criticising Sir Bartle Frere's note on Afghan affairs, the Duke complains of the scant deference paid therein to treaties and rights. But we submit that we must bear in mind the possible in politics, and if, as the Duke shows out of the Ameer's own mouth, the Ameer could not make engagements with us—not being a free agent, either within or without—and the frontier tribes would not make any; how, in the name of practical statesmanship, was the Indian Government to be carried on?

To our mind, Col. Malleson correctly states the question in his introduction :—

“The policy of masterly inactivity . . . becomes inarticulate folly when applied to an Afghanistan contiguous to and leaning on Russia, and under such circumstances it can only mean the resignation to Russia of a territory well described by a German writer as the glacis of the fortress of Hindustan. The pages of this volume will make it clear that the India of the past was really safe, really powerful only when she had her troops cantoned beyond the passes of Afghanistan. The real contest for India has always taken place on the Helmand. The Helmand once passed, and Kandahar once occupied, the Indus has never stopped an invader. No invasion was ever possible as long as Hindustan kept in her own hands the keys of her fortress—the valleys beyond the passes leading to her fertile plains.”

Although the shuttle of intrigue has been flung across Western Asia, from Constantinople to Cabul, the factors in the fight are still the same—the Britannic and the Muscovite Empires and the Mahomedan races. This time it was the intractable Ameer at Cabul who must get some one to guarantee his frontier and his throne against foes within and without. If one guarantor will not do it another had to be sought, and England and Russia must needs shake hands, intrigue, or fight across a territory which no native seems strong enough to hold or able enough to organise, in face of those mighty unknown forces which civilisation has created and which civilisation alone can wield.

Under these circumstances it is natural and necessary to ask, How stand, relatively and positively, the chief parties concerned—how stands, above all, England? What is our strength and what are our weaknesses? We find that between England and Russia, and between England herself in West and East, the same peculiarities and contrasts still prevail of Constitutional and Despotic Governments—although in our case so strangely crossed by action and reaction of the Despotic East on the Constitutional West, of a Premier, in character and opportunity despotic, disposing of resources and guiding destinies created and accumulated by freedom..

Accordingly, we find the action of Russia swift, secret, silent, calculated, as that of India would be were it governed from Calcutta; whilst we others depend on Parliamentary majorities, on the ins and outs of office, on the right man being in the right place at the right time, on the bias for philanthropy or statesmanship; and, as a nation, we learn our geography after war is declared and battles have been fought—we study our maps by the light of blazing towns. Be our policy right or

wrong it may go in or out with a Minister, whilst ignorance may be mistaken for apathy, and both disappear as soon as they have done all the harm possible.

Thus the Caspian, a Russian lake, is the fundamental fact of the Russo-Eastern Question, and Russia, unfasting, unfasting, has worked towards its consummation; Alexandria an English port, fortress, and arsenal, has been always the only possible answer to the Ashourada basis and the Meshed route, for there will the English Empire be braced up or cut in twain. This has been increasingly evident ever since the first Napoleon dashed at Egypt; it is understood by every statesman but the English, yet, with us, the Alexandrian question is a question still, and a question it may remain until we settle it, as is our wont, at last with the roar and the bound of a lion.

In like manner a railway system in connection with an open isthmus and a Persian port, a branch to Ispahan and along the coast to Kurachee, is the necessary complement of Anglo-Indian offence or defence, and years ago we sat upon the plan, and pigeon-holed it—but, until Lord Beaconsfield's Suez Canal and Cyprus policy, we looked in vain even for such statesmanship as could see that to keep India we must first be able to get there!

Imperialism, properly so-called, is simply an attribute of empire, and when men go about to decry it, for party purposes, they might more properly complain of those two great anomalies, in our national character and imperial organisation which do, indeed, so hamper the one and hinder the other. Englishmen, as a nation, do not understand abstract ideas. They must become concrete; we must be able to see, taste, touch, handle, ere we believe; when false policy has lost us a campaign, we begin to see what it is all about. Our Russo-Turkish policy has been so bemuddled, very much because our younger politicians lack courage and ideas, whilst all our older ones are so exclusively occupied with Constantinople, that they cannot even be made to understand the greater importance of Alexandria, that Russia has a basis against India, some 1200 miles nearer to it than is the former city, and the bearing of that fact on our policy.

The other anomaly is in our Imperial Constitution, and each anomaly aggravates the other. In fact we *have* no Imperial Constitution, and then we grumble at Lord Beaconsfield when he fills up the vacuum in an unconstitutional sort of way. We are Imperial Englishmen, but we have no forms by which we can exercise our faculties as such; our Parliament is not Imperial, partly because it is vestry and vestry-ridden, and

it cannot admit of the opposite characteristics at the same time. The hiatus in our Imperial Constitution aggravates the anomaly in our national character,—conscription or a war income-tax, brought about by mismanagement of our Imperial business, may remedy both. No Grand Council of the Empire, in any Elective or Constitutional sense, bringing the realities of Empire home to us, has as yet any chance of existence, and consequently the ideas and passions which always exist in the common people cannot come properly to the support of our real statesmanship.

We, however, have now to make the best of things as they are, and war and rumours of war are sufficiently arousing us. Let us consider, with every sense of responsibility, the very great and real questions that now confront us. As Mr. Bright said, in 1877, at Bradford, “the Canal (Bosphorus) which the Creator of the world made for the traffic and service of the world, has as good a right to be open to the world as the Canal made by M. Lesseps with the money of French shareholders.” True, both have a right to be open, and both are liable to be shut, and the policy which would open the one must be considered together with the policy which may attempt to shut the other; else we may present Russia with the means of straightway attacking our defence of India on our way by the shortest route thither, and at its vitalest point, at the same moment that Russia may herself advance against India from her half-way house on the Caspian. Between the Britannic and Muscovite Empires lies the fate of the Empire, civilisation, and commerce of India, involving, indirectly, also Australia; and the fate of Suez and Constantinople, the two greatest sites and thoroughfares of the world, may have much to do with settling the fate of the world’s two greatest empires.

Is it safe to suppose that we shall never be at war with Russia? Is it safe or practical statesmanship to suppose that we are not likely to quarrel with any Power that would wish to block the Canal against us? Our interests are universal, and no great wars can be localised. Suez may be closed any day. That great thoroughfare is cut through sand. But its twin route to the Red Sea runs on iron, and is easier defended. Shall Alexandria be held by nothing stronger than treaties? Are we to have no material guarantees for its use? Alexandria, the key of the Canal, and of the rail, and which opens or locks the gates of the East? And east of her, the first point is Persia, which, from its vast central citadel, in connection with the inevitable railway of the future, may be made to bar the passage of troops east, west, north, or south. “The only

danger to India," says Schuyler, "lies through Persia. The success of such an expedition would, of course, depend upon which country had the preponderance in Persia;" and again, "if any difficulty with England ever arise, it will probably be in Persia, and not elsewhere." Persia has been enabled by Nature, and would be disposed by self-interest to serve us vitally in any Eastern crisis. She rears her everlasting hills on the very spot whence a Russian army could be taken in flank or attacked behind, and we know, if only from recent analogies, what would be the effect, moral and material, of a small British force holding such positions in concert with a native race. At present, Russia is destroying or absorbing the trade of Persia, as she has absorbed much of her territory. Persia has nothing to fear, and everything to gain from England; Persia has nothing to gain and everything to fear from Russia. In those regions a right policy of trade would at once constitute and forestall a policy of empire.

On these points Sir H. Rawlinson has the following:—

"The Persia of to-day may powerfully affect the fortunes of Great Britain's Empire in the East." (Preface to first edition.) "Strategists will point out that any serious Russian advance from the Caspian in the direction of Merv and Herat would be impossible, if the columns were threatened on the flank from Persia" (chap. ii. p. 137). "The physical capabilities, as well as the intelligence of the Persians, are far above those of the Turks, Indians, Uzbeqs, or Afghans. Ten thousand men . . . commanded by British officers, would not only be a respectable military body, but would elevate the tone of the people, and show what they were capable of," (p. 138).

We can only make room for the following frequent hints from Col. C. M. MacGregor, referring our readers to his volumes. He agrees with our last-quoted writer, that, with discipline and leaders, Persian soldiery would do great things, and adds that they will probably be used for us or against us. He praises their physique and intelligence, especially that of their light cavalry, and assures us that if England does not use the Sarakhs for defence, Russia will for offence; that raids of Turkomans may precipitate Russian measures of annexation and occupation on the road to Herat; that we had better realise the importance of a Persian alliance; adding that Persian officials would make no objection to a complete survey of their country.

The question, therefore, returns with tenfold emphasis, Is England to have a half-way house to her Indian and

Australian Empires, and to her natural and necessary ally? and, if so, Where and how, with what allies, and by what policy? Is this the opportunity or is it not? To appreciate fully the value of Alexandria one must appreciate also the whole system of defence all along the line, and not of defence only, for in great crises attack and defence are one.

Turkey either has or has not the right to the suzerainty of Egypt. If she has the right to it, she has the right to sell it, unless to put some other Power or Powers at a greater disadvantage than at present. But the Power that would be placed at greatest disadvantage by the sale of the suzerainty to another Power is England. Nay, more, in peace England does two-thirds of the carrying trade of the world, and in war or peace the Isthmus is to her absolutely essential. What Power has such pretensions, either on her own behalf, or on that of the world? The question of policy against a people, also, is part of our case, for the people of Egypt would think themselves in paradise could they live under a well-ordered Government; and, on the other hand, the advances of Russia around the Caspian and her latest conquests in Armenia are imperative justifications enough for England. Freedom and trade are universal interests, and the policy of Imperial England is none other than a union of them both. The question remains, of course, of treaty obligations.

The parties concerned in this Suez question are the people of Egypt, the Sultan, the Khedive, and the Mediterranean Powers. The Sultan never has done, does not care to do, and is not able to do one single act for the people of Egypt, but he drains them of blood and gold. They are slaves, he their Suzerain slave-holder. The question of the Khedive is rather a vexed one, and the Khedive may be better than he is painted. Certainly he is the best-abused man in Africa. According to one version he has doubled the taxation in fourteen years, created eighty-seven millions of public debt, and diminished the resources by unproductive public works. By the enormous increase of his private estates, and by the pressure of the *corvée* system, about one million individuals have fallen from the class of small proprietors to that supported by daily labour.

According to others he has spent 10,000,000*l.* on the Canal, 13,000,000*l.* on railways, set up 8000 miles of telegraph wires, dug 900 miles of irrigation channels, built 426 bridges, and two great bridges over the Nile, constructed many roads and the harbour of Suez, and reconstructed that of Alexandria. He has increased the exports from 2,800,000*l.* to 14,000,000*l.*, the

cultivated acreage from 4,050,000 to 5,425,000, and educated 100,000 children against 6000 formerly.*

But of three things we are certain, that the Khedive has made Alexandria and Suez what they are; that he has constructed the Canal, and that he is not Suzerain; and it is the question of suzerainty we are discussing.

Moreover, Egypt *must* be under tutelage to some Power; the Turk cannot hold it, and, with regard to the Mediterranean Powers, we could not consent to the political neutralisation of the Canal, because it is a vital artery of our imperial system. Not only may we, but we must want it for our own armaments; nor can we forego a necessity which would also be a right for the sake, or at the request of parties not so nearly interested. Turkey is in possession, but can guarantee nothing, not even the dredging or the very existence of the Canal. If we, therefore, in possession instead of Turkey, guaranteed its effective and perpetual use and working in time of peace to all concerned, no injury, but a benefit rather, would be conferred on the Mediterranean Powers; and, as for a time of war, the very meaning and interpretation of war is that whatsoever Power is greatest at any given spot, has its own supreme will and way there. To deny *that* were to deny human nature. If, then, our first and chiefest act of war would be the acquisition of Alexandria, why should it not be an act of peaceful settlement? We can't alter the meaning of war because we can't alter human nature; but there is another thing we can't alter—namely, geography. Unless we could neutralise Russia's basis on the Caspian, and its nearness and ready approach to Herat, it is nonsense and child's play for us to talk of neutralising the Canal.

If, therefore, we buy of Turkey that which she has a right to sell, may we not ask what right, save in the interests of universal freedom and international advantage, has Greece, or Italy, or France, or Spain to interfere, and where would be their *locus standi*? If greater world-interests than our own are ever jeopardised by our supremacy on the Isthmus, then greater Powers than our own will unite to protest against it. Meanwhile we are the leading partners in the concern; ours are the greatest interests; we are the safest trustees for the nations. Not only the later advances of Russia in the East, but her very existence in the Caspian and Aral Seas tells us what *our* existence as an Asiatic Power involves. The

* See a curious pamphlet lately published in London, we believe without a publisher's name, and containing a cartoon depicting the Khedive standing on an eminence, baited by a crowd of representative European characters, and, in defence, pointing them to the road to India.

Canal will have to be widened, for thousands and tens of thousands of tonnage are shut out, and undertakings are stifled in their birth, because of its narrowness. The upshot of the matter, therefore, is that no Power could be disadvantaged in time of peace, but the contrary; that in time of war, when the absolute logic of battle is alone conclusive, other Powers could be only slightly disadvantaged, but England vitally. But then those other Powers could only wish to traverse the Isthmus in defiance of us, or to our detriment. Why, then, if we can fairly purchase, should we forego our own vital interests on behalf alone of those who may wish to attack them?

The key ought to be with us, at Alexandria: it is with Russia, on the Caspian: Russia now has not so much to deliver an attack on India, or to excite or profit by the fact of an Indian mutiny, or to interrupt the Suez thoroughfare; and then, if we possess not Alexandria and her iron road to the Red Sea, the question of empire is settled for us as far as delays of weeks and of thousands of miles can settle anything in war. Russia has unlocked the East with one key, "Asbourada," and the door which that key has opened can only be shut by a right use of the Persian mountains over against it, and by an Anglo-Persian alliance. The other key to the East, Alexandria, is in the hands of the Ottoman Turk, and the double door it commands—the Canal and the rail—may, in theory, be flung wide open or slammed in our faces. Anyhow, Alexandria, a fortress, port, and arsenal, in our possession, is the only possible answer to the Asbourada basis and the Meshed route.

We say the key of the situation is on the Caspian, because the initiative of action may at any time come from that quarter, in concert with an initiative of obstruction at Suez, and we are not ready to reply at either place. Without previous command of the Isthmus how could we reach those mountains of Persia, unless with ruinous delay—how command the Caspian coast or threaten the Russian route—how could we swiftly enough reach India? Without a Persian alliance Persian mountains would but cover the flank of Russia's march; we should be reduced to the defensive, and that on the confines of India itself.

These are vital questions! Barring the new frontier, we have made default all along the line. Russia is free and able to act at once, and would at once close the Canal and leave us lagging in the rear. Our nearest help would be at Malta; our nearest basis would be England, against Russia's at Asbourada, and if we wanted one nearer we should have to conquer it at

Alexandria for the occasion. If not taken by a *coup-de-main*, a siege of that city and the stoppage of the Canal would begin about the same time as the Russian entrance into Herat. Ample verge would thus be secured for disaster; valour would again redeem stupidity and dazzle the world; nor, after a decent interval for remorse, need a horrible butcher's bill make us moralise too morosely on the value of foresight and resolution.

It is clear, therefore, that the question of Egypt is a burning question. It must now come to the front, and may, during the coming summer, become an intensely practical one. But the value of Egypt to England, and of England to Egypt, cannot be adequately considered apart from our entire policy and strategy from Alexandria to the Indus, and that also of Russia from Khiva to the Persian Gulf. Besides considerations already named, there is involved the question of our nearer route, *viâ* Suez, to Kurachi, the nearest point of communication with our whole military system is India, with the great frontier passes of the Empire, and the approaches thereto, such as Herat and Candahar. Nor is the subject complete without considering the influence of this nearer route on our Australian Continent and on Africa.

The further question of the rights of the nationality of Egypt, and of the terrible wrongs which are inflicted on her by Turkey and the Khedive, and which are involved in *any* connection with Turkey, affords a moral argument of immense weight and value. The whole platform of evidence respecting Egypt constitutes, we conceive, an irresistible demonstration in favour of change of masters.

There are then four great cardinal facts, representing also four great cardinal changes, in Anglo-Indian and Russo-Indian politics since the days when Constantinople was queen. The first is that, as things stand to-day, Russia could, in case of war, strike at India from her nearest base thereto, a base 1200 miles nearer than Constantinople. The second is that she could, at the same time, seek to close the Canal, thus forcing our legions of relief to go by the Cape, or otherwise to their disadvantage. The third fact is that Russia could, by the same means, prevent our flanking her from the Persian mountains. The fourth fact is that Russia may now be enabled to proclaim herself the champion, instead of the foe, of the Mahommedan races.

The first of these great facts is already irrevocably settled in favour of Russia. By her railways, flotillas, and armaments, and by the incessant propagandism of her diplomacy her basis at Asbourada, on the south-east corner of the Caspian,

is established. There is, however, a possible means which may or may not be used for checkmating her action even there, but it depends on our reversing our policy of self-effacement in Egypt, and on our availing ourselves of Persian strategy and of a Persian alliance. The latter we have disregarded, if we have not spurned, from the days of Sir Henry Rawlinson's embassy until now. The second fact, the possible stoppage of the Suez route, presents yet the aspect of a grand alternative. Can we make up our minds, in the interests of civilisation and of Egypt as well as our own, to neglect no just means of acquiring Alexandria, and thus not only secure the best means of defending the Suez outlet, but also the means of forwarding troops by rail to the Dead Sea? The Canal might be obstructed, even by accident (and if let alone would soon obstruct itself, for only ceaseless dredging keeps it clear), but Alexandria once ours it would take half the fleets of the world to prevent our landing troops there, and several armies to cut the rails and to hold them against us. The third fact is almost as serious as the second, of which it would be the result. The championship of the Mahommedan races remains still a great unsettled factor in the Eastern Question. Russia already has not been far from appropriating it, and we have done what we could to facilitate the process.

Now, taking the fact of the Asbourada basis and its consequences, it seems to us not possible for England long to disregard the Alexandrian solution of the difficulty. We have said that it is possible to checkmate Russia on the Caspian; to make Persian mountains—provided we could get to them—answer the Russian lake and harbour. But the same dilemma exists for Persia as for India. Without possession of the Isthmus we may be sent round by the Cape, or disadvantaged to an equal degree, when most we want a short cut and *because* we want it.

Russia has already, at Asbourada, halved her distance from India; she would thus, at the same time, be enabled to treble ours. We must, therefore, either occupy Alexandria or accept the situation, and the situation is that by the Russian advance to Asbourada, acting together with pro-Russian obstruction on the Isthmus, our virtual distance from the needful point at the supreme hour of the empire's agony may be found increased by more than 3000 miles.

And the question really pretty well narrows itself to this, for we are not supposing any half impossible advance by Balkh or Khiva, but by routes where armies often have marched and may now march much more easily. It is not even essential to suppose a Russian advance at all; it is only necessary to

suppose a crisis in India, and that troops must be had, *viâ* Suez. In that case it would avail us little that Hindustan is a natural fortress, for the danger would be within it. Nor would it avail us much more that we have rapid means of concentration there if we lacked the men to concentrate. Nothing would then avail us but a firm grip, not alone on the Canal, but on the Isthmus. Russia has long set machinery to work which if left alone will absorb and control the Persian Empire and its resources, and has already done a great deal too much towards it. Long since the Persian flag was forbidden even in trade to appear on what was once a Persian sea, whilst her only harbours there have become Russian. The railway extended to Tiflis and projected to Tabreez, in Persia, will infallibly draw the Persian trade, to the detriment alike of Persia and ourselves, and all the world but Russia; with the Batoum harbour, and the rail from the Black Sea to the Caspian, and from the heart of the Empire to Tiflis and Tabreez, the machinery will be tolerably complete, and the possession of Kars and other Armenian fortresses would but crown the work. Russia would then either use or obstruct any inter-continental railway from Scutari, *viâ* the Euphrates, Indiadwards, and unless we secure ourselves at Egypt it will avail us nothing that at many points along the coast from where it would touch the Persian Gulf eastwards, that line would be in communication with our mercantile marine, and under the control of our navy.

Several years since Col. V. Baker calculated that "in twenty years the Russian regular army would consist of 3,000,000 trained men, minus losses, besides about 400,000 frontier Cossacks, and an additional 5,000,000 in reserve, minus losses;" with this awful embodiment of power, with Persian resources and strategy Russianized, and thrust like a wedge between us and India, and with our route to India liable to be *elongated* at Russian option by several thousand miles, it seems plain to us that the will of destiny or of Peter, or of our own folly, may, in various not improbable contingencies, be near its consummation.

Of course recent Russian progress in Armenia tightens the bonds of Persia, morally and materially; but, in order to realise the precarious nature of the Suez question, let us consider what would be the effect on English opinion of the slightest direct advance of Russia towards Suez. Why, it would awake the English nationality as did "the shot heard round the world" that of America; or, in the more recent instance, of the sudden kindling of the North against the South! The powder magazine is there, heaped up ready, and the train is laid. It

wants but the spark. Policy against policy, and we are invulnerable, for the reservoir of population on which we ought to be able to draw is, compared to that of Russia, as 235,000,000 to 90,000,000; whilst India is a fortress approached through deserts, and England is an island, and in money and ships the contrast is superlative and superfluous. But impolicy against policy, isolation against concentration, with Persia absorbed and used against us, with our half-way house at Suez unsecured—our trade, civilisation, and Empire seem likely to be alike abased before a Power whose diplomacy is never at fault, and which reaches from St. Petersburg well nigh to the Persian Gulf, and from the Oxus to the Danube.

In the East, moreover, the construction of railways is only a matter of time, and they will completely obviate those difficulties of transport supply and want of water, upon which the security of India from attack now depends. The Caspian, a Russian lake, we say, is the fundamental fact of the Russo-Eastern question, for there Russian influences concentrate, and thence they are meant to radiate. Alexandria, in the hands of the English, is the only adequate answer on behalf of English interests. Railways, commerce, and strategy are the weapons which Russia wields, and the Caspian will soon be directly connected with the whole Russian system; whilst from Krasnovadsh, a splendid harbour, there are easy gradients from the eastern shore of the Caspian along the ancient bed of the Oxus, a position which may, by our default, confer on Russia the strategical and commercial command of Western Central Asia. There are plentiful water supplies and easy routes along the Attek from Asbourada, *viâ* Kisil Arvat, to the north, or Koochan and Meshed, to the south; and a third and more difficult route to Meshed by Subsawar. Even from Tabreez and Teheran to Herat there are no engineering difficulties. The world is busy with projects for connecting Persia with west and east, and when we consider that from Teheran to the gate of India is only some 600 miles, we should be astonished were it not so.

To be absorbed by Russia or used by England seems the manifest destiny of Persia. She *must* be under the tutelage of the one Power or the other. But making Ispahan a railway centre, with branches to Bagdad, Teheran, and to the coast, we should draw the trade to Ispahan, and thence to our ships and rails. Ispahan would recover its old position as chief town of the Persian Empire, and the capitol would then be far removed from the Russian frontier whilst brought close to our own base of operations. Sir Henry Rawlinson remarks on this question (p. 351) that "a far more reasonable project (than a Russian

one) would be a line from Bushire, by Shirac and Ispahan, to Teheran; would not only throw the goods of Europe and India into Persia, with a minimum expense of land carriage, but would furnish the country with a possible military equipoise to the pressure from the north."

Want of continuous internal water communication should lead Persia to depend on our railways, just as the extraordinary fertility of her northern territory, which can thus alone be connected with the ocean, and, with a system of free interchange, points to the same conclusion. Further, her great central desert plateau so hinders communication between north and south that the physical or material unity of Persia can only be accomplished by such a railway system as would subserve also her commercial freedom and political independence. As the Suez Canal has created a new strategy, so Russian operations around the Caspian have created a new need for it. For the first time in history a real Russian attack against India, and a real defence of it by England have become possible. The Persian Gulf is the English *point d'affair*; Ispahan would be the natural commercial and railway centre of such an alliance, and the Persian mountains its watch-towers and fortresses.

Strategical and commercial preponderance in Asia will rest with the Power that first completes its railway system. But this, again, seems to depend for us on Suez, and Suez on Alexandria. Without them the proposed intercontinental rail from Scutari to Bagdad would be too much under Russian control; with them Alexandria would give us an impregnable basis and a certain thoroughfare, and show us how to command the railway system which will command the East. For us, with the Isthmus in our grasp, railways and ships are the whole Eastern question; but the supreme value of Egypt consists in this, that without it no other part of the defence can be thoroughly worked, whilst with it our weakest point becomes our strongest.

If progress consists of the advance of certain great principles, races, and systems, and policy of a carefully-prepared defence and a rapid and impetuous attack, it follows that a policy worthy of empire must represent or coincide with interests that are universal, whilst using to the uttermost its own particular advantages, and it is because the principles, races, and systems of Russia and England both are advancing, and of the future, that they need not come into collision. All true progress is parallel, and true policy comprehends that and acts upon it. Essential antagonisms are between bad systems, or between good and bad, and all others it is the business of policy to allay and to accommodate. "La politique," said the great Napoleon, "c'est la fatalité" (destiny). The quarrel

between Russia and Turkey is real, because, conterminous empires, one is of the past and the other of the future; and, moreover, the conflict is at every point—principles, races, and systems. If, on the other hand, there is any quarrel between Russia and England, it cannot be one of essentials. To prove a necessary quarrel between Russia and England, we must prove that one of those Powers has no destiny, or is not fulfilling it. But if ever Empire had a manifest destiny, that of Russia is to organise a certain portion of the East. To quarrel with Russia for doing this is to quarrel with her for fulfilling an exact parallel destiny with our own.

We have said that any worthy policy of Empire must tend not only to the interests of Empire, but to the progress of the race, and this has been pre-eminently true of England from the time when we vindicated the freedom of the seas against Spain, and the Empire of the mind against Rome. Our trade, civilisation, and religion have everywhere replaced anarchy and inaction with life and progress. Canada, North America, Africa, Australia, Egypt, India, all tell us the same tale, and it is taken up right round the world. It is manhood everywhere that we have implanted, developed, or set free,—the manhood that goes from progress to progress, from conquering to conquer,—the manhood that trades, thinks, acts, labours, and believes.

After her kind, also, it is the destiny and duty of Russia, we say, to organise vast regions, and to reclaim their savagery by force and will. It is the duty and happiness of England, at a far higher level, and by a more consummate policy, whilst organising government, to develop also individual freedom. Russia's work is rudimentary, ours complex. Russia deals more with blind force, we with living citizenship and with the peoples' will. Each system has its weak point—ours is that perilous transition-time from an armed occupation to some sort of representative system, which is ages nearer in India than it can be in Russia.

But in considering a policy of empire, we are bound to regard not any one Power alone, but all Powers; not any one policy that may be hostile, but all policies and combinations that may be injurious. For we can prepare no thorough system of defence without looking out for allies, and considering plans of defence and of attack on every side; and as Russia must always, or for many ages, be our chief neighbour in the East, we are bound to regard any vantage-ground she may hold over against our road to India as a possible opening against us. Hence her advance beyond a certain point India-wards would necessitate an increase in our Indian army and in

our Indian taxation. Her encroachments Persiawards, especially on the northern frontier of Persia, would undoubtedly menace or destroy the basis of our best defence or attack against Russia, *en route* to India. Her further establishment on the south-eastern corner of the Caspian would be a direct preparation for such encroachment, and for moral and material ascendancy over Persia, whilst her preponderance at Constantinople would enable her to strike, with tremendous vantage and effect, at our Suez thoroughfare. And, to crown all this, should she form a real alliance with Turkey, her position, so often vaingloriously boasted, as champion of the Mohammedan races, might haply, working together with other forces, shake the fabric of our Eastern Empire to its base.

The danger, therefore, of Russian aggression is no jest or dream, nor is its bitterness lessened by the fact that our own impolicy has put into Russian hands the possible lever of Mahomedan fanaticism. Had not England broken through her long continued indifference and inaction in Central Asia, it is difficult to see what elements of power for successful invasion Russia could want that she does not already possess, except time and opportunity. This may seem a hard saying, but it is easy and plain enough to any man who will take time to examine a few facts thoroughly and judge them fairly. We say it is a question whether England will or will not take now the few easy but momentous steps necessary to secure herself the victory, lest we see the gates of the East closed against ourselves at Alexandria, and flung wide open to Russia on the Caspian.

The question now has wider and truer issues than ever before: one epoch of the Anglo-Eastern question closes and another opens. Hitherto isolation has been the condition on which we have held India, now all this is changed and changing. We must accept responsibility or defeat; we must control the strategy of Merv, Herat, and Quettah; we must connect them by railways with their Indian base, or let Russia connect them with hers; we must support, or continue to desert Persia in her struggle against Russia for trade, frontier, and existence; we must secure to Persia her mountain frontier, or prepare to see Russia march past it to threaten us from Herat; we must keep real possession of the Khyber and other passes; we must defend the Suez canal in the best way possible, or risk the loss of our communications with India.

There are, in fact, at present, two Eastern questions, *each* more important than the *direct* question at Constantinople. The one is of that imperial Britaunic confederation without which we can hope neither to compete with other Powers, nor

to organise our own: the other is that of our mighty unknown future in India. The *strategic* connection between these two questions is the Suez Isthmus; and those who maintain that Constantinople has nothing to do with our confederated, or with our Indian Empire, have to maintain one of two things; either that a hostile Power, at Constantinople could not strike with tremendous vantage and effect at the Suez thoroughfare, or else that a difference of weeks, or of thousands of miles between opposing or supporting Powers is, in warfare, a matter of no importance.

It is therefore essential that Englishmen prepare themselves, whilst considering the question at Constantinople, to consider it wholly and in all its parts—not as a Turkish or Russian question, or even alone as an Indian question, but *as an Imperial English question*. The common sense of Englishmen tells them that there is and must be an Eastern question, inasmuch as we have not only India to protect, but Australia to communicate with; it tells them that Russia is the likeliest and the only apparent foe to attack India; it tells them that the Mediterranean end of the Canal is, if not the only, the fatalest place at which she could strike—and that striking there at Indian, she cannot but strike also at Australian communications; it tells them that we must be ready not only to parry, but to anticipate that blow; and it tells them, therefore, that we have to complain somewhat of the cowardice, the ignorance, or the prudery of statesmen who have failed to set these things and their inevitable issues plainly before Parliament or the people.

The Suez Canal is the key to the riddle of many centuries and of three continents. It directly affects every part of the Anglo-Indian question. Persia, which was before as practically remote as Japan, is brought by it almost to the gates of the Mediterranean. It alters altogether the conditions under which the Anglo-Russian contest for trade, commerce, political influence, civilisation, aye and the chief control of the world of Islam has to be fought out, and is equivalent to the creation of a first-class Power always bound to promote all our interests in all those respects!

A mixed policy of trade, civilisation, and empire will doubtless increasingly rule the future of England, but all alike demand prompt action in Egypt. Is there anything in sound political morality to hold us back? By her present connection with Turkey, Egypt loses her men, her land, her money, her freedom, her past, her present, and her future! Rid of her present rulers she would rise, at a bound, in all things that make a nation, or that ennoble a state.

Consider the spacious harbours, the fertile shores, the splendid sites, the far reaching seas, the noble rivers, and all the lost opportunities and vantage for war and peace, for trade, commerce, and civilisation! For what human purposes can such have been created unless entirely the reverse of those to which they have been appropriated? Without details about atrocities and maladministration, what is Egypt but a bankrupt slave State? what is the whole Ottoman empire but one wide imperial bankruptcy? By what right, again, that other nations can be called on to support or approve, does the Turk hold the keys of three continents? By what right does he bestride the main thoroughfares of the world to close and obstruct them against the world? Time was, before the projection of Russia into or towards Central Asia, and before the creation of the Suez Canal, when Turkey was a real obstacle to Russian advances, but now the Turkish flank is turned on the north-east by the Caspian, and on the south-east by the Suez Canal.

And as to interests really Turkish, they should, of course, be those of the people, and not those of their rulers. They must be those not of the Khedive, but of his slaves; of living populations, not of dead theories or a rotten dynasty! By freeing Egypt from bad government we should restore her to herself. Everything Egyptian, except its parasites and slave traders, would exult in our suzerainty, and would quadruple in value at the bare announcement. With a natural system of alliances and a common-sense policy, we can have no reason at all to fear Russia in the East or anywhere else. But it has been clearly shown that, Russia apart, even though Russia and Constantinople both were blotted from existence, we could never secure our route to India without securing Alexandria as an English port, arsenal, and fortress.

What, then, should be England's policy? It is written on the map, and in high principles of international right. It is known to our foes, who would foil it. Let us state our policy, and let it be one of English and of universal interests. Let us have no contradictions of principle. Let us not deny to Russia the freedom of the seas,—that were to deny at once our principles, policy, and trade. Let us watch for a just and fair opportunity, and one is sure to come for at least the suzerainty of Lower Egypt. Let us recover the Persian alliance. It is by far the cheapest way of blocking the Russian advance against India; it is the only way by which our whole Eastern system of trade, policy, and strategy can be combined. Necessarily, the policy of the present cabinet is a waiting policy, at least as regards the reconstruction of the Ottoman empire, or the

realisation of her assets. So far, however, it is a policy of Constantinople rather than of Persia and Alexandria, and, except her recent frontier policy, it is rather one of leaving Russia's road to India open, and of allowing England's real road thither to be closed.

Mr. Prinsep, who has had good opportunities of observing, thus ably puts the *morale* of our position in the East:—

“Do Englishmen realise the fact that it takes as long to travel from Bombay to Delhi by rail as from London to Brindisi, and from Bombay to Mysore as long again. Yet neither Mysore nor Delhi are the limits of our empire; that we should have acquired this vast empire is one of the marvels of history. The secret lies in the contrast we present in our characters. We are the complement of the native. We owe our success to the squareness and solidity of our character. Our thoroughness inspires his respect. There is no Power that can take our place in the country. If we were to go, the flames of war would light India from the Himalaya to Cape Comorin. I have talked with eminent natives on the subject, and they have always said, ‘It is peace that our nation wants. We have had no time to develop. We want education and knowledge.’ They think we have been sent to govern them by the gods. It is this moral force of our rule rather than the physical that maintains our authority.”

To these considerations we will add two final ones.

First,—whatever the intentions of the Russian government, is it possible for the Russian army, quartered in remote regions and in rigorous latitudes, not to seek stir, excitement, and promotion, and to covet vehemently more southerly quarters, such as beset the whole circumference of their empire? Bulgaria, Constantinople, Teheran, Tabreez, Balkh, and Merv, all offer this double inducement; and just over the present Russian border are those magnificent provinces of Persia, Ghilan and Mazanderan, now utterly neglected, but the richest belt of country in the world—coal and iron beneath, and lemon and orange groves above. Merv, distant only some 300 miles from Khiva, has a fine climate and extraordinary fertility, comprises an oasis of 90 miles in circumference, and once possessed a million population. It is but 140 miles from the banks of the Oxus, and Khiva is on the Oxus. It has also water communication with Herat, nearly complete, by the Moorghab river, and is but 240 miles from that town. Thus, easy and natural would be the Russian approach to Merv, “the key,” and thence to “Herat, the gate” of India. In like manner, Balkh is but 270 miles from Cabul, which covers from the west the famous Khiber Pass and Peshawur. Ghilan and Mazanderan would absolutely command the Persian capitol, and extinguish all hopes of Anglo-Persian strategy

and policy by appropriating their very basis; whilst Tabreez in Russian hands would be perilously near any inter-continental railway, and the harbour Batoum would receive supplies direct for all that region.

Second,—in case of any war endangering India we should move upon Alexandria as surely as a magnet turns to the pole. Despite all political doctrinaires or factious opponents, the road to India would be kept. The nation would will it; like lightning, the impulse would speed through our ranks. A minister, any ministry who opposed it, would disappear like thistle-down before the whirlwind. What! should *we* stand being sent “round by the Cape?” Should we allow the waterway of our empire to be cut in two, and assemble our navies on either side to inspect the incision? Should we allow our Empire to be lost, whilst the country, nay, the continent we have saved, holds out its hands for our occupation? Should we look on whilst Russia broke up the Canal, and fail to seize Alexandria’s alternative route by rail to the Dead Sea, simply because the most bankrupt and infamous government in the world holds that port and city?

Surely our interests are too imperial, too all embracing to be surrendered to a policy that grasps no vital facts or living rights, and that would be not only anti-British, but anti-human. Our Empire is one and indivisible, and so also is its right of way, and none the less so because England’s right coincides with the world’s interest. We misread the spirit not only of any present, but of any possible English statesman, if, before this crisis is past, there have not been discovered many reasons—Indian, Egyptian, English and human—why we shall never be barred at the Isthmus. The English nation is not effaced, nor is any English statesman likely to propose to efface either his country or himself. But events may now any day force upon us a choice of policies. In the stress of whatever first great war, we *must* make sure our salvation of the Empire at the Isthmus; nor could our statesmen justify themselves to the Empire, to posterity, or to the world at large, of whose best interests we are the safest and most trusted depositaries, or even to Egypt itself, were we to promote war in order to gain Alexandria in the resulting confusion, instead of endeavouring to conciliate and satisfy all treaty rights whilst frankly and boldly seeking that suzerainty of Egypt which it is the interest of several Powers for us to acquire. Better far at once purchase it of the Ottoman than expend more than the cost, as well as incur the guilt and damage, of a great war for that which we may acquire without it. Haply England may soon have but to stretch forth her hands for the equity of Egypt’s redemption.

ART. VII.—THE EARLY EVANGELICAL LEADERS.

1. *Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography.* By the Right Honourable Sir JAMES STEPHEN, K.C.B. New Edition. London: Longmans, Green, Reader and Dyer. 1875.
2. *Reminiscences of Many Years.* By LORD TEIGNMOUTH. Two vols. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1878.

THOSE who are familiar with Sir James Stephen's charming volume may fairly think that his essays on "Richard Baxter," "The Evangelical Succession," "William Wilberforce," and "The Clapham Sect," leave nothing to be told as to the early leaders of the Evangelical party in the Church of England. But it is over thirty years since the last of these essays first appeared in the *Edinburgh Review*, and it is twenty-five years since the volume received its last additions and corrections from its gifted author. Since that time the publication of various works—e.g., Lord Macaulay's *Life*, and notably the "Reminiscences" mentioned at the head of this paper, have thrown fresh light on the lives and characters of some of the worthies commemorated by Sir James Stephen. Many also of our readers will not remember the first appearance of the essays; others may not have studied them in their collected form. We shall not, therefore, be merely repeating an oft-told tale if we briefly sketch the lives and careers of the men whom—adopting Mr. Gladstone's definition of a hero as one "who pursues ends beyond himself by legitimate means, as a man, not as a dreamer"*—we venture to call the heroes of English Evangelicalism.

Few men were better qualified for the work of an historian than was Sir James Stephen. "It seems to me," wrote Lord Russell to the Prince Consort, in recommending Sir James for the Professorship of Modern History at Cambridge, "that experience in the practical business of life is a good foundation for an historian. Xenophon, Tacitus, Davila, Guiccardini were all men engaged in political or military affairs."† Lord Teignmouth tells us that in Lord Russell's estimation, Sir James Stephen was "the ablest man he had ever known," and the noble reminiscence adds his own testimony, to which we cordially give our assent—"That Sir James was signally qualified for the authorship of these essays by his rare talents and accomplishments, by integrity, collegiate, and professional training, enlarged experience of public life, eminent literary acquire-

* In his recent lecture at Hawarden, on Dean Hook.

† "Life of Prince Consort," ii. 203.

ments, and the command of a style of composition, rich in varied excellence, no less than by personal familiarity with most of the personages whose characters he portrayed.*

To Sir James's possession of another qualification for his work, whether as professor or biographer, and one as desirable as it is—especially in Ecclesiastical biographers—rare, the Prince Consort bears testimony. "We have had Sir James Stephen here," the Prince writes to Stockmar from Osborne, "and I was able to have much conversation with him. Never have I seen an Englishman with a mind more open and free from prejudice. I understand now why he was unpopular; for he hits hard at the weak points of his countrymen."† This habit of hard-hitting is so freely indulged in in the most popular of these essays. "The Clapham Sect," in which the writer portrays the relations and friends of his youth, for whom he had the warmest affection, that on its first appearance in the *Edinburgh Review*, a very general impression prevailed—we ourselves shared it—that the essay was written in an unfriendly spirit towards the eminent men to whom the writer inappropriately gave the collective name of the "Clapham Sect." But we must turn from the biographer of the Evangelical leaders to the men themselves.

On Richard Baxter—the subject of the seventh of Sir James's essays—Dean Stanley confers the title of "The Oracle and Patriarch of Evangelical Nonconformity." He was this; but he was much more. He had none of that narrowness which is a note of Evangelicals, conforming or nonconforming, and which led Arnold to describe them as people "of infinitely little minds." Baxter deemed that the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Decalogue contained the essentials and fundamentals of religion, and maintained that "no particular words in the world are essential to our religion, otherwise no man could be saved without the language those words belonged to." When pressed by some brethren of the straiter sort that such wide terms of fellowship would admit into the Church the abhorred Papist, and yet more dreaded Socinian, Baxter replied, "So much the better, and so much fitter it is to be the matter of our concord. For myself, I will take no narrow name. I will be a Christian, a mere Christian, a Catholic Christian."

* "Reminiscences," vol. i., appendix, p. 370. Sir James was appointed Legal Adviser to the Colonial Office in 1813, Counsel to the Board of Trade, 1824, Assistant Under-Secretary to the Colonial Office, 1834, Permanent Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, 1836. Professor of Modern History at Cambridge, 1849. Professor of Modern History and Political Economy at Haileybury, 1855.

† "Life of Prince Consort," *ubi supra*.

"That much abused word, Catholic," says Dean Stanley, "was to him the expression of his dearest convictions. He always used it in its original sense of 'Universal,' 'Comprehensive.'"

This preference of moral and spiritual to dogmatic Christianity, and this dislike to creeds and tests, Baxter impressed upon the group of Churches which in his day were known as "Presbyterian,"—which are in nowise to be confounded with the branch of the Scottish Presbyterian Kirk now existing in England. This freedom from dogmatic theology, the practice of free and open communion, and the abandonment of any attempt to maintain Presbyterian Ecclesiastical order,* led the English Presbyterian Churches to become Arminian and Arian in doctrine, until Priestley, Belsham, and Lindsay arose, and taught the doctrine of Christ's simple humanity, and the English Presbyterian Churches, forgetting the old Baxterian traditions and hatred of party badges, assumed the name of Unitarian.†

‡If Baxter be thus not only the Patriarch of Evangelical, but also of unorthodox nonconformity, it is not less true that his writings, more especially his "Saint's Everlasting Rest," and his "Call to the Unconverted," influenced the theology both of the men who were the founders, and of those who afterwards became the leaders, of the Evangelical Party in the Established Church.‡

The origin of that party, however, was not Baxterian. Its source is to be traced to the great Methodist Revival, and to its Calvinistic, not its Arminian element. George Whitfield, and not John Wesley, must be looked on as the founder of the Evangelical Party. How and why Wesley, originally a High Churchman, became unwillingly, and perforce a Dissenter, it is beside our purpose to consider. Whether Whitfield had not the ambition or the organising skill to become the founder of a new church we know not. He remained to his death a Minister of the Established Church, preaching in its pulpits when he had the opportunity, holding no preferment in the Church, but making no attempt to found a sect. Whilst Wesleyan Methodism and its various offshoots are numerous, organised, and influential

* The Provincial Assembly of Presbyterian Ministers of Lancashire and Cheshire, however, has held its yearly meetings for more than 200 years, and still annually holds them.

† *Vide* Dean Stanley's Address at the inauguration of the statue of Richard Baxter, July 28th, 1875, as published in *Macmillan's Magazine* for Sept. 1875, and the letters of the Revs. J. J. Tayler and Jas. Martineau, in the Notes.

‡ "Reading Baxter" is a very frequent entry in Wilberforce's diary, and in his "Practical View" he says—"It may, perhaps, be truly affirmed that the writings of few, if any, uninspired men, have been the instruments of such great and extensive benefit to mankind as those of Mr. Baxter."

bodies, there is not, nor ever was, any religious body bearing the name of Whitfield. The Calvinistic Methodists perpetuate his theological teaching, but they are a much less influential body than the parent stock of Methodism, and most of the Churches sprang from it, while the "Ministers in the connection of Selina, Countess of Huntingdon"—a connexion formed, we believe, for the preservation and extension of Whitfield's Calvinism, are not now to be distinguished in their theology and teaching from other orthodox Dissenting ministers. Warburton bestowed on Whitfield the name of Fanatic, which he was not; others of his cotemporaries gave him the milder name of Enthusiast. An Enthusiast, in the best sense of that word we think he was—no man who was not in that sense an Enthusiast, ever accomplished, as Whitfield did, a great work; but he was not, to use again the language of Mr. Gladstone, "A wild Enthusiast, pursuing his ends by unlawful means, and so excessively given to certain ideas and objects of his own that he loses all the proportions of his nature."*

The true description of him is, we think, that he was a natural orator and actor, whose oratorical and histrionic gifts were applied to religious teaching.

Born the son of a publican in Gloucester, he was educated at the Grammar School of St. Mary de Crypt in that city, and while there showed the qualities we have attributed to him. "He studied the English dramatic writers, and represented their female characters with applause, and when the mayor and aldermen were to be harangued by one of the scholars, he was selected to extol the merits, and to gratify the taste of their worships."†

In his youth he showed a strange mixture of bad passions and devotional feelings. Weary of school, he became "professed and common drawer for nigh a year and a half at the public-house, now kept—his father being dead—by his mother. Yet under these untoward circumstances, he found leisure to compose sermons, and stole some hours from the night to study the Bible." "A thorn in the flesh, and a messenger of Satan to buffet him," was a quarrelsome sister-in-law, a dweller with the family at the Bell Inn, who drove him, to use his own words, "to retire and weep before the Lord, as Hagar, when flying from Sarah." To Bristol he fled, as to a city of refuge, and there he devoted himself to the study of Thomas à Kempis. Returning to Gloucester, he resumed his dramatic studies. But the time had come when he was to find his calling in life. He became a servitor at Pembroke College, Oxford, and found his

* *Ubi supra.*

† Stephen, "Essays," p. 381.

experiences as a "Common Drawer" useful to him in his new situation. "For," he says, "many of the servitors being sick at my first coming up, by my diligent and steady attendance, I ingratiated myself into the gentlemen's favours so far, that many who had it in their power chose me to be their servitor."

At Oxford, Whitfield came under the influence of the Wesleys—then themselves under the influence of the mystic William Law, whose "Serious Call," had, ere this, powerfully impressed the mind of Samuel Johnson, as years afterwards it influenced the mind of John Henry Newman. His joining the then small set of the Wesleys did not increase his comfort. Solicited to join "in excess of riot," with others of the servitors, he refused, "and his limbs were so benumbed by sitting alone in his study because he would not go out amongst them, that he could scarce sleep at night."

The Master of Pembroke threatened to expel him if he persisted in visiting the poor, a practice much insisted on by the Wesleys. "I had no sooner," he writes, "received the sacrament publicly at St. Mary's, on a week day, but I was set up as a mark for all the polite students that knew me to shoot at. . . . I daily underwent some contempt from the collegians. Some have thrown dirt at me, and others took away their pay from me."*

The effigy of one of the humbler students at Pembroke College—Samuel Johnson—now adorns its gate. We have yet to learn whether later generations of Pembroke men have atoned for the contumely poured by their predecessors on the former servitor of their college, by any memorial of him whose labours in his day and generation were alike far more abundant, more valuable, and, in their results, more enduring than those of the Fleet Street sage.

Being thus brought under "a state of concern," the theatrical element in his character showed itself by "dressing to admiration," to quote Sir James Stephen, "the character of a penitent." He thought it unbecoming the character to "have his hair powdered, and wore woollen gloves, a patched gown, and dirty shoes."

We have neither space nor inclination to quote the language in which, with the unction common to all Evangelicals, he describes the state of mental agitation and despondency through which he passed, until, to use his own phraseology, "The spirit of mourning was taken from me. For some time I could not avoid singing psalms wherever I was, but my joy became gradually more settled."

* Quoted in Dr. Birkbeck Hill's "Dr. Johnson: his Friends and his Critics," pp. 28, 29.

The former tapster now returned to his own city, whither the fame of his piety and talents had preceded him; and so great was it that the Bishop of Gloucester offered to ordain him deacon, though he had not yet attained the age of twenty-one years. After another period of mental distress, he was reluctantly ordained deacon. "When the Bishop," he writes, "laid his hand upon my head, my heart was melted down, and I offered up my whole spirit, soul, and body."

The history of his itinerant ministry, both in England and America, we must compress into the compendious statement of one who knew him well. "In the compass of a single week, and that for years, he spoke in general forty hours, and very many sixty, and that to thousands; and, after his labours, instead of taking any rest, he was engaged in offering up prayers and intercessions with hymns and spiritual songs, as his manner was, in every house to which he was invited."*

No one can deny that Whitfield was a great orator; not only did the "common people hear him gladly," but men like Hume, Franklin, Pulteney, Bolingbroke, and Chesterfield admitted his oratorical genius, while neither courtiers, bishops, cautious Scots, callous slave dealers, nor North American Indians were proof against the charms of his eloquence.

We think it is no less true that he was a great actor. Read his sermons, and they differ in little but in length and, perhaps, in want of polish from the evangelical sermons commonly heard forty to fifty years ago. The impression they produced on the hearers was the effect of the preacher's voice and manner. "Sometimes," says a witness, "the preacher wept exceedingly, stamped loudly and passionately, and was frequently so overcome that, for a few seconds, one would suspect he could never recover, and when he did, Nature would require some little time to compose herself."

His power over the sympathies of his hearers was unsurpassed by any orator of ancient or modern times. The effect of his preaching was not to make them say, "What a fine preacher!" but to produce in them a spirit like that which of old animated the hearers of Demosthenes, and made them cry, "Let us march against Philip." "The agitated assembly caught the passions of the speaker, and exulted, wept, or trembled at his bidding."

Amongst Whitfield's constant hearers were Foote, whose farces of "The Hypocrite" may partly have been inspired by his attendance on Whitfield's ministry; and Garrick, who was not above learning from one who, had he given way to his early

* Quoted by Sir James Stephen, "Essays," p. 365.

propensity for the drama, would have proved a powerful rival. Both Foote and Garrick agreed in the remark that "Whitfield's oratory was not at its full height until he had repeated a discourse forty times." In fact, the more he studied his part the better he acted it.

With this agrees the testimony of Franklin :—

"I came," he says, "by hearing him often, to distinguish between sermons newly composed and those he had preached often in the course of his travels. His delivery of the latter was so improved by frequent repetition that every accent, every emphasis, every modulation of the voice, was so perfectly timed, that, without being interested in the subject, one could not help being pleased with the discourse—a pleasure of much the same kind as that received from an excellent piece of music."*

The words which were first spoken to the Hebrew Prophet may be applied to Whitfield in reference to Franklin and his other rational and sober-minded hearers :—

"Lo, thou art unto them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice, and can play well upon an instrument, for they hear thy words and they do them not."†

Dr. Johnson, with his usual dogmatism, said to Boswell :—

"Whitfield never drew as much attention as a mountebank does; he did not draw attention by doing better than others, but by doing what was strange. Were Astley to preach a sermon standing upon his head on a horse's back, he would collect a multitude to hear him; but no wise man would say he made a better sermon for that. I never treated Whitfield's ministry with contempt; I believe he did good. He had devoted himself to the lower classes of mankind, and among them he was of use. But when familiarity and noise claim the praise due to knowledge, art, and elegance, we must beat down such pretensions."‡

There was no lack of knowledge, art, and elegance in the ministry of the establishment in Johnson's time, but it had no hold on the people. There was much more than eccentricity, familiarity, and noise, in Whitfield's eloquence. He spoke from the heart to the heart in language "understood of the people" on subjects which have in all ages had the greatest attraction for the human mind, and so fixed the attention of hearers who would have placidly slept while Johnson's friend, Bishop Percy, read for a sermon one of Addison's moral essays in the *Spectator*, with a text prefixed.§

* *Vide* Stephen, "Essays," pp. 394, 395. † Ezekiel xxxiv. v. 32.

‡ "Boswell's Johnson" (Standard Library edition), p. 375.

§ This is said to have been done on at least one occasion by Bishop Percy.

So far from Johnson being right in saying that Whitfield "never drew as much attention as a mountebank," Sir James Stephen, in his brief sketch of Whitfield, tells of several occasions on which he riveted the attention of multitudes "brought together for purposes the most strangely contrasted with his own." On Hampton Common he found twelve thousand people assembled to see a man hung in chains, and forthwith improved the occasion. Another execution was delayed for an hour that not only the crowd, but the wretched convict, may listen to the great itinerant. At Basingstoke Fair he mounts a stage erected for a wrestling match, while the crowd eagerly listened to his "testimony against such lying vanities."

At Moorfields, on Whit-Monday, he had a stiff encounter with a Merry Andrew, and after three hours' praying, preaching, and singing, "retired to the Tabernacle with his pockets full of notes from persons brought under concern, and read them amidst the praises and spiritual acclamations of thousands. Three hundred and fifty awakened souls were received in one day, and I believe the number of notes exceeded a thousand."*

It is remarkable that while the abolition of the slave trade, and subsequently of colonial slavery were the great achievements of the Evangelical Party in the day of its power, its founders looked upon slavery as perfectly lawful and Scriptural. John Wesley regarded the slave trade as "that execrable villainy which is the scandal of religion, of England, and of human nature." Slavery as "the sum of all villainies," and American slavery as "the vilest that ever saw the sun;"† but Whitfield not only was a slave owner, but condemned the law which at that time forbade the introduction of slaves into Georgia. He could placidly write in his journal "*Blessed be God for the increase of the negroes. I entirely approve of reducing the orphan house as low as possible, and I am determined to take no more than the plantation will maintain, till I can buy more negroes.*"

It is due to Whitfield's memory to point out that his purchase of negroes was only for the purposes of the orphanage he had founded, and that he had in view the moral and spiritual elevation of his slaves. It must also be borne in mind that except the Society of Friends none of the Churches in England or America had as yet borne any testimony against either slavery or the slave trade.‡

* *Vide* Stephen, "Essays," pp. 396, 397.

† See his "Letter to Wilberforce." Stephen, "Essays," p. 520.

‡ All the members of the original Slave Trade Abolition Committee formed in London, in 1787, except two, were Quakers. Wilberforce, "Life," vol. i. p. 151.

Next in the pedigree of the Evangelical Party comes John Newton—the child of Whitfield, and the father of a numerous spiritual progeny. As in the case of his spiritual father many circumstances connected with Newton's youth seemed ill-calculated to produce the Evangelical minister of the future. Early left motherless, he in his twelfth year began a sailor's life in a vessel of which his father was master. He had received much religious instruction from his mother, and as he says "took up and laid aside a religious profession three or four times before he was sixteen years old."

At one time he gave nearly his whole time to spiritual study and meditation, was much in prayer and fasting, and carried his scrupulosity so far as hardly "to answer a question for fear of speaking an idle word." This state of mind, in an after and wiser mood, he denounced as "gloomy, stupid, unsociable, and useless." A chance perusal of "Shaftesbury's Characteristics" easily led him to adopt sceptical opinions. Human affection then came into play, and for the love of Mary Catlett, then in her fourteenth year, he abandoned his ship, was pressed into the Royal Navy, became a lieutenant, deserted, was recaptured, and degraded to the rank of common seaman. He then exchanged into a merchant ship on her way to the Coast of Africa. Here, to use his own words, he became "exceedingly vile." He became the overseer of a slave depôt on the "Gold Coast," and sank into a bondage little, if any, better than that of the slaves themselves. He next became a partner in a slave depôt, and "began to be wretch enough to think himself happy: in the language of the country, the white man was becoming black."

• Rescued by a friend of his family—not without unwillingness on his part—from this degraded and degrading position, he became a master mariner, and made four slave-trading voyages. With a placidity equal to that of Whitfield, and which even the horrors of the middle passage could not disturb, he tells us that he experienced in his last voyage to Guinea "sweeter and more frequent hours of Divine communion than he had ever elsewhere known;" he at another time said, "no employment afforded greater advantages to an awakened mind than the command of a slave ship."

During the time occupied by these four voyages the religious impressions of his early life revived. His marriage with the object of his early attachment also tended to reclaim him from his vicious habits. While absent from home he mixed much with religious society in the West Indies, and in North America. There he met Whitfield, whose "ministry was exceedingly useful to him." Compelled by ill-health to give up a seafaring life, he became a landing waiter in the Custom House at Liverpool.

His leisure hours were devoted to study. He became able to read the Scriptures in the original Greek and Latin, made himself acquainted "with the best writers in Divinity—at least in his estimation—in Latin, French, and English." The result of these studies and of Whitfield's ministrations was a fixed resolve to "find a public opportunity to testify the riches of Divine grace, thinking that he was, above most living, a fit person to proclaim that faithful saying that Christ Jesus came into the world to save the chief of sinners."

"He that seeketh findeth," the desired opportunity was therefore soon found, and after "some small attempts in a way of preaching and expounding" amongst Dissenters, to whom he gravitated, he was persuaded by friends to seek, and by their influence found, admission into the ministry of the Established Church. In the thirty-ninth year of his age, the former sailor, slave-owner, slave-trader—and if we are to take his own oft-reiterated testimony against himself—the almost reprobate, was ordained deacon, and became curate of Olney, in the county of Bucks. He resided at Olney for sixteen years, and there, as is well known, became the friend of Cowper and of Thomas Scott the Commentator, whose religious opinions he succeeded in settling and in moulding after his own fashion. During these years he published many sermons and religious letters, some so-called poetry, likewise of a religious kind, and a work on Ecclesiastical History. His labours at Olney, though abundant, were not successful, and he was driven away "by the incorrigible spirit prevailing in the parish." A field of labour far more important and auspicious than Olney now opened to him. John Thornton, then the head of a family which has for generations, even until now, supplied the Evangelicals with leaders, and ever supported the party with all its wealth and influence, obtained for Newton the rectory of St. Mary Woolnoth, in the City of London. For the remaining twenty-seven years of his life Newton officiated in the church of that parish—a dark, cumbrous, and wholly unæsthetic pile, which stands at the corner of Lombard and King William Streets—if, indeed, it has survived the operation of the Acts of Parliament for reducing the number of City churches, and if no church restorers or decorators have, vainly we fear, attempted to wash the blackamoor white.

The position and influence of a City clergyman, then, was widely different from what it is now. Then, the merchants, bankers, and wealthy tradesmen lived in it; the City clergy resided in their parishes and preached to numerous wealthy and influential congregations. Now, in the great majority of City parishes, on the Sunday the clergyman comes in from the suburbs, officiates to a score, and often less, of persons, in many

instances attracted by the bribe of sharing in the parochial charities, or in the sacramental alms—in others by direct payment—and then returns home, to enter his parish no more until the time comes for the next repetition of the solemn farce.*

From Newton's Lombard Street pulpit he exercised a deep and widespread influence, and helped forward the rise and progress of the Evangelical party within the Establishment, then, to quote Sir James Stephen, "deeply imbedded in the mudbanks of a somnolent orthodoxy." To extricate the Church from these mudbanks, and set it well afloat, was the task proposed to themselves by Newton and his fellow-labourers. This task they began, and their successors completed. For a party leader Newton had many disqualifications: his was a hard, unsympathetic—it is not saying too much to add—coarse nature. We justify this assertion by quoting his own account of his conduct at and after his wife's death.

"I took," he says, "my post by her bedside, and watched her nearly three hours, with a candle in my hand, till I saw her breathe her last. I was afraid of sitting at home and indulging myself by poring over my loss, and therefore I was soon in the street, and visited some of my serious friends the very next day. I likewise preached three times while she lay dead in the house, and after she was deposited in the vault I preached her funeral sermon with little more sensible emotion than if it had been for another person."

And then he gives an instance of conjugal forethought certainly rare, and we hope unexampled: "I preached from a text which I had reserved from my first entrance on the ministry for this particular service, if I should survive and be able to speak."†

As a preacher he had no pretensions to rank with Whitfield or with Wesley. We have the evidence of his friend and follower, Richard Cecil,‡ "that he appeared to least advantage in the pulpit, as he did not generally aim at accuracy in the composition of his sermons, nor to any address in the delivery of them. His utterance was far from clear, and his attitudes ungraceful."

He also appears to have been guilty of the unpardonable sin of preaching without any premeditation on his subject. Yet his

* We await with interest the report of the Royal Commission on the parochial charities of the City of London. The amount devoted to the support of week-day lectures in the City churches would astonish those unacquainted with the facts. Owing to the changed circumstances of the City, these lectures are now utterly useless.

† *Vide* Stephen, "Essays," p. 409.

‡ Minister of St. John's Chapel, Bedford Row, long a well-known Evangelical place of worship.

influence as a preacher was, beyond all doubt, exceedingly great—the secret of his influence lay in this, that at a time when the orthodox clergy inanimately read to listless hearers, their moral essays with all the coldness of Blair, but with none of his elegance of style, the honest old sailor, with the earnestness and energy of a man whose faith in the message he had to deliver was as real and undoubting as his faith in his own existence, bore his testimony to that truth which, as we have seen, he thought himself above most men living most fitted, and therefore most bound to declare. Another source of his influence was his varied and extensive correspondence on religious subjects. He may be called the *De Sevignd* of the Evangelicals. Unfortunately he did not wait for others to give his letters to the world, when death should have removed him and his correspondents from the scene; but with characteristic want of feeling, he, during his life, published, under the significant title of “Cardiphonia,” a selection from his correspondence. With what feelings Cowper and his other friends saw the unrestrained utterances of Newton’s heart to them on the most sacred and private of subjects advertised in the papers and exposed for sale on booksellers’ counters, may easily be imagined. The book, however, gained a wide and long-enduring popularity, and is still, we believe, occasionally republished.

We have mentioned that Newton, during his stay at Olney, formed the acquaintance and influenced the opinions of Thomas Scott, whose name stands next on the bead-roll of Evangelical leaders. Like Whitfield and Newton, his early career gave no promise of his future. The son of a Lincolnshire grazier, he received such education as a country grammar school in the middle of the last century could give. On leaving school he was apprenticed to a medical man, from whose service he was dismissed for some unrecorded but “gross misconduct.” Returning home, he passed the next nine years of his life “in the most laborious and dirty parts of the grazier’s business.”

Finding that his hope of succeeding to his father’s farm was not to be realised, and desiring to escape from the life of a farm servant, he devoted himself to the improvement of his education, and with the intention of taking Orders he “mastered many classical and some theological books.” Tossed on the sea of learning, “without one landmark, or one friendly star,” without rudder, compass, or pilot, he drifted into a state which he describes as “nearly Socinian and Pelagian, and wholly Arminian.” A century ago bishops were not too inquisitive as to the real opinions of candidates for Orders, and Scott, in the state of belief we have described, having first, as then by law required, subscribed his “assent and consent” to the “Popish liturgy and the

Calvinistic Articles," became a deacon of the Established Church and curate of a parish near Olney. "The powers," to quote Lord Macaulay, "which erring man calls fate and chance," led him to become an occasional hearer of Newton. Scott at first despised Newton and challenged him to a controversy, which Newton prudently declined. An offer of preferment was now made to Scott; his acceptance of it would have involved a re-subscription to the Articles, rather than make which he willingly remained a poor curate. This offer, and his intercourse with Newton, however, led him to review his opinions and for the first time to study orthodox theology. In the end, he passed from the influence of Socinus, Pelagius, and Arminius to that of Augustine, Athanasius, and Calvin. The steps by which this change was effected he told the world in a book to which he gave the title "The Force of Truth." A devoted Evangelical, the late Bishop Wilson of Calcutta, pronounced this work to be only second and scarcely inferior in value to the confessions of St. Augustine himself. It used to be—perhaps still is—a great favourite with Evangelicals. It is interesting, as is any book which narrates the writer's mental history; and as to its matter, it may fairly claim an equality with the "Apologia pro vita sua" and the "Phases of Faith," though in point of style it is not to be compared with either of these works. It was not, however, "The Force of Truth" which gave Thomas Scott the reputation and influence which he long enjoyed. His "Commentary on the Bible" is one of the standard works of Evangelical theology. It was to be found in the house of almost every one holding those opinions, not only in England but in America, and in many households the reading of a portion of the Commentary formed part of the family worship.

Francis Newman rightly describes Scott as "a rather dull, very unoriginal, half-educated, but honest, worthy, sensible, strong-minded man."* Nevertheless, so great was the reputation which his "Commentary" and other long since forgotten works gained for him in Evangelical circles, that we find in the "Apologia" that John Henry Newman, while yet under the Evangelical influences which governed the early days of both the Newmans, meditated a reverential pilgrimage to the parsonage of Aston Sandford, of which parish for the last eighteen years Scott was the rector. He lived and died neglected, if not despised, by the hierarchy of the Establishment; but esteemed and admired by the most active and zealous of its members, who perceived and felt that "Thomas Scott, the comparatively unlearned, the positively unskilful, and the superlatively unamus-

* "Phases of Faith," p. 8 (ninth edition).

ing commentator, had descended further into the meaning of the sacred oracles, and had been baptised more copiously into their spirit, than the most animated and ingenious and accomplished of his competitors.*

We may justly apply to John Newton the terms in which John Stuart Mill speaks of Bentham and of Coleridge, and call him "the great seminal mind" of the early Evangelicals, for not only did he inspire Thomas Scott, the expositor of Scripture of the party, but also Joseph Milner, its ecclesiastical historian. Newton, during his residence at Olney—with but slight qualifications for the task—wrote and published some "Observations on Ecclesiastical History," in which he attempted "to trace the Lutheran or Evangelical system from the Apostolic Age until it faded away before the growth of Papal errors in the sixth and following centuries."

His friend Cowper thought that Newton had in some respects showed his superiority as an historian to Gibbon, but in this judgment Cowper was solitary. The "Observations," however, attracted the attention of Joseph Milner, and inspired him with the idea of writing a "Church History" on the same principle. For this task he was much better fitted than Newton. Milner was one of the clergy of Hull, and head-master of the Grammar School of that, his native town. A member of the University of Cambridge, and respectably proficient in classical knowledge, he had the still more important qualification for a Church historian, of a much more familiar acquaintance with the Greek and Latin Fathers, than was then usual in this country. He devoted all his leisure and the resources of his mind to the composition of his Church History. He did not live to complete his plan, but left his account of the German Reformation to be finished by his brother Isaac—of whom we shall hereafter speak—and the work was in the end finished by John, one of the sons of Thomas Scott the commentator.

"The Church History of Joseph Milner," says Sir James Stephen, "is one of those books which may perish with some revolution of the moral and religious character of the English race, but hardly otherwise."† The book has not perished; but it is at present under an eclipse.

"The Church of England," says Dr. Martineau, "heedless of the contradiction, manages to be both a Sacerdotal Church and a Solifidian Church."‡ At this moment, and for a time, the sacerdotal element in the Establishment has completely eclipsed the solifidian, and with it Milner's Church History, which is

* Stephen, "Essays," p. 429.

† "Essays," p. 438.

‡ Address at Manchester New College, 1871, entitled "Why Dissent?"

entirely solidian in spirit and purpose. When the Pauline and Lutheran doctrine of the Articles shall re-assert its domiuiou in the Establishment, the Church History of Joseph Milner may emerge from behind the clouds and regain its popularity.

While Newton was the living illustration of the principles of the Evangelical school—the “living epistle known and read of all men”—Scott their interpreter of Scripture, and Milner their ecclesiastical historian—Henry Venn was “their systematic teacher of the whole Christian institutes.” Henry Venn’s forefathers, from the Reformation downwards, had been clergymen, and his sons and grandsons have carried on the liue of Evangelical succession to our own days. He was, at the beginning of his career, in the early years of George the Third’s reign, vicar of Huddersfield—not then the large and important manufacturing town it now is. Driven by ill-health to resign that incumbency, he became rector of the small parish of Yelling, in Huntingdonshire, where he continued twenty years. “He,” we are told by Sir James Stephen, “lived in a long and friendly intercourse with Whitfield, and officiated with him in places of public worship which rejected Episcopal control.”*

Venn was celebrated as a preacher, and remarkable for his power of conciliating and winning over people who were prejudiced against him and his doctrines. Some now living can call to mind the traditions handed down by a few aged men and women in Yorkshire, who loved to dwell on their personal recollections of their apostolical teacher. But it was by his “Complete Duty of Man”—“a perfect and continuous view of the Evangelical system of Christian ethics”—that Venn gained his reputation, and exercised his influence; and which, re-edited by his grandson, long kept alive both his memory and his influence. Like Scott’s “Commentary” and Milner’s “Church History,” it is at this time greatly diminished in popularity.

With Henry Venn the first generation of the leaders of the Evangelical party ends. We now turn to the second generation—that remarkable group of men to whom Sir James Stephen has infelicitously given the name of “The Clapham Sect.” Mr. Trevelyan tells us that Lord Macaulay used to point out that Thackeray fell into an error in “introducing too much of the Dissenting element into his picture of Clapham. The leading people of the place, with the exception of Mr. William Smith, the Unitarian Member of Parliament,† were one and all staunch Churchmen, though they readily worked in concert with those religious communities which held in the main the same views and pursued the same objects as themselves.”‡

* “Essays,” p. 444. † He sat for Norwich for many years.

‡ “Life of Lord Macaulay,” p. 61.

Mr. Thackeray was a stranger to the "holy village," as some derisively used to call it, and his mistake was natural; but that Sir James Stephen, who was certainly in his youth much at Clapham and reared under its influences, should have made a similar mistake, we confess surprises us. In fact, as Lord Teignmouth—whose earlier years were also spent at Clapham—truly says, "the title of 'Clapham Sect' is doubly a misnomer, for the leaders of the religious movement, traced by Sir James's graphic pen, abjured the practice no less than the profession of sectarianism, whilst of the fourteen individuals whom he selects as his representatives only six were resident at Clapham.* Spite of its misnomer, this essay deserves the praise which Macaulay, writing to one of his sisters at the time of its first publication, gave it. "I think," he says, "Stephen's Article on the Clapham Sect the best thing he ever did."† From the style of the Paper, some, at its first appearance in the *Edinburgh*, attributed its authorship to no less a person than Macaulay himself. It could only have been written by one who had, like Macaulay or Stephen, lived at "dear old Clapham," as the former in his later days called it, and was familiar with its Common. "That delightful wilderness of gorse bushes, and poplar groves, and gravel pits, and ponds great and small," where Lord Teignmouth and his schoolfellows played at soldiers, and in which character the younger William Wilberforce frequently endured the punishment of flogging at the hands of a negro bandman, while his father was "exerting his strenuous efforts to rescue the negro from the similar usage of the white."

On that Common, also, "little Tom Macaulay" played with his contemporaries at "leopards, a game of which he never tired," and the "Mount" on it he "regarded with infinite awe, as being the nearest approach within the circuit of his observation to a conception of the majesty of Sinai;" while the later dispensation was represented by the singularly ugly "church with its absurd painted window with the dove, the lamb, the urn, the two cornucopias, and the profusion of sunflowers, passion-flowers, and peonies," which Macaulay in the days of his fame notes in his diary he "loved for the sake of old times," and where he also records "he heard a Puseyite sermon very different from the oratory which he formerly used to hear from the same pulpit."‡

"The scattered pastors of the Evangelical school," says Lord Teignmouth, "had lacked concentrated action, when a group of distinguished laymen professing its tenets selected Clapham as

* "Reminiscences," vol. i. p. 386: Appendix. † "Life," vol. i. p. 68.

‡ *Vide* Macaulay, "Life," vol. i. pp. 28, 29; vol. ii. p. 25. Teignmouth, "Reminiscences," vol. i. p. 3.

their residence, under the auspices of John Venn," Rector of Clapham, and son of that Henry Venn whom we have referred to as the friend of Whitfield, and who himself bore a prominent part in the Evangelical movement.

Whether or not it was the "awakening ministry" of John Venn which attracted these laymen to Clapham does not appear; but by selecting a common place of residence they secured, to quote Lord Teignmouth, "a rallying point of counsel and enterprise—a lever by which they verily moved the world." "For the truth is," writes another of their decendants, that "from that little knot of men emanated all the Bible Societies, and almost all the Missionary Societies, in the world. The whole organisation of the Evangelical party was their work. The share which they had in providing the means for the education of the people was great. They were really the destroyers of slavery and the slave trade;"* and, without the aid of the Evangelical party and their outdoor agitation, the efforts of Romilly and Macintosh for the amendment of our criminal law might have remained fruitless. We are glad to be able to cite Mr. Trevelyan's testimony to the fact that "without the aid of Nonconformist sympathy, and money, and oratory, and organisation, the efforts of the Clapham leaders would have been doomed to certain failure."†

Many of the Clapham leaders were, as Lord Macaulay pointed out, "public men of the greatest weight. Lord Teignmouth had governed India at Calcutta, Grant governed India in Leadenhall Street, Sir James Stephen's father was Percival's right-hand man in the House of Commons, and Simeon's real sway in the Church was far greater than that of any primate."‡

First and foremost among the group of Evangelical leaders stands *William Wilberforce*, well described by Sir James Stephen§ as "the Agamemnon of the host, the very sun of the Claphamic system;" and by Sydney Smith as truly, but in more homely terms, as the "head of the Patent Christians of Clapham."

The life of this excellent person was originally given to the world by his sons, Robert Isaac, at one time Archdeacon of York, but afterwards a pervert to the Roman Church; and his more celebrated brother, the orator of the bench of Bishops of our day, Samuel, successively Bishop of Oxford and Winchester. The earlier part of the work was composed by the Archdeacon, who read much of his manuscript to Lord Teignmouth. "The composition," says our Reminiscent, "was, as

* "Teignmouth," vol. i. p. 362.

† Macaulay, "Life," vol. i. pp. 61-68.

‡ *Vide* Macaulay's Letter to his Sister, "Life," vol. i. p. 68.

§ Mr. Wilberforce's only sister was the second wife of Sir James's father.

might be expected, excellent, but the style was dry, and the plan was changed, and a more prominent share in the work was assigned to the Bishop."

Towards the end of his life, the Bishop, when he had departed very far from the Evangelicalism of his father, and become more and more a High Churchman, published in one volume a compressed and expurgated edition of the "Life." This edition presents William Wilberforce in quite another light to what he really was—less Catholic-spirited than in the true sense of that word he really was*—more of a mere Churchman, and less of the Evangelical leader. Whoever would know what Wilberforce was should read the original edition of his life, not neglecting the additional light thrown on it by Sir James Stephen's personal recollections of him, which are embodied in the ninth of the Essays now before us.

Sir James Stephen, comparing the second generation of Evangelical leaders with the first, says:—

"They adopted the same creed with equal sincerity and undiminished earnestness, but with a far keener sense of the hindrances opposed to the indiscriminate and rude exhibition of it. Absolute as was the faith of Mr. Wilberforce and his associates, it was not possible that the system called 'Evangelical' should be asserted by them in the blunt and uncompromising tone of their immediate predecessors. A more elaborate education, greater familiarity with the world and with human affairs, a deeper insight into science and history, with a far nicer discernment of mere conventional properties, had opened to them a range of thought, and had brought them into relations with society of which their fathers were comparatively destitute."†

Our readers should bear this comparison in mind in reading our brief notices of the Clapham leaders. Let us add that both they and their fathers, like the Puritans, were illustrations of the fact that "intense exclusive conviction fastened on a single object, and discerning truth and right in nothing else, is the frame of mind, however unworthy of the philosopher, that fits men for decided vigorous action and leads to immediate practical results."

We have said that the Evangelicals were like the Puritans, and so they were, if, indeed, it be not more accurate to say they were Puritans themselves, for we agree with the writer above quoted that "the fundamental idea of Puritanism, in all its forms and ramifications, is the supreme authority of Scripture acting directly on the individual conscience as opposed to a reliance on the priesthood, and the outward ordinances of the

* *i.e.*, in the sense in which Baxter used the word.

† "Essays," p. 537.

Church. To realise the standard of faith, worship, and conduct recorded in Scripture has been ever the object of Puritanism,"* and, let us add, was the object of the early Evangelicals.

William Wilberforce was born at Hull, 24th August, 1759. His father was a merchant of that town, but traced his descent from a family who long possessed a large estate at Wilberfords (the original name of the family) in the East Riding of Yorkshire. From the first, William's constitution was feeble, and we are told by Lord Teignmouth that from his early youth he took, by the advice of his medical attendants, a small but not increasing dose of opium. In stature he was low, and in person slightly deformed, and throughout his life suffered much from an affection of the eyes. He first went to the Grammar School of his native town, of which Charles Milner, the historian, and his brother Isaac were the masters. Even in his earliest schooldays he showed a characteristic which remained with him to the end. "So rich were the tones of his voice, and such the grace and impressiveness with which it was modulated, that the Milners would lift him on the table that his schoolfellows might admire and imitate such a model in the art of recitation."†

His father died ere the child had attained his tenth year, and he was entrusted to the guardianship of an uncle. His father left him a large fortune, which was largely increased by a bequest from his guardian uncle. He was removed from the Grammar School at Hull to a private school at Wimbledon, where his uncle resided. This change appears not to have improved his education or promoted his comfort, but it involved his coming under influences which materially affected his career. His uncle's wife was a disciple of George Whitfield, and under her guidance he formed habits of devotion and acquired a knowledge of the Bible which produced their fruits in his later life. His mother, probably from the dislike of Methodism, then common in the upper and wealthier classes,‡ removed him from Wimbledon to the Grammar School of Pocklington, in his native county. "Had I stayed," he said afterwards, "with my uncle, I should probably have been a bigoted, despised Methodist." This change of school led him to "some general knowledge of polite literature, and to an intimate acquaintance with the best dinner-tables in that part of the county of York." Thence he passed to St. John's College, Cambridge. At the distance of more than eighty

* John James Tayler, "Retrospect of Religious Life in England," p. 85, and p. 196, second edition.

† "Teignmouth," vol. i. p. 246; "Essays," p. 469; "Life," vol. v. p. 53.

‡ This is illustrated by a remark made by Wilberforce's grandfather, "If Billy turns Methodist he shall not have a sixpence of mine." "Life," vol. i. p. 7, note.

years from his joining that college, his distinguished son, the late Bishop Wilberforce, spoke of him at a meeting in St. John's as "one trained for his after-deeds of greatness within the walls of your own college"—a very eloquent oratorical compliment to the Johnians, but unfortunately it had no foundation in fact. "His college companions," says Sir James Stephen, "were hard-drinking, licentious youths, whose talk was even worse than their lives. His teachers did their best to make and keep him idle. The single problem proposed for his solution was, 'Why should so rich a man trouble himself with fagging?' and no Johnian Archimedes could find the answer."*

From college he passed, within six weeks after he had attained his twenty-first year, to the House of Commons, which he first entered as member for his native town of Hull. In connection with this election, a townsman of Wilberforce's, General Perronet Thompson, delighted to tell a story received by tradition from his elders. The mob, passing Wilberforce's house, recognised at the window his only sister, and greeted her with the cry, "Miss Wilberforce for ever!" a compliment which she received with a remark, the terseness and candour of which were equal—"God forbid!"

Coming to London, he mixed with a dissipated set of young and fashionable men. But he became the intimate friend of one of a very different stamp, the younger William Pitt, whom he pronounced "to be the wittiest man he ever knew, to whose mind every possible combination of ideas seemed always present, and who could at once produce whatever he desired." In the company of Pitt and their friend Eliot, Wilberforce started for a summer tour in France. This was suddenly put an end to by a message to Pitt from George the Third, summoning him to aid in opposing the Indian Bill of the Coalition Ministry, and turning out its authors. In the memorable struggle which followed, Pitt had no more zealous or effective supporter than Wilberforce, and afterwards, during their joint lives, Wilberforce at all times exercised very considerable influence over Pitt. At a county meeting held in the Castle Yard, York, in March, 1784, he denounced the "Infamous Coalition" with a vehemence which gained the assent of the freeholders there assembled. "I saw," says Boswell, who was present, "what seemed to be a shrimp mount upon the table, but as I listened he grew and grew until the shrimp became a whale." The result of this appeal to his fellow Yorkshiremen was that he was selected by them as an independent candidate to wrest the

* This is abundantly proved by a letter of Wilberforce to Dr Frewen, who had been one of the tutors of St. John's, given in the "Life," vol. v. p. 144.

representation of the great, and then undivided, county of York from the powerful confederation of Whig families, who had long controlled it. This he did without a contest, and kept uninterrupted possession of the seat for nearly thirty years.

He was now in his twenty-fifth year. Accompanied by some of his relatives, and his former schoolmaster, Isaac Milner, he again set out on the Continental journey, which the political struggles of 1783-4 had interrupted. His early religious impressions, though clouded over, had never been effaced. Isaac Milner had become a sincere and thorough member of the Evangelical party. Through Milner's influence, or, in the Evangelical phraseology, "through the influence of the Divine Spirit, and by the instrumentality of Milner," Wilberforce experienced that change of feeling which the Evangelicals call "Conversion,"* and from that time he resolved to devote himself, and did unceasingly and unsparingly devote himself, to "the reformation of manners, and the abolition of the slave trade." For the tasks which he set himself he had many qualifications.

"The influence," says Lord Brougham, "which the member for Yorkshire always commanded in the old Parliament; the great weight which the head, indeed the founder of a powerful religious sect, possessed in the county, would have given extraordinary authority to one of far inferior personal endowments. But when these partly accidental circumstances were added to his powers, and the whole were used and applied with habits of industry which naturally belonged to one of his extreme temperance in every respect, it is difficult to imagine any one bringing a greater force to the aid of any cause which he might espouse."

Sir James Stephen, who could scarcely remember Wilberforce in his best days; and Lord Teignmouth, who certainly did not hear him until quite his latest, speak rather disparagingly of him as a Parliamentary speaker. But Lord Brougham, his successor in the representation of Yorkshire, whose recollections of him went back to an earlier date, says:—

"His eloquence was of the highest order. It was persuasive and pathetic in the highest degree, but it was occasionally bold and impassioned, animated with the inspiration which deep feeling alone can breathe into spoken thought, chastened by a pure taste, varied by extensive information, enriched by classical allusion, sometimes elevated by the more sublime topics of Holy Writ—the thoughts and the spirit

'That touched Isaiah's hallowed lips with fire.'

Few passages can be cited in the oratory of modern times of a more electrical effect than the singularly felicitous and striking allusion to

* Wilberforce was also much influenced by the Nestor of the Evangelicals, John Newton.

Mr. Pitt's resisting the torrent of Jacobin principles: 'He stood between the dead and the living, and the plague was stayed.' The singular kindness, the extreme gentleness of his disposition, wholly free from gall, from vanity, or any selfish feeling, kept him from indulging in any of the vituperative branches of rhetoric; but a memorable instance showed that it was anything rather than the want of power which held him from the use of the weapons so often in other men's hands. When a well-known popular member thought fit to designate him repeatedly and very irregularly as '*the Honourable and religious gentleman*'—not because he was ashamed of the Cross he gloried in, but because he felt indignant at any one in the British Senate deeming piety a matter of imputation—he poured out a strain of sarcasm which none who heard it can ever forget. A common friend of the parties, having remarked to Sir Samuel Romilly, beside whom he sat, that this greatly outmatched Pitt himself, the great master of sarcasm, the reply of that great man and just observer was worthy to be remarked. 'Yes,' said he, 'it is the most striking thing I almost ever heard; but I look upon it as a more singular proof of Wilberforce's virtue than his genius, for who but he ever was possessed of such a formidable weapon and never used it?'

In Wilberforce's later years Lord Brougham admits that he had "a want of condensation, lapsing into digression, and ill-calculated for a very business-like audience like the House of Commons."*

In addition to the qualifications attributed to Wilberforce by Lord Brougham, he possessed another, indispensable in the leader of an army which so much depended on its Nonconformist wing.

"He was (as Sir James Stephen remarks) exempt from bondage to the Evangelical or any other party except in his immutable attachment to the great fundamental doctrines of the Gospel—he was [which we may parenthetically remark no one who knows him only from Bishop Wilberforce's edition of the *Life* would imagine] very much a latitudinarian. Though conforming to the ritual of the Church of England, he occasionally attended the public worship of those who dissent from her communion,† and maintained a constant and affectionate fellowship with many of them. He travelled the highways of life, and conversed freely with all who thronged them. He knew little of polemical divinity, and seemed to care for it but little."‡

Lord Brougham speaks of Wilberforce's "industry." He was no doubt gifted with great nervous energy, and was capable of

* Brougham's "Sketches of Statesmen of the Reign of George III." pp. 151, 152. Edition (French) 1839. The late Sir Francis Burdett is the member referred to. Conf. "Life," vol. iv. pp. 327, 328.

† In his earlier days he not unfrequently attended the Essex Street Unitarian Chapel, the first built *eo nomine* in England.

‡ "Essays," p. 488.

great application, and could get through a great amount of work without feeling fatigue; but in his habits he was desultory and unbusiness-like.

A lady, beneath whose roof his once celebrated "Practical View" was composed, remembering the artifices to which she was obliged to resort to promote the unusual concentration of his thoughts necessary for the work of composition, declared that when at length "she saw the volume complete upon her table, she declared herself a convert to the opinion that a fortuitous concourse of atoms might by some felicitous chance combine themselves into the most perfect of forms—a moss-rose or a bird of Paradise."

Lord Teignmouth tells us that—

"But for the extraordinary activity and elasticity of Wilberforce's intellectual temperament, the irregularity of his habits would have cost him much more exceeding waste of time. At Brighton he asked me to seal his letters. The first preliminary to this proceeding was a long search, in which he joined, for the wax, and when I questioned him afterwards where it should be placed, he pointed to his table covered with papers, begging me to 'turn it loose once more upon the common.' Mr. Samuel Thornton, who represented Hull when Wilberforce sat for Yorkshire, assured me that Wilberforce sometimes wrote four answers to the same letter, each consisting chiefly of an apology for previous supposed neglect."*

Of Wilberforce's irregularities in his correspondence we remember two illustrations, furnished us by our venerable friend General Perronet Thompson, whom we have before quoted in this Paper. The General used to relate that on the death of his father, Wilberforce wrote him a letter of condolence, expressed with "all proper Evangelical unction." At the same time Wilberforce wrote to a tradesman, apologising for not paying his account. Unfortunately, he misdirected the letters, and the letter of condolence did not arrive at its destination until three weeks after its time, when, as our friend used to say, the Evangelical unction tasted rather flat. On another occasion, Wilberforce's friend Isaac Milner, then President of Queen's, Cambridge, applied to him during the long vacation to frank for him two letters—one was intended for an undergraduate, threatening him with expulsion unless in the next term he gave proof of a reformation of manners—the other was meant for the undergraduate's father, in which the President told him that he had written severely to his son, "but that there was no harm in the lad." Here, again, Wilberforce misdirected the letters, with what result on the President's censures need not be pointed out.

* "Reminiscences," vol. i. p. 253.

As to kindness, gentleness, and freedom from vanity and selfishness, which distinguished Wilberforce, there is an universal assent on the part of all who knew him. Robert Hall, with somewhat too much of "Evangelical unction," described him as "the incarnation of love;" while Rowland Hill, with his customary plainness of speech, publicly declared, while directing his audience's attention to Wilberforce, that "he required no further proof of Almighty power than that such a soul should have been domiciled in such a body."*

Wilberforce was at all times sympathetic and social, and even mercurial in his temperament.

"In the age of Jekyl Mackintosh and Sydney Smith, society had no member more popular or attractive than Wilberforce. Society was not merely his delight, or his passion—it was the necessity of his existence. While mixing with all that was eminent in wit, in learning, in genius, he not only endured but rejoiced in companions whose absence would have been a luxury to any one but himself. When Pitt, Burke, and Sheridan were not to be had, he would take the most cordial pleasure in the talk of the most woollen of his constituents from Leeds. Towards the other sex his attitudes and looks and bearing expressed a respect and a tenderness so heartfelt and so grateful, as to impart to the humblest woman he addressed a sense of self-complacency; and so as to fascinate those who were themselves most skilful in the arts of fascination. He was, moreover, by the gift of Nature, a mimic, and amongst the most consummate actors of his time, constraining his companions to laugh, to weep, to exult, and to meditate at his bidding."†

In the "whole compound and mixed mass of such a character" there could not fail to be some at least apparent incongruities with the ideal of the leader of a great religious party. Bishop Jebb happily describes Mr. Wilberforce "as entering his room with all the sweetness of an angel, and all the agility of a monkey;" and Lord Teignmouth remembers many instances in which this curious union of angelic and ape-like qualities was displayed. Wilberforce was habitually careless of his personal appearance: in dressing, he never used a glass; he always wore a suit of black, often on, and sometimes beyond, the verge of shabbiness; and he was generally weighed down by

"the weight of books and packets with which his capacious pockets were generally stuffed. Mr. Owen, Secretary of the Bible Society, was wont to describe with his inimitable humour a scene at Kensington Gore, when he was offering up family prayers. As Mr. Wilberforce was kneeling before him, one of these receptacles burst

* "Teignmouth," vol. i. p. 246.

† Condensed from various passages in Sir James Stephen's Essay.

open, emptying its contents on the floor. What with surprise at the abundance and variety of the materials spread out before him, and Wilberforce's grotesque endeavours to regain possession, Mr. Owen's gravity was sorely tried."

A still more laughable scene occurred in the House of Commons. Wilberforce usually carried an inkstand in his waistcoat pocket. On one occasion, while seated next to Sir Thomas Baring, who wore the nankeen trousers common at that time, Wilberforce jerked over him the whole contents of his ink-bottle. He started up, proceeded to apply blotting-paper, and "in his distress cut such capers on the floor" as to provoke the uncontrollable laughter of the House. On another occasion Lord Teignmouth saw him

"garnish, before breakfast, every button-hole of his coat with flowers whose freshness sorted ill with the faded hue of his almost threadbare garment, till the heat of a summer day had produced assimilation no less singular than the previous contrast. And he was quite unconscious of the notice which his personal appearance attracted."

On another occasion at Church

"he discovered, on opening his Prayer Book, a tulip flower, and, remaining standing while the rest of the congregation were sitting, commended to Lord Teignmouth its beauty loud enough to be heard by many, who evidently regarded him with surprise."

"Again, when visiting his son Samuel at Brightstone, I [Lord Teignmouth] saw Mr. Wilberforce mount on the seat of his pew, indicating, as he leant over the pulpit, looking through his eyeglass full at the preacher's face, his delight by the animation of his gestures as he rose tiptoe responsively to the eloquence to which he was listening, whilst quite unaware that every eye of the rustic congregation was fixed upon him." *

We have dwelt upon these peculiarities in Mr. Wilberforce not assuredly for the purpose of depreciating his memory, for which we have the highest reverence, and even affection, but that our readers may see in all its aspects the character of the man who, at so early an age, devoted himself to the Reformation of Manners and the Abolition of the Slave Trade. As to his first task, his object was to obtain the issuing of a Royal Proclamation against vice and immorality, and to form an Association to carry it into effect. Through the influence of Pitt, then in the fulness of his power, the issuing of the Proclamation was easily obtained. For years the reading of this Proclamation was—we believe it still is—part of the ceremonies of the Commission-day at Assizes, when the Proclamation is as intelligible to the gaping rustics who crowd the Court on those occasions,

* "Teignmouth," vol. i. p. 244, *et seq.*

and produces as much effect as the Commission of Assize itself. To form the Association was a harder task. Wilberforce personally solicited most of the Bishops to become members of it, and found on the part of the Prelates that unwillingness to commit themselves to any decided course of action, which is seemingly ever their great characteristic. Nor was discouragement wanting on the part of some members of the laity, whose co-operation he sought. "So you wish, young man," said a nobleman, whose house he visited, "to be a reformer of men's morals? Look, then, and see there what is the end of such reformers," pointing, as he spoke, to a picture of the Crucifixion.*

Spite of all discouragements, the "Society for the Reformation of Manners" was organised and existed for some years. It does not seem to have accomplished much. Sir James Stephen does not refer to it, and Mr. Wilberforce's sons in their "Life" refer to it only as being the first of the many societies and associations which arose out of the Evangelical Revival.

Very different was the result of his labours in the other task which he set himself—the Abolition of the Slave Trade—though its accomplishment required an almost superhuman amount of energy and perseverance. The words in which one of his later fellow-labourers† speaks of the abolition of slavery are equally applicable to the movement against the slave trade:—

"We found the people not actually against us, but apathetic, lethargic, incredulous, indifferent. *It was then, and not till then*, that we sounded the right note, and touched a chord that never ceased to vibrate. *To uphold slavery was a crime against God.* It was a novel doctrine, but it was a cry that was heard, for it would be heard. The national conscience was awakened to inquiry, and inquiry soon produced conviction."

Early in 1787, Wilberforce announced his intention of bringing forward a motion relative to the slave trade, but his ill-health prevented his so doing until the Session of 1789, when he moved a series of resolutions condemnatory of the trade. He was ardently supported not only by Pitt, but by Fox and Burke. But the slave traders were a match for the great Minister and the leaders of the Opposition combined. They adopted a

* "Life of Wilberforce" (Edition 1838), vol. i. p. 136. The noble lord anticipated the dictum of a Scotch judge (we think Lord Braxfield), on the trial of Muir and Palmer for sedition. One of the defendants, in his address to the jury, said, "Christ Himself was a reformer." "And muckle he made of it," interposed the learned judge, "he was hangit."

† Sir George Stephen, a connection (we believe) of Sir James Stephen—formerly a solicitor in London, now in Australia. We quote the passage from the "Phases of Faith," p. 104.

Fabian policy, and prevented the House coming to a resolution that Session. The next Session was spent in examining witnesses for and against the trade. The examination in the House, and the preparation for it out of doors, strained to the utmost the feeble constitution of the anti-slavery leader. In 1791 he renewed his motion, and though again supported by Pitt and Fox, "the character, talents, and humanity of the House were left in the minority of 88 to 163."

With undaunted perseverance he returned to the charge, setting an example of perseverance which we, in our day, have seen not unworthily followed by Charles Pelham Villiers in the case of Corn Law Abolition, and by Henry Berkeley in the case of the Ballot, he renewed his motion in the Session of 1792. Some fragments of his speech on that occasion are preserved, and from them we make the following extract, as a good specimen of his oratory :—

"Oh, sir, are not these things too bad to be any longer endured? I cannot but be persuaded that whatever differences of opinion there may have been we shall this night be at length unanimous. I cannot believe that a British House of Commons will give its sanction to the continuance of this infernal traffic. We were for a while ignorant of its real nature, but it has now been completely developed and laid open to your view in all its horrors. Never was there, indeed, a system so big with wickedness and cruelty; to whatsoever part of it you direct your view, whether to Africa, the Middle Passage, or the West Indies, the eye finds no comfort, no satisfaction, no relief. It is the gracious ordination of Providence, both in the natural and moral world, that good should often arise out of evil. Hurricanes clear the air,* and the propagation of truth is promoted by persecution; pride, vanity, profusion, in their remotest consequences, contribute often to the happiness of mankind; in common, what is in itself evil and vicious is permitted to carry along with it some circumstances of palliation; even those descriptions of men that may seem most noxious have often some virtues belonging to their order. The Arab is hospitable; the robber is brave. We do not necessarily find cruelty associated with fraud, or meanness with injustice. But here the case is far otherwise; it is the prerogative of this detested traffic to separate from evil its concomitant good, and reconcile discordant mischiefs; it robs war of its generosity, it deprives peace of its security. You have the vices of polished society, without its knowledge or its comforts, and the evils of barbarism without its simplicity. Nor are its ravages restricted, as are those of other evils, to certain limits either of extent

* This may have suggested to Erskine, who was present, the celebrated passage in his defence of Stockdale,—“Tempests occasionally shake our dwellings and dissipate our commerce, but they scourge before them the lazy elements which without them stagnate into pestilence.”

or continuance—in the latter it is constant and unintermitted, in the former it is universal and indiscriminate. No age, no sex, no rank, no condition is exempt from the fatal influence of this wide-wasting calamity. Thus it attains to the fullest measure of pure, unvarnished, unsophisticated wickedness; and, scorning all competition or comparison, it stands without a rival in the secure, undisputed possession of its detestable pre-eminence."

In the debate which followed, Wilberforce was again supported by Fox with great energy, and by Pitt in a speech well known to every student of Parliamentary eloquence, and which not less judges than Windham, Fox, and Grey pronounced to be "one of the most extraordinary displays of eloquence they ever heard." "For the last twenty minutes," said Wilberforce, "he seemed inspired."

In his peroration, as he quoted from Virgil—

"Nos que ubi primis equis oriens afflavit anhelis
Illic sera rubens accendit lumina vesper,"

the first beams of the rising sun shot through the windows of the House, and seemed, as Pitt looked upwards, to suggest to him without premeditation these noble lines. Wilberforce's motion was again defeated, but the Churches of Britain were now aroused. The slave traders felt the traffic could not long be maintained; they therefore took counsel against Pitt with his most trusted colleague, the crafty and unprincipled Henry Dundas, how the abolition of the trade might be effected with as little harm to themselves as might be. Dundas accordingly proposed that the traffic should be abolished after 1800. Wilberforce, however, succeeded in accelerating its abolition by four years—viz., 1796, but in the next Session the House rejected the motion altogether. Time and space fail us to describe the unwearied persistence with which during fourteen weary years, encountering delay, defeat, and disappointment of every kind, Wilberforce struggled to accomplish his self-imposed task. It was not until after death had removed Pitt from the scene, and the Fox-Grenville Ministry came into power, that the slave trade was abolished. The ease with which the Whig Ministry effected the abolition of the nefarious traffic proves that Pitt, had he been so minded, could have carried the measure years before; but though himself in its favour, the ever-powerful influence of Dundas over him, the opposition of Thurlow and the insane prejudice of George the Third, who had been led to believe in a mysterious and occult union between the abolition of the slave trade and what were then called "French principles," prevented Pitt from exercising that influence over his colleagues which he often exerted to carry measures of less im-

portance. Altogether, his trifling with the slave trade is the darkest passage of his life.*

The slave trade was abolished; its logical result was the abolition of slavery in our Colonies. In 1823—two years before the close of Wilberforce's Parliamentary career—he put forth "an appeal" in favour of the Emancipation of our Slaves, which produced a great effect on the public mind, and he supported by his vote and speech the first motion for Emancipation made by Mr. Fowell Buxton, to whom Wilberforce, on account of his growing infirmities, yielded the Parliamentary leadership on the question.

Decidedly Evangelical as was Mr. Wilberforce, he was entirely free from that spurious heavenly-mindedness affected by some religious professors of that school, whom Arnold thus denounced:—"There are some, Englishmen unhappily, but most unworthy to be so, who affect to talk of freedom and a citizen's rights and duties as things about which a Christian should not care. Like all their other doctrines, this comes out of the shallowness of their little minds—'understanding neither what they say nor whereof they affirm.'"[†]

With such narrow views Mr. Wilberforce had no sympathy. He warmly supported Mr. Pitt's motion for Parliamentary Reform in 1784, and, spite of the panic caused by the French Revolution, he continued to support the cause of Reform in 1793, 1809, 1810, 1812, and years later, when Lord John Russell for the first time re-raised the banner of Reform, Mr. Wilberforce was among his supporters. Mr. Wilberforce also strove unselfishly and wisely to prevent Mr. Pitt engaging in the anti-revolutionary war with France.

On this subject he said:—

"In spite of so much bitter experience, there is still a proneness in statesmen to form great schemes of complicated policy, and there is in the people of every country a fatal facility of entering into wars, though they soon tire of them. I own that I more and more think that it is our true policy to cultivate our own internal resources; to gain the hearts of our people, to economise in our expenditure, while we lighten the pressure of taxes on the lower orders, and lay them, if needful, even more heavily on the higher."[‡]

The position taken up by Mr. Wilberforce in reference to the war with France caused at least a temporary estrangement from

* See Wilberforce's defence of Pitt's conduct on the Slave Trade, "Life," vol. i. p. 165; also Mr. Stephen's criticism on Pitt, *ibid.* vol. i. p. 225. Pitt's greatest vacillation on the question was during his second administration, 1804-6. "I was never," says Wilberforce, "so dissatisfied with Pitt as at this time," *ibid.* vol. iii. p. 173. Pitt's health was then already failing.

† Stanley's "Arnold," vol. ii. p. 413.

‡ "Life," vol. iii. p. 76.

him on the part of Pitt, which, as Wilberforce not only admired the ministers but loved the man, was no small grief to him. In the same spirit of honourable independence he again separated from Mr. Pitt on the question of Lord Melville's (Dundas) impeachment, voting for the impeachment, though Melville had been one of his early friends. The only occasion we find of Mr. Wilberforce's theological opinions narrowing his usually liberal tendencies was his opposition to Mr. Fox's motion in 1790, for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts. His horror of "the then prevalent Socinianism" within the Church made him illogically think that to enforce tests on Nonconformists was the best mode of defending the Church's "Liturgy and Articles."* We have seen it stated, also, that with his usual foresight he saw that a demand for disestablishment would be the logical outcome of the repeal of the Test Acts.† He was always a steady supporter of Catholic emancipation.

To give even an imperfect sketch of Mr. Wilberforce's Parliamentary career, would be to write the history of the House of Commons for the last forty years of the reign of George the Third, and the first five years of that of his successor. But it was not only in Parliament that Mr. Wilberforce gave his time and labour to the service of his country.

"Whether," says Sir James Stephen, "churches and clergymen were to be multiplied, or the Scriptures circulated, or missions sent to the ends of the earth, or national education established, or the condition of the poor improved, or Ireland civilised, or good discipline established in gaols, or obscure genius and piety enabled to emerge, or in whatever other form philanthropy and patriotism laboured for the improvement of his country, or of the world—his sanction, his eloquence, and his advice were still regarded as indispensable to success. No one man, however, nor any one hundred men, could have assumed the actual superintendence of all the complicated affairs in which he was thus immersed."‡

He was one of the earliest of platform orators—a profession created by the necessities of the agitation on behalf of the various schemes of public benevolence which arose out of the Evangelical movement. His platform eloquence was even superior to his Parliamentary.

"His reception at public meetings," to quote Lord Teignmouth, "was enthusiastic. His advent was preluded by visible commotion. Business was at a standstill, and the speaker of the moment held his breath while every eye was riveted on the agile but unsteady gait of

* "Life," vol. i. p. 255-9.

† Skeat's "Historical Memorial of the Test and Corporation Acts," p. 28.

‡ "Essays," p. 499.

the man of the people, as, leaning on some friendly arm, he was borne amidst tumultuous applause to his rostrum. When he rose, utterly self-forgetful, every countenance reflected the unspeakable benignity which beamed from his own. . . . His language was fit vehicle for the beauty and occasional sublimity of his thought. Memnon's orisons never discoursed sweeter music than that which found utterance in the tones and cadences of his exquisitely modulated periods; and as he realised the '*Sursum corda*' of his loftiest aspirations, he seemed, despite of the deformity of his outer man, to stand forth, as it were, transfigured by the light of his own heaven-gifted eloquence."*

Amidst the absorbing engagements connected with the anti-slavery cause, Mr. Wilberforce did not forget the reformation of manners to which he had devoted himself. The chief service which he rendered to this cause was the publication, in 1797, of his "Practical View of the prevailing Religious System of Professed Christians in the higher and middle classes of this Country, as contrasted with Real Christianity." Such a book, written by a layman, and the member for the largest English county, was certain to create a sensation—especially as at that date laymen were not so much addicted to theological studies as they have been of later years. It solaced the melancholy close of Burke's chequered and eventful life, and no religious work ever attained greater popularity or wider circulation. Assuming that real Christianity and Evangelicalism are one and the same thing, it is a logical statement and defence of the position held by the author and his party. He in his later years pronounced it to be "much too diffuse and tautologous."† It passed, we believe, through fifty editions, but it is unsuited to the wants and feelings and controversies of the present day, and is consigned with Scott's "Force of Truth" and other Evangelical standards we have mentioned, "to the dust and silence of the upper shelf."

Mr. Wilberforce retired from Parliament in 1825, retaining to the close of his life the most vivid recollections of, and a warm attachment to, the House of Commons, of which, for forty-five years without interruption, he had been a member and an ornament. When told by Lady Trevelyan of Lord Lansdowne's intention to bring the younger Macaulay into Parliament, "he was silent for a moment, and then his mobile face lighted up, and he clapped his hand to his ear and cried, "Ah! I hear that shout again. Hear! hear! what a life it was."‡

Mr. Greville records a curious anecdote which Lord Glenelg—himself a Claphamite—told him on the authority of Lord Abinger (Sir James Scarlett), who was present:—

* 'Reminiscences,' vol. i. p. 258. † Conf. Stephen Essays, 504.

‡ "Life of Macaulay," vol. i. p. 140.

“When Wilberforce went out of Parliament, he went to Canning and offered him the lead and direction of his party (the Saints), urging him to accept it, and assuring him that their support would give him a strength which, to an ambitious man like him, was invaluable. Canning took three days to consider it, but finally declined, and then the party elected Brougham as their chief; hence the representation of Yorkshire and many other incidents in Brougham’s career.”*

Let us compare this with the “Life.” “Poor Canning,” was Wilberforce’s remark on him after his death—“I knew him well, and he knew that I knew him. He felt that I knew him before he became well acquainted with Pitt.”†

One would infer from this that it was not likely that Mr. Wilberforce had shortly before offered Canning the Parliamentary leadership of the Evangelicals; on this alone we should have doubted Mr. Greville’s story, but Wilberforce’s biographers tell us that “though Mr. Canning, Charles Grant, and Henry Brougham were pressed on him by various friends, he felt most deeply the importance of keeping the great cause (anti-slavery) in possession of its old honourable distinction of being one in which all party differences were extinguished, Pitt and Fox fighting in the same rank, and in the same spirit he committed to Mr. Buxton rather than to any leading member of the House of Commons (as a testamentary designation, and to hold him forth as the depository of his principles on West Indian matters) his application for the Chiltern Hundreds.”‡ We think, therefore, Mr. Greville’s story had no foundation in fact.

We doubt, also, whether Brougham could have been chosen by the Evangelical party as their leader; the habitual profanity of his language, and his declaration at Glasgow, the very year of Mr. Wilberforce’s retirement, “that man shall no more render account to man for his belief, over which he himself has no control,” would tend to alienate them from him. That he often acted with, and was consulted by, Wilberforce and his friends, is undoubtedly true, and Lord Teignmouth tells us that at a meeting of the committee for erecting a monument to Wilberforce, Brougham equally amused and surprised its members by suddenly declaring “that for his part he must avow himself as belonging or inclined to (the reminiscent forgets which) the Evangelical party.”§

* “Greville,” vol. ii. p. 125.

† “Life,” vol. v. p. 341.

‡ Vol. v. p. 138, and notes and the letters there referred to. In the Memoir of Lord Abinger by his son there is no reference to any such occurrence; nor does Lord Brougham, in his autobiography, refer to his having been the Evangelical leader.

§ “Reminiscences,” vol. ii. p. 278.

Mr. Wilberforce lived to see the introduction of the Whig Government's Emancipation Bill. On its being remarked at dinner that "at this moment the debate on slavery is just commencing," he sprung up from his chair, and with his clear voice startled his friends by suddenly exclaiming in a most striking manner, "Hear! hear! hear!" "Thank God," said he, "that I should have lived to see a day in which England is willing to give twenty millions sterling for the abolition of slavery."*

He died on July 29th, 1833, within one month of completing his 75th year.

"Wilberforce," writes Lord Macaulay to his sister, "is gone. He owned that he enjoyed life much, and that he had a great desire to live longer. Strange in a man who had, I should have said, so little to attach him to this world and so firm a belief in another—in a man with an impaired fortune, a weak spine, and a worn-out stomach! What is this fascination which makes us cling to existence in spite of present sufferings and of religious hopes?"†

At the request of a large number of the members of both Houses, of all parties, Wilberforce was buried in the north transept of Westminster Abbey, close to the tombs of Pitt, Fox, and Canning. The venerable Abbey may contain the remains of a greater but not of a better man.

Second in command of the Evangelical host was Henry Thornton, a connection and the life-long friend of Wilberforce, and son of that John Thornton whom every reader of Cowper's letters knows. Henry Thornton was thirty years member for Southwark, and in Parliament acted with Wilberforce,‡ and was his most trusted counsellor. "He was," according to Lord Brougham, "a man of strong understanding, great powers of reasoning and of investigation, an accurate and a curious observer, but who had neither cultivated oratory at all, nor had received a refined education, nor had extended his reading beyond the subjects connected with moral, political, and theological learning."§

Wilberforce thus wrote of him to a common friend, after the almost irreparable loss occasioned by his death: "A more upright character I never knew, taking the word in the largest sense, as expressing the fulfilment of every duty, and the cultivation of every Christian grace and moral virtue on right principles."||

* "Life," vol. v. p. 370. † "Macaulay's Life," vol. i. p. 318.

‡ Besides the members named in this paper. Mr. Bankes, M.P. for Dorsetshire, Mr. Babington, M.P. for Leicester, and Sir Thomas Acland, Bt., M.P. for Devonshire, also generally acted with Wilberforce.

"Statesmen of the Reign of George III." p. 152.

"Life," vol. iv. p. 232.

Mr. Thornton was a partner in the well-known banking-house of William Deacon and Co., which has survived the fall of so many once celebrated banking and commercial establishments. His practical knowledge of banking led him to contribute a valuable work to the controversy on the currency—his essay on "Paper Credit," the "publication of which," says Miller in his *Philosophy of History*, "formed an epoch in the history of the science to which it belongs." A still more congenial task was the composing "A Family Commentary" on the Sermon on the Mount and other portions of Scripture, and a volume of Family Prayers. These were published after his death, under the editorship of the late Sir Robert H. Inglis, and were much used in Evangelical families.*

Mr. Thornton lived at Clapham, in a house still occupied by his descendants. Its library is the sole monument of the architectural skill of William Pitt—for it was designed by no less a man. Adjoining and communicating with Mr. Thornton's house was Broomfield, long occupied by Wilberforce, and we cannot forego transcribing from Sir James Stephen's pages the following account of the home-life of the Clapham leaders.

"On the bright evening of a day which had run its course some thirty or forty summers ago, the usual group had formed themselves in the library already celebrated. Addressing a nearer circle might be heard above the unbusy hum the voice of the Prælector [Mr. Thornton himself is referred to], investigating the characteristics of Seneca's morality perhaps, or, not improbably, the seizure of the Danish fleet; or as it might be, the various gradations of sanity as exhibited by Robert Hall or Joanna Southcote; when all pastimes were suspended and all speculations put to flight, to welcome the approach of what seemed a dramatic procession emerging from the deep foliage, by which the further slopes of the now checkered lawn were overhung. In advance of the rest, two noisy urchins were putting to no common test the philanthropy of a tall shaggy dog, their playfellow, and the parental indulgence of the slight figure which followed them. Limbs scarcely stouter than those of Asmodeus, sustaining a torso as unlike as possible to that of Theseus, carried him along with the agility of an antelope, though under the weight of two coat-pockets, † protuberant as the bags by which some learned brother of the coif announces and secures his rank as leader of the circuit. Grasping a pocket volume in one hand, he wielded in the other a spud, caught up in his progress through the garden; but instinct at his touch with more significance than a whole museum of horticultural instruments. At one instant a staff on which he leant and listened to the projector at his elbow developing his plan for the better coppering of ships' bottoms, at the

* The twenty-first edition, published 1847, is now before us.

† To be able to hold one of the volumes of Dalrymple's State Papers was Mr. Wilberforce's rule for the size of his pockets.

next it became a wand pointing out to a portly constituent from the Cloth Hall at Leeds some rich effect of the sunset; then a truncheon, beating time to the poetical reminiscences of a gentleman of the Wesleyan persuasion, looking painfully conscious of his best clothes and of his best behaviour; and ere the sacred cadence had reached its close, a cutlass raised in mimic mutiny against the robust form of William Smith, who, as Commodore of this ill-assorted squadron, was endeavouring to convey them to their destined port. But little availed the sonorous word of command, or the heart-stirring laugh of the stout member for Norwich, to shape a straight course for the volatile representative of the county of York, now fairly under the canvas of his own bright and joyous fancies. He moved in obedience to some impulse, like that which prompts the wheelings of the swallow or the dodgings of the barbel. But whether he advanced, or paused, or revolved, his steps were still measured by the ever changeful music of his own rich voice ranging over all the chords expressive of mirth and tenderness, of curiosity or surprise, of delight or of indignation. *Eheu fugaces!* Those elder forms are all now reposing beneath the clods of the valley: those playful boys are right reverend and venerable dignitaries of the Church; and he who then deemed to read while he listened silently, is now in the garrulity of declining years, telling old tales, and perhaps distorting in the attempt to revive their pictures which have long been fading from the memory.**

William Smith, though a dweller at Clapham, must not be classed with the Evangelical leaders; although a laborious fellow-worker with them, they, to a man, were utterly Athanasian. Smith was a follower of Priestley and Belsham, a believer in the simple humanity of Jesus: but to quote the beautiful language of Sir James Stephen, "they judged that many an erroneous opinion respecting the Redeemer's person would not deprive of his gracious approbation, and ought not to exclude from their own affectionate regards a man in whom they daily saw a transcript, however imperfect, of the Redeemer's mercy and beneficence."†

"My most faithful friend," writes Wilberforce of Smith in his diary: "how full of good-nature he is! What a lesson does he give to 'Evangelical Christians.'" Throughout the war against the slave trade, Wilberforce had no more faithful and effective ally than the Unitarian member for Norwich.

Second only to Thornton in the Evangelical councils—if indeed he were not his equal, or even superior—was James Stephen. A long residence in the West Indies enabled him to give his personal testimony to the evils of slavery and the slave

* "Essays," p. 529-30. In the concluding sentences Sir James refers to himself.

† *Ibid.*, p. 546.

trade, and by a series of masterly pamphlets he most effectually promoted the interests of the Negro cause. Brought into Parliament by Mr. Percival, with whom he had unbounded influence, he was there, as Lord Macaulay truly says, "his right-hand man." He was, in fact, the originator of the celebrated "Orders in Council," which, instead of collecting, as he hoped, all the trade of the world into England, effectually ruined whatever Napoleon's measures had left of our own. But his errors on questions of political economy must not blind us to his real merit. He lived but for the anti-slavery cause, and retired from the House of Commons—where he sat for a Government borough—because the Ministry of the day would not support the bill brought forward by Wilberforce, establishing a Register of Slaves. Freedom from official trammels enabled him to give more labour to the anti-slavery cause, and his business-like habits supplied what was lacking in that respect in its great leader. "He was," says Lord Brougham, "a warm and steady friend—a man of the strictest integrity, and nicest sense of both honour and justice, in all the relations of private society wholly without a stain; though envy might well find whereon to perch, malice itself, in the exasperating discords of religious and civil controversy, never could descry a spot on which to fasten."*

The Evangelical leaders numbered amongst them yet another member of Parliament—Charles Grant, one of the best men, in Wilberforce's judgment, that he ever knew. Had Mr. Grant enjoyed in early youth the advantages of a first-rate education, he would have been as distinguished in literature as he was in business. He was a man of imposing appearance, of repressive manners, so that one who knew him observed to Lord Teignmouth, that Mr. Grant was, "without exception, the most awful man he ever knew." As one of the Directors of the East India Company, he had immense influence over his colleagues, and was looked upon as "the Ruler of the Rulers of the East." In Parliament, he was ever received with that respectful attention which the House of Commons gives to members who rarely address it, and then only on subjects of which they are masters. Wilberforce or Stephen was not more devoted to the cause of the Negro than was Grant to the cause of the propagation of Christianity in British India, spite of the long-continued opposition of his colleagues in Leadenhall Street, and of the Anglo-Indian clique in Parliament. He, aided by Wilberforce, Thornton, and Stephen, promoted measures for the evangelization* of India, which at length were carried with the full approbation of Parliament and the country. At Clapham, where he lived, "he

* Quoted by Sir James Stephen, "Essays," p. 551.

was hailed as a man whose piety, though ever active, was too profound for much speech; a praise," Sir James Stephen mischievously adds, "to which, among their other glories, it was permitted to few of his neighbours to attain or to aspire."*

Such were the Parliamentary leaders of the Evangelical party. Mr. Trevelyan, in his life of his uncle, has described them in terms which we cannot hope to improve, and therefore transcribe:—

"A mere handful as to number, and in average talent very much on a level with the mass of their colleagues, counting in their ranks no orator,† or minister, or boroughmonger: they commanded the ear of the House, and exerted on its proceedings an influence, the secret of which those who have studied the Parliamentary history of the period find it only too easy to understand. . . . Confidence and respect, and (what in the House of Commons is their unvarying accompaniment) power, were gradually given to this group of members. They were not addicted to crochets, nor to the obtrusive and unseasonable assertion of conscientious scruples. The occasions on which they made proof of independence and impartiality were such as justified and dignified their temporary renunciation of party ties."‡

Long as this article already is, we cannot bring it to a close without a brief notice of other Evangelical leaders who never found their way into the House of Commons. One of the most liberal and philosophical divines of our day, preaching from the words "Help, Lord! for the godly man ceaseth," said:—

"With many a bright child, many a high-minded youth, restive under Puritanical guardianship, it would seem, I fear, no bad news that the godly were ceasing, and his suppressed feeling would be that they could very well be spared; for the phrase has become appropriated to a type of character far from lovely, even in its best aspects; and so adverse to natural joy, and dreary in its idea of perfectness as to repel all large and genial minds."§

If these pages should come beneath the eye of any of Zachary Macaulay's descendants, we trust they will acquit us of any irreverence or disrespect to his memory when we say that, in our judgment, the words we have just quoted exactly describe his character. The man who, in what must have been the proudest moment of his life, when his eldest son, in the presence of and welcomed by the then venerable and venerated leader of the Evangelicals, in a speech against slavery, gave to the world the first specimen of that eloquence which afterwards charmed and

* "Essays," p. 553.

† Wilberforce may certainly be ranked as a great Parliamentary orator.

‡ "Life of Macaulay," vol. i. p. 70.

§ James Martineau, "Hours of Religious Thought," p. 243.

commanded the most fastidious assembly in the world, could express no feeling but one of dissatisfaction "at so young a man speaking with folded arms in the presence of royalty;"* whose repressive system of training his children made his distinguished son say, "of the strictest sect of our religion, I was bred a Pharisee;" certainly is a character not lovely, even in its best aspects, and sufficiently unjoyous and dreary to repel all large and genial minds. After saying this, we would as frankly say that the inscription beneath the bust of Zachary Macaulay in Westminster Abbey, of which Sir James Stephen slightly and unjustly speaks as the work of some "eulogist less skilful than affectionate;"†—but which, we agree with Mr. Trevelyan, is "beautiful"—states the exact truth as to the elder Macaulay when it describes him as one "who, during forty successive years partaking in the counsels and in the labours which, guided by favouring Providence, rescued Africa from the woes and the British Empire from the guilt of slavery and the slave trade, meekly endured the toil, the privation, and the reproach, resigning to others the praise and the reward." Every page of the earlier edition of Wilberforce's "Life" supplies abundant proof of the exact truth of this description. When Wilberforce was at a loss for a piece of information he used to say, "Let us look it out in Macaulay." His knowledge of general literature approached that of his distinguished son; but he lacked his son's powers of communicating his knowledge and ideas to others. He would often exclaim, "If I had only Tom's power of speech!" In addition to his other labours, Zachary Macaulay for years acted as editor of the *Christian Observer*, then the organ of the Evangelical party. Nor were other employments wanting to him. "He marched at the head of a company of the Clapham Volunteers, his austere features overshadowed by the bearskin cover of his helmet, and his modest deportment betraying little of the heroism which he manifested during the early life struggles of the Sierra Leone Company."‡

Seated in the Clapham coach "between Messrs. Smith and Brown, of Saint Mildred's, Cornhill, calmly listening to them on the Paving-Rate Question," might frequently be seen John Shore, first Lord Teignmouth, who under other skies had had to decide far graver affairs of State than those which exercised the souls of Messrs. Smith and Brown. Entering the service of the East India Company as a youth, he from the beginning of his life acted on the advice of an old friend—"Make yourself useful, and

* *Vide* Macaulay's "Life," p. 113.

† "Essays," p. 547.

‡ Trevelyan, "Life of Macaulay," vol. i. pp. 60-68; Teignmouth, "Reminiscences," vol. i. p. 368.

you will succeed;" and so, with no brilliant talents, but great energy and industry, and with high religious principles, he led a life of usefulness which was crowned with the predicted success. He became one of Warren Hastings' Council, then a Member of the Supreme Council established by Mr. Pitt's India Bill, and was selected by Mr. Pitt to be Governor-General of India, for the purpose of introducing there the pacific system which, at the instance of Mr. Pitt, Parliament had enjoined. Mr. Wilberforce said of Lord Teignmouth: "No consideration of interest, gratification, or credit could make him swerve consciously a hair's-breadth from the line of duty."

Sir James Stephen, with scarcely concealed sarcasm, calls him "the St. Louis of Governors-General," and depreciates his career and memory, which are ably defended by his son, the second Lord Teignmouth, in his "Reminiscences"* Into that controversy we have not time to enter. For our purpose it is sufficient to note that as Governor-General he adopted immediate measures for supplying the military stations with churches and chaplains, and successfully laboured to improve the attention of the British to the observance of public worship, and secure an increased regard for the Sacred day.

Such a Governor-General was dear to Charles Grant, to whom Wilberforce expressed a wish that at the close of his four years of office the ex-ruler might settle at Clapham. When that time arrived Lord Teignmouth, by which title he was then raised to the Irish Peerage, settled in the sacred village. "To be useful," was still his aim and object. When, accordingly, at the time that a French invasion was expected, and the Lord Lieutenant of Surrey became incapacitated, the ex-Governor-General discharged the duties of the Lieutenantancy with his usual energy, and enrolled volunteer corps throughout the country, whose muster-roll showed 8000 names. But a more congenial field of usefulness was at hand. Wilberforce and his colleagues were at this time founding the Bible Society, and Lord Teignmouth, to use Wilberforce's usual phrase, was "put in harness"† as its first president. He retained the office for many years—we believe until the close of his life. By his sedulous attention to the duties of his office he did much to promote the welfare and extend the operations of the Society, which Lord Shaftesbury, his worthy successor in the presidency, pronounced to be "the greatest, the best, the noblest in this country."

Time and space fail us, and we must therefore dismiss with the mere mention of their names Thomas Clarkson and Grau-

* *Vide* vol. i. Appendix, p. 372.

† To get his friends into harness—*i.e.*, employed in one or other of his benevolent projects—was always a great object with Wilberforce.

ville Sharp, who in their different departments shared with Zachary Macaulay the extra-Parliamentary leadership of the Evangelical party. But our enumeration of these leaders would be deficient if we failed to mention four clergymen, who held important positions in the councils of the party. Family relations between them were thought by Sir James Stephen a reason for passing over with a mere reference the name of John Venn, Rector of Clapham, and projector, and one of the original founders, of one of the great Evangelical organisations—the Church Missionary Society: and we are not aware of any source from which information about Mr. Venn can now be obtained. Next in this group is Thomas Gisborne, of Yoxall, a Derbyshire squire, who, to escape the importunities of his brother freeholders to become Member for that county, took refuge in the ministry of the Church, and was for more than half a century rector as well as squire of his own parish. "He was the expositor of the 'Evangelical' system to those cultivated or fastidious readers who were intolerant of the ruder style of his less refined brethren. He addressed them as a poet, as a moralist, as a natural philosopher, and as a divine."* In short, the position of Thomas Gisborne among the early Evangelicals closely resembled that of John Keble among the early Tractarians. Keble, however, though dead, is still a living power, and his works are studied by thousands, while those of Gisborne have passed into the oblivion which seems to be the common lot of the works of all the men whose careers we have been surveying.

The man who, in the phraseology of the party, was "the human means under Providence of effecting Wilberforce's conversion," was sure of the respectful attention of his disciple; and Isaac Milner, who became Dean of Carlisle, President of Queen's, Cambridge, and filled the Mathematical Chair in that University once occupied by Newton, exercised great influence in the Evangelical councils. He was a man of undoubted ability. We have heard General Perronet Thompson, who at the earliest possible age was a Fellow of Queen's, say that he learned more from the President than from any other man he had ever known. He appears to have exercised a genial influence over the undergraduates, and the Evangelical leaders supplied his college with a constant stream of pupils from the Academy at Elland, in Yorkshire, which was maintained at the cost of the party for the training of candidates for the ministry. Johnson was still the model on which men aiming at a literary reputation formed themselves, and Milner seems to have had much of Johnson's conversational power and much of his pom-

* Stephen, "Essays," p. 533.

posity without any mixture of his brutality. Like Johnson, Milner seems to have had a constitutional tendency to indolence.* Possessed of considerable literary acquirements and much controversial skill he yet rendered small service to his party. He took some part in the controversy as to the Bible Society, but a continuation of his brother Joseph's Church History is the only production of his pen which may in some slight degree preserve his name from utter oblivion.

A still wider influence over the undergraduate mind of Cambridge was exercised by Charles Simeon, who, for more than half a century, occupied the pulpit of the church of the Holy Trinity in the University town. Lord Teignmouth and Sir James Stephen agree in describing him as singularly deficient in those gifts and graces which should be possessed by all orators, sacred or profane; and both agree as to the great influence he obtained by his sermons over those who heard him. Many a pulpit was in after days filled by an Evangelical minister, who had drunk in his theology from the stream overflowing from the pulpit of Holy Trinity. It was not only as a preacher that Simeon sought to exercise influence over the Church. He may be called "the great articulator of the Evangelicals."† He composed, under the title "*Horæ Homileticæ*," many hundred skeletons of sermons, which were intended to be clothed with rhetorical integuments, and animated with the breath of Evangelical fervour. A reader of these ghastly compositions, if asked, as was the Hebrew prophet in the Valley of Vision, "Can these dry bones live?" might well be pardoned if, like the prophet, he expressed his scepticism. We fear that the shaking of these dry bones is now seldom heard in Anglican pulpits, though we believe the book is still an authority amongst orthodox Dissenters. Nor was it only by the press that Simeon sought to secure a succession of Evangelical ministers for the Establishment. Possessed of considerable wealth, he devoted a large part of it to the purchase of advowsons in the names of a body who still, by the name of "the Simeon Trustees," exercise no inconsiderable amount of Ecclesiastical patronage.

If we are right in believing that disappointment always attends the endeavour to perpetuate any stereotyped form of

* Of this indolence General Thompson told the writer a ludicrous illustration. "The President was administering the communion in the College chapel. The consecrated bread ran short, and, to save himself the trouble of a fresh consecration, the President made the crumbs on the paten into a sort of pile, which he administered to the last recipient."

† As we remember to have heard an acute and learned judge profess his ignorance of what an articulator was, we may explain that it is a putter-together of skeletons. Readers of "Our Mutual Friend" will remember that Mr. Venn followed this occupation.

religious opinion, this patronage will probably fall ere long into the hands of some to whose opinions Mr. Simeon would have been most opposed, for already great changes have occurred since he, the last of the early Evangelical leaders, was laid in his grave. Lord Teignmouth's house—the cradle of the Bible Society—is now a Roman Catholic Institution. A theology which the former parishioners of Clapham would have called “full-blown Popery” is now preached from the pulpit of John Venn, its leading originator being one brought up under Evangelical influences, and who has now tardily but justly been elevated by the Head of the Roman Church to the dignity of Cardinal. Of the three sons of Wilberforce, the second and the youngest* became Romanists, and the third and most distinguished of all, as a Bishop of the English Church, of High Church opinions, scarcely concealed his dislike of the Bible Society and the Missionary Society, in the formation of which his father had so large a share. In fact, the utter extinction of the Evangelical party has lately been proclaimed as a fact by the *Times*, and supported by arguments of great ability and weight, though they are controverted somewhat feebly by a few survivors of the party. Into that controversy it is not for us to enter. It only remains for us to record our conviction, much as we differ in many things from the excellent men whose lives we have endeavoured to sketch, that England has seen no more benevolent and useful citizens. We hope that what we have written may tend to revive the interest which should always be felt in such noble and disinterested characters.

* The Romanism of Henry William Wilberforce (the youngest son) was marked by all the fervour usual in converts. In a brief memoir of him by Cardinal Newman it is related what pleasure he received permission to die and be buried in the habit of some monastic order. We happen to know that not long before his death he was wandering on the extreme north-west coast of Cornwall and lost his way. He met a farmer who took him to his house, refreshed him—with in such houses the invariable cup of tea—and put him on the right road. The grateful visitor promised to send some token of remembrance, which he did, much to the horror of his host, who, like the great majority of his class, was a decided Wesleyan—in the shape of a printed statement of his reasons for going over to the Church of Rome.

INDEPENDENT SECTION.

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

ILLUSION AND DELUSION: THE WRITINGS OF
CHARLES BRAY.

1. *The Education of the Feelings.* First edition, 1838.
2. *The Philosophy of Necessity.* First edition, 1841.
3. *On Force, its Mental and Moral Correlates.* Undated.
4. *A Manual of Anthropology.* 1871.
5. *Pamphlets by the same Author:—Illusion and Delusion. The Reign of Law, Two Parts. Toleration. Christianity, Two Parts.*

THE works of Mr. Charles Bray, of Coventry, have been long before the world without attracting a degree of attention at all adequate to their deserts. But how, indeed, can the average Briton, with that "bloodthirsty clinging to life" which Mr. Matthew Arnold ascribes to him, be expected to sympathise with a system in which the vanity of things in general and the eternal death that awaits the individual are two of the cardinal doctrines? The gospel of pure Nihilism is a name which has been not inaptly bestowed on the writings of this truculent philosopher. But let the reader form his own judgment as to their tendency from an abstract with which we here present him, culled from the works of our author, and given, to a great extent, in his own words.

We imagine, indeed, that outside of and around us there is a real world, with an actual sun in the heavens above and the veritable verdure of earth beneath, a world wherein we and our friends—friends with real faces—live and move, love and hate, raise seed after our kind, and disappear; but all this is an illusion and delusion, a jugglery of the senses, which conspire with the intellect to impose upon us. The constitution of our faculties, it is true, forces us to believe in such a world; but still

this world is no more a reality than our dreams, which we believe in while they last. Each creature, as we call it, is itself a creator; it makes its own world and carries it about with it; and no two creatures have the same world, since no two creatures are constructed alike. We believe that each separate object we see has a unity of its own; but this is a mistake. The unity is imposed thereupon by the faculty of individuality, and is a mere fiction of the mind. An object in itself is an aggregate of separate and distinct forces, which are called the properties of matter. Matter itself we believe to be solid and impenetrable, and to consist of ultimate particles; but these ultimate particles are "creatures of the imagination, and as pure assumptions as the spirits of the spiritualists." Material atoms are the centres from which forces act, the whereabouts of push and pull. Gross matter, therefore, is quite as ethereal and insubstantial—in fact, as immaterial as spirit itself can be. But centres of force imply locality, and locality space. Space, therefore, must have an existence of its own. If all created things be an illusion, at least the antecedent void is a reality. Not so, however. Space also is a pure creation of the mind. The same holds true of time.

But if the material world thus crumbles into nothingness, at least we touch solid realities in the world of mind. Good and evil surely are real; and in the mandates of the moral law we come face to face with the eternal verities. With the world of mind, however, it fares little, if at all, better. The moral world is plainly as much our own creation as the physical. Men imagine, indeed, that they are masters of themselves, having power to refuse the evil and choose the good; but this is a great illusion and delusion. Men have no such power. Nothing could possibly have been otherwise than it is. Repentance and remorse are foolish regrets over what could not, under the circumstances, have happened differently. All actions, therefore, and all motives are, in their own nature, indifferent; it is only in their consequences that any distinction can be observed between them. Such as minister to man's pleasure he calls "good;" such as give him pain he calls "evil." There is no good but pleasure, and no evil but pain. Hence the distinction between moral and physical evil cannot be maintained. Morality is a kind of chemistry of the mind, the likes and dislikes of the individual corresponding to the attractions and repulsions of atoms. Men, we know, imagine that morality finds its sanction in the existence of a being whom they call God, a person something like themselves, who has a preference for holiness, purity, justice, love, and so on, and takes vigorous measures to secure their practice by his creatures; but this is another of those illu-

sions and delusions to which people are so liable. To attribute moral attributes to the Deity is much the same as to suppose Him to wear clothes.

But if the world of matter and the freedom of the will and moral distinctions and a Personal God are all so many mental impostures, at least we who frame these fictions have a real existence of our own. Far from it. We ourselves are the greatest illusion and delusion of all. The same faculty of individuality which manufactures "bodies" out of the separate forces which go under the name of the properties of matter, gives unity also to certain separate ideas and feelings, and thus creates what we are pleased to call our minds. A mind is the aggregate of a stream of consciousness. Each idea or feeling or state of consciousness is a distinct entity. There is nothing in which impressions and ideas inhere, nothing through which they pass. When we say "I think," we deceive ourselves. What we ought to say is "Thinking is."

Here, then, we reach firm ground at last. We have got being and not mere seeming now. For, whatever else may deceive us, consciousness, at all events, cannot. The "self" and the "not-self," indeed, may be alike illusory. We may deny the external cause of our states of consciousness—matter, or the internal cause of the same states—mind; but the existence of "thinking" stands above dispute, for to doubt it is still a thought. Our own consciousness, then, is all that is known to us, and all that we can by any possibility know. Beyond this we have only more or less probable inference. But the question is what inferences are the most probable. So we turn now to the constructive side of our philosophy.

Consciousness tells us that we have a body, and this body has a brain, and pressure on the brain puts a stop, to all appearance, to consciousness; we are, therefore, driven to the conclusion that there is a direct and immediate connection between consciousness and the brain. Moreover, whatever affects our brain affects our consciousness; between the two there exists an invariable relation, so that, given the state of the one, we might ascertain that of the other. It is evident, then, that it is to the brain we must first look in laying the foundations of our system. Phrenology lies at the base of psychology: and it is only from the inductive study of mind that we can expect any progress in mental science. Metaphysic is mere guesswork until brought into connection with cerebral organisation. Now, the brain is not a single organ but a collection of parts, each the seat of a separate mental faculty, and the strength of each faculty is in proportion to the health, quality, and size of that part of the brain wherewith it is connected. The shape of the head is a fair index of the size of

any organ. These mental faculties, arrived at by the inductive study of craniology, create the world of individual consciousness. The physical world with its myriad marvels, the moral world also with its righteousness and its wickedness, are wholly elaborated by the subtle chemistry of the brain. Whatever, therefore, may, or may not, exist outside of us, the only world of which we can know anything is that which is revealed in our consciousness. Matter, no doubt, exists; but we are absolutely in the dark as to its essential nature. How, then, can we say that it differs from spirit? Nay, if we attend to the point, we shall find reason to believe that the two are in the last resort identical. For matter is known to us only by its properties, and these properties resolve themselves into the various modes of motion which we call the forces of Nature. Heat, light, electricity, galvanism, chemical affinity, attraction and repulsion are the names we give to these various forces; and it is the glory of our age to have shown that they are readily convertible into one another. Physical force, therefore, under whatever form, is one and the same. Now, force in itself is a mere abstraction, and as inseparable from the agent which causes it as motion is from the thing moving. There is, therefore, but one agent or cause of all natural phenomena.

But the round of disguises which this protean agent is capable of assuming is not exhausted by the modes of motion just spoken of. The physical force contained in food is converted in an organism into vital energy, and the molecular action of the brain is transformed into mind or consciousness. Life and mind, therefore, are correlates of physical force; they are the form assumed by physical force when subjected to organic conditions. Thus all phenomena, of what kind soever, are the production of one and the same agent. In this agent is comprised more than mere force; it contains the intelligent direction of the force. It is not motion, but the cause of motion. It is a great mistake to suppose that matter itself is this agent. Matter in no case generates force, but only conditions it. Force, like matter, is indestructible, and neither comes into existence nor goes out of it, but only changes its form.

But how can mere physical force ever be converted into mind or consciousness? It never is. There is no such thing as mere physical force. Every atom of matter acts intelligently, and has so acted always. But, just as in our own case, an act which was performed at first with conscious intelligence comes by dint of repetition to be performed automatically, so the conscious intelligence which once pervaded the world has subsided in the ages into automatic action, constituting what we call "Natural Law." Thus God does not become conscious of Himself in humanity, as

Hegel says, but rather resumes His consciousness. For this one universal agent, the cause of all motion and emotion, is none other than God, "in whom we live and move and have our being."

What, then, of matter? All consciousness, we see, and all physical force, are but "the varied God." There is no agent but mind, conscious or unconscious. What place can matter have in such a scheme as this? Is it a substance distinct from God, but coeval with Him, reluctantly moulded into shape by intelligence? No; God is everything or nothing. He is the clay as well as the potter. God is not in Nature: He is Nature. Matter, so to speak, is mind solidified. It is that mode or form of force which we are constituted to perceive through our senses. Matter is the body of God as force is the soul; and as in man so in Nature, body and soul are one and indivisible. The function of matter is to determine the mode of manifestation which force shall assume. The same force, submitted to different organic conditions, becomes Shakspeare or a sheep. But if matter directs force, it is only because force has so constituted matter as to render this possible. Mind has first to build up organism, before organism can control the manifestation of mind. Practice begets habit, habit begets structure, and structure begets instinct, or unconscious intelligence, alike in the individual and in the world at large. But practice was itself begotten of will. There is therefore a living will, conscious or automatic, in all objects; and primeval fetishism was right. We began with the worship of Nature, and in the worship of Nature we must end. God must be looked for here, in this world, and not in an imaginary scheme of things based on the implied imperfection of this. "Religion itself is the expression of simple reverence and trust, accompanied by awe and wonder, as we stand in the presence of constant and unvarying and irresistible power." We mortals imagine that there must be something very rotten in the state of the universe if it does not tend to our individual happiness. But that is because we still believe the sun to go round the earth in the world of morals. Nature, however, pays no heed to individuals. Her object is to keep life at high pressure, that all may exert their energies to the utmost, and thus increase the sum of general happiness. The final cause of things, indeed, is the production of pleasurable consciousness; but one man's consciousness is as good as another's—not to say better, as the world gets on.

Such are, in very brief outline, the doctrines which Mr. Charles Bray, the philosopher of Coventry, has spent a lifetime in expounding. Mr. Bray first appeared before the world in 1838 as the author of a little book called "The Education of the Feelings." This is a captivating volume, inspired throughout by

a high tone of feeling, full of home truths, and exhibiting an intimate acquaintance with the highways and byeways of the heart of man. Whatever judgment may be formed of Mr. Bray's philosophical powers, we make acquaintance with him here as a good man; for no one can read this little book and fail to esteem the author. With regard to matters of speculation this treatise occupies neutral ground. All can read it with pleasure and approbation, whatever their philosophical or religious opinions. The principles subsequently developed do, indeed, peep out in occasional passages, but they are nowhere aggressively thrust forward. The same practical lessons which Mr. Bray inculcates are constantly deduced by other teachers from quite different premises. Thus the very possibility of morality at all is commonly assumed to rest on the theological, but after all irreligious, doctrine of the freedom of the will: whereas Mr. Bray takes as the indispensable foundation of morality the antagonistic principle of necessity. Like St. Paul he is willing to say, "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling," only on the full understanding that it is God which worketh in all "both to will and to do of His good pleasure."

Mr. Bray's next work, the "Philosophy of Necessity," first published in 1841, is a philosophical vindication of the principles tacitly assumed in the earlier and more popular treatise. Its declared object is to show that "mind is equally the subject of fixed law with matter"—a principle far more widely recognised at the present day than it was when this treatise first appeared. Nowhere is the argument for the Reign of Law in the moral world better or more forcibly put than in the first chapter of this volume. The author shows how our consciousness of freedom in our actions and our instinctive feelings about responsibility, praise and blame, reward and punishment, virtue and vice, find their true explanation in the theory which postulates uniformity of succession in the moral world in place of an exceptional contingency.

The second chapter of this work is devoted to an inquiry into the "Origin, Objects, and Advantages of Evil." As this is one of those questions which have been banned as insoluble, let us spend a moment in considering how far it comes within the limits of profitable discussion.

Why is it that we hear so much about the "mystery of the existence of evil?" And why is no mystery ever made out of the existence of good? Plainly because people insist on starting from their conclusion instead of from the premisses. Postulate a Benevolent and Omnipotent Being as the cause of all things, and evil is then, indeed, a mystery, or rather a contradiction. All must be very good. No philosophy but optimism is open to the

theist who scruples to limit the power of the Creator. The problem, however, is not, Given such and such a cause, to find how its effect can be the state of things we know, but, Given the actual state of things, to ascertain its cause. Now our knowledge of the cause is clearly limited to what we find in the effect. The question for us, therefore, is to understand truly the effect that is to say, to interpret the universe aright. That what we call evil exists in this world of ours is a fact which must be accepted, and which it is futile to discuss. This evil, indeed, may be purely partial and relative ; the harmony of the universe may be made up of discords ; but the evil is not less evil, nor the discord less harsh on that account. It may well be that those conditions and occurrences which shock the sensitive mind are, under the given constitution of things, the only means possible for the production of good. But why the constitution of things should be such as to require this, is a problem on which no man can throw a glimmer of light. Whether the Devil is really as black as he is painted is a perfectly fair inquiry. But why there should be a Devil is a question which it is waste of time to consider. And Mr. Bray, though professing to handle the latter question, has not really touched it. Except in one passage (p. 44), which is obviously fallacious, he has wisely abstained from asking why the constitution of things should be such that pain and suffering, and, what is worse, moral misery and degradation, should be the indispensable condition of progress, and has confined himself to showing that, under the actual scheme of things, evil is not so gratuitous as it looks at first sight.

The publication of "Force and its Mental Correlates" in 1866 was followed, in 1871, by a "Manual of Anthropology," in which our author's views assume a systematic shape, as the titles of the successive chapters are sufficient to show :—1. In the Beginning ; 2. Man ; 3. Morality ; 4. Physics and Metaphysics ; 5. Religion ; 6. Sociology ; 7. Summary and Conclusion. Thus within less than 350 pages we travel from the original "fiery mist" through the study of man as a material, mental, moral, and social being, on to the ultimate conclusion, which constitutes the new religion, that "The One and All requires the resignation of the individual and personal—of all that is selfish—to the Infinite Whole."

These larger works were followed by a number of pamphlets in elucidation of various aspects of the system, one of which has supplied the title of this paper. It is, however, chiefly to the "Manual of Anthropology," as containing the most systematic expression of Mr. Bray's views, that the reader's attention will now be invited. And, passing over the first two chapters, which

are chiefly a compilation, let us glance for a moment at the ethical portion, after which we will go on to the metaphysical views of our author. We have seen that from the first Mr. Bray has aimed at a thorough reorganisation of moral philosophy on the basis of causation, or, as it has been inaptly termed, necessity. Spinoza's definition of freedom is the only one he will accept:—"Human liberty, of which all boast, consists solely in this, that man is conscious of his will, and unconscious of the causes by which it is determined." And thus, as Mr. Bray adds, "a thing is said to be free when it is determined to action by itself alone; but that self, whatever it may be, acts necessarily in accordance with the laws of its own nature." This is the foundation-stone of his whole superstructure, and any one who thinks there is something more in human freedom than this had better leave Mr. Bray's ethic alone, for he will find there no compromise.

"Good and evil are purely subjective;" how is this consistent with our author's speaking of "the external standard of utility?" Because that external standard, or the tendency of actions to produce happiness or misery, resolves itself back into an internal one, since happiness must always be an affair of feeling. To say that there is an external standard of duty is to say that it is not the mind of one individual only that can determine right and wrong.

Mr. Bray is a declared adherent of the school of Bentham, but upon the master's dictum that "The first law of Nature is to seek our own happiness," he puts the following important gloss, "It is true we never directly seek our own happiness, but happiness results from the gratification of our desires and affections." And in this way the self-centred morality which Mr. Bray professes to teach is refined away under his touch till we find the proposition, "A man necessarily seeks his own happiness as the law of his being," reduced to the obvious truism that "he can feel nothing else than his own feelings." In fact, so far from referring conscience and benevolence to self-love, what Mr. Bray really does is to deny the existence of the last-mentioned motive altogether. He cuts at the root of Bishop Butler's distinction "between the cool principle of self-love, or general desire of our own happiness, as one part of our nature and one principal of action; and the particular affections towards particular external objects, as another part of our nature, and another principle of action" (Sermon xi. —Upon the love of our neighbour). Mr. Bray will have none of the "cool principle," but allows conscience and benevolence an equal chance among other particular desires.

It is curious that a moralist who denies any special principle of self-love should be found insisting on the selfishness of every

action. Our author tells us that "If we really love to make our fellow-creatures happy, there is nothing unselfish in our doing it; we are only gratifying our own desire," whence he argues that there can be no such thing as a disinterested affection. This is a common argument enough, but surely a twist of language! True, it is in every case our own desire we seek to gratify: but desires equally our own may have very different objects; the starting-point being the same, the goals may be widely sundered. We may desire our own good without thinking of other people, or we may desire the good of other people without thinking of ourselves. Now, the latter state of mind is just what is intended in common language by "an unselfish and disinterested desire." Similarly, when we do right, regardless of consequences, we do it out of obedience to our own desire. But this is precisely what people mean when they talk of disinterested virtue. We have an interest in right-doing, or we would not do right, but it is not a selfish interest. The word "disinterested" does not imply the absence of interest or liking, but the absence of a selfish interest or expectation of personal gain.

Why Mr. Bray should seek to obliterate the well-defined distinction between physical and moral evil it is not easy to see; except that, while his own teachings are always of the highest, he evidently takes a certain pleasure in deranging the nerves of quiet, respectable people. Certainly the confusion of these two things is no consequence of the doctrine of causation. Granted that moral notions spring originally out of feelings of pain and pleasure, yet in the process of evolution they lose sight of their origin, and become the source of keener pangs and purer pleasures than anything physical can produce. Witness Regulus returning to his spikes, an illustration which our author is himself very fond of. Granted also that the good and the evil of actions lie not in the actions themselves, since all is determined, but in the view we take of them, yet the relativity to us of moral good and evil does not at all diminish their reality. The solid earth with all its moving life, the infinite interspaces of the stars, and the dateless epochs of geology owe their reality to minds so constituted as to have ideas of time, space, and matter. But is that reality thereby rendered one whit the less? It is a relative reality only that men are concerned with, though they are not aware of the fact, because they leave out of count their own minds the one permanent factor in all cognition. The absolute reality of unknown and unknowable causes is assumed and may be fictitious.

This remark brings us by an easy transition to the metaphysical views of our author.

Let us first concentrate our attention on the most salient feature

of Mr. Bray's philosophy—namely, the illusion and delusion of things in general. When a man begins to talk in this uncomfortable sort of way, one ought to pin him down to a definition of reality. It will very soon appear that the reality he denies is a reality which the healthy, honest, easy-going people, who are disturbed by his scepticism, are not at all concerned to maintain. It is not philosophical quiddities and entities that Brown and Jones care about, but the facts of sight and touch. Leave them these, with the power acquired by experience of foreseeing the orderly recurrence of perceptions, and you may do what you like with the substrata. But, says Mr. Bray, in effect, though not in these words, the real world is not the world of my perceptions, but something which underlies my perceptions; and as my perceptions demonstrably cannot resemble the external world which they typify, it is evident that man walks in a vain show, Nature is organised hypocrisy, God is a liar, and existence a cheat. He does not go on to wish, as some do, to be freed, once and for ever, from this insulting and painful position of affairs; for, indeed, Mr. Bray exhibits a highly commendable and philosophical calmness under the systematic imposture of which he believes himself the victim. His mind is too well-balanced and his digestion, no doubt, too good, to allow his scepticism to cloud his happiness. But since this scepticism is not the freak of a single mind, but the reasoned, and, as they think, philosophical belief of many, it is well to examine what it is worth.

My perceptions, the sceptic informs me, cannot resemble the external world. That depends entirely on what is meant by the "external world." Most people are ready to believe that A's perceptions resemble B's, if both A and B have the usual complement of senses in good working order. Now, if there be anything more in externality than the fact that A's perceptions do not stand alone, but are corroborated by B's and C's and D's, and so on to the Nth, it is a pity no one has explained what it is within the last three or four thousand years during which men have been racking their brains on the subject. The table at which I write is a solid reality; I can both see it and touch it; I scout the notion of its being a subjective hallucination. But why? Because I am quite sure that if my wife were to come into the room, her perceptions would corroborate mine. If they failed to do so, one of us would have to consign the other to the care of Dr. Tuke. The only world, then, external to my perceptions is the world of some one else's perceptions; and, as it is commonly allowed that sane, healthy people agree in their perceptions, it follows that it is untrue to say that my perceptions cannot resemble the external world. To avoid confusion, the reader must remember that we are here speaking, by no choice

of our own, of externality to mind. Of course there is a world external to my body, for externality is a relation which holds between one set of perceptions and another. But to talk of a world external to my consciousness, in any other sense than as depending on the consciousness of some one else, is meaningless, unless, indeed, we conceive of consciousness as an extended substance.

As for the source of Mr. Bray's scepticism, it is the same as that of all metaphysical scepticism—namely, the theory of a representative perception. This theory postulates that the world of our consciousness is not the real world at all, but only a blurred and distorted image of it. Now, if there be a noumenal world behind the phenomenal, and the noumenal world be the real world, while the phenomenal is all we know, then, of course, we never come into contact with reality at all. But if the world of our consciousness be the real, and the only real, world, where is all the illusion and delusion? For even Mr. Bray allows that we are certain of our own consciousness. This is a faith which no man taketh away from us. But, rightly understood, this is all that is required to secure the reality of the material universe. Sun, moon, and stars, the heaving ocean, and the eternal hills—what are all these but so many combinations of sense-impressions, actual or potential? It is the approaches to idealism only that are sceptical: complete idealism leads men back to common sense. A stupid and unmetaphysical generation pronounced Berkeley visionary, notwithstanding that his system was really a revolt against the absurdities of Locke, who informed a bewildered world that the greenness of a table-cloth was only in the mind of the spectator, while the length, breadth, and thickness of it were in the article procured at the draper's. Berkeley struck at the root of scepticism by identifying things with ideas. Reid, disliking the sound of his conclusions, refuted him, with much self-complacency, by identifying ideas with things! The essential point, of course is to see that there is no difference between the two—that the ideal (in this sense) is the real and the real the ideal, in opposition to scepticism which declares that the only real is the noumenal, and is inaccessible to sense. But Mr. Bray, instead of following out idealism to its full and legitimate conclusion, has stopped short at a half-assent to it, which is worse than none at all. He has gone far enough to say that consciousness is all we know, and not far enough to say that consciousness is all there is; so that the result is a divorce of knowledge from existence. He thinks himself bound to believe that there is a real and objective world, while convinced that this world is out of reach of human ken, and that no man ever came across any firmer reality than a subjective mirage of his own making. How

much those words "subjective" and "objective" have to answer for! If Mr. Bray could only see that the distinction they mark is not between consciousness and some other kind of existence, but between one department of consciousness and another, he would cease to pour contempt on our daily impressions of reality. Such states of a man's consciousness as are peculiar to himself we call "subjective;" such as are common to him with others are "objective." The latter series of mental states constitutes the external world; for, being common to many minds, they are external to, or independent of, any particular consciousness. If I see a human figure standing in my room, which no one else can see—that is a subjective hallucination; if everybody else, under the proper conditions, can see it, then it is an objective reality. Now, it is this kind of reality only—namely, the reality of corroborated sense-experience, which the mass of men are concerned with. Brown and Jones would stare on being told that there is no reality in a marble, which is green and smooth and round and hard, but that the whole reality lies in an unknown and unknowable something, which is the cause of those impressions; and if they were further informed that their sense-impressions were worth nothing unless they were true copies of what had just been declared to be unknown and unknowable, their astonishment would become tinged with contempt. Even if the metaphysician were to abate somewhat of his pretensions, and entreat them to believe that the marble they beheld and handled implied the existence of another marble, or of a cause of that marble, which they could neither behold nor handle, they would fail to see the necessity of the inference. And the present writer, too, as one of the vulgar, fails to see the necessity of such an inference. He does not, indeed, wish to deny that there may be a cause, or causes, of the consensual impressions of mankind. Such an inference is plausible, but cannot be necessary. For since there must be an uncaused somewhere, there is no logical bar to our placing it at perceptions, and resting in them as ultimate facts. But the very doubtfulness of the inference from perceptions to a cause is an additional proof, if such were needed, that a consideration of causes does not enter into our idea of the reality of things. Sublunary reality implies no reference to, much less consists in, such cause or causes. What ordinary people mean by "reality" is a series of phenomena—the metaphysician may pronounce them "effects" if he will, but that is to import a theory—and beyond these phenomena they never go. Let us, too, be content with a vulgar reality, and we may look on unappalled at the tricks of the "almighty showman," which Mr. Bray lays himself out to explode.

Having now entrenched ourselves within the impregnable lines

of a mundane and market-day reality, we will watch Mr. Bray's ship ploughing the abysmal ocean of metaphysic, and throw a shell or two into her at our leisure. Mr. Bray may have his revenge when he finds us sailing on the same waters.

Outside the world of consciousness Mr. Bray discovers two things, force and matter, and these two are one, or, at all events, agree in one. Thus matter and force, instead of being mere abstract names, the one for certain states of our consciousness with their established relations, the other for the changes which these undergo, are transformed in our author's system, as they so often are elsewhere, into a thriving pair of deities—active and passive, if not actually male and female. Mr. Bray tells us that it must be distinctly understood throughout his book that "force" represents an entity, not a condition (*Manual*, p. 36). Matter is the body and force is the soul of the one substance of the universe. Now all force is, in its essence, will. This will, working from everlasting to everlasting, has always, in some incomprehensible way, been solidifying itself into organism, making certain grooves, apparently, for itself, out of itself, to direct its own action. At all events, matter exists as well as force—that Mr. Bray is quite sure of—and its function is to determine the action of will, and enable it to become permanent and automatic. Thus matter plays the same part in Mr. Bray's system as the "occasional causes" of Malebranche. But Malebranche's idea was a step forwards, and led Berkeley to see that matter could be dispensed with altogether, since the direct action of will was quite competent to take care of itself and produce phenomena unaided; whereas, Mr. Bray's "matter," we cannot help thinking, is a step backwards. Malebranche, moreover, imagined that he had the authority of Divine revelation for the existence of an unthinking substratum of perceptions. But Mr. Bray has no such imperative inducement. Why, then, does he encumber himself with a superfluous principle? Surely the best metaphysician is he who accounts for appearances by means of the fewest assumptions! Perhaps, however, the reason is not far to seek. Finding that certain relations hold true of force and matter within the sphere of consciousness, Mr. Bray transfers those relations to his ontological entities, which are not the force and matter with which science deals. This is a frequent vice in metaphysical treatises. Science knows nothing of the world of absolute existence into which our author attempts to penetrate. Its task is the analysis of the common consciousness of mankind, actual and potential. When science explores the recesses of space and the buried eras of time, she is finding what potential experiences are indicated by the analogy of our actual perceptions. Science, in a word, is inductive inference grounded

on existing facts of sense. If, then, Mr. Bray will wing his adventurous flight into the land of no man's consciousness, he must not force scientific conceptions to become the companions of his voyage. Space and time, he tells us, are forms of human thought. Here are his own words for it:—"We have ideas also of space and time, and must, therefore, have faculties that create them; but, however difficult it may be to conceive, they are not entities, but *pure creations of the mind*, and have no existence out of ourselves." The *italics* are ours, and we hail the declaration. But what are poor matter and motion and force and structure to do in a world where time and space are not? The structure which makes the whole difference between Shakspeare and a sheep is a structure which does not exist in space—which has neither length, breadth, nor thickness! Surely this is neither science nor metaphysic, but the hybrid offspring of their unnatural union! Science postulates phenomena, and applies itself to ascertain the laws of their succession; metaphysic is an attempt to account for phenomena by means of other than physical causes. It is clear that the intersection of these two planes of thought can only produce confusion. Thus, we have Mr. Bray telling us, in emphatic language, that "Consciousness is all we know or can know, and we cannot know, therefore, of anything differing from it" (p. 161), while he lays down with equal positiveness the doctrine of a material basis of consciousness—"Of course, there is a world without us, but the world in which we believe is created by a correlation of forces in the brain, which forces are received in different quantities, and are variously modified before they reach the brain" (p. 163). Now, these two propositions refuse amalgamation. For if consciousness be all we know or can know, then the brain, as we know it, is a part of our consciousness. But, if so, it is clear consciousness cannot depend on the only brain we know. It must, therefore, depend on some other brain—not on the phenomenal, but on a noumenal brain—a brain of no dimensions, because not existing in space, which is itself a product of consciousness. But is this the meaning which any physiologist would care to have attached to his words? When the physiologist refers consciousness to the brain he has in mind the material brain which he can examine and dissect.

The same strange compound of Hume's idealism with the belief in a material basis of consciousness is perpetually presented to us in Mr. Bray's pages. Take the following perplexing passage as typical of many:—"The phenomenal world is not a reality; each creature creates its own world and carries it about in its own head; outside itself there is nothing but the play of forces on the nervous centres of each being" (p. 231). Now, if

“outside itself” means outside the animal’s head, then there is a whole world of material objects outside; if it means outside the individual consciousness, then neither head nor nervous centres can exist outside of that, save in so far as they exist in some other like consciousness. Or does Mr. Bray mean to assign a prerogative of absolute existence to the head over the other members of the body? His phrenological proclivities will hardly carry him so far as that. But, not to press verbal objections, what our author seems to mean is this—Withdraw from the world the glamour of individual consciousness, and you will find only force acting on structure. This may sound like a very ordinary materialism. But there are two things to be borne in mind. One is that this structure is not different in kind from force, but is itself force which has somehow crystallised into form; the other, that we have here that mysterious extra-spacial structure, whose acquaintance we have already made. This absurdity of a structure which does not exist in space, and is divorced from all the properties of matter, is the outcome of our author’s attempt to reconcile the idealism of Hume with the superficial materialism of science. Idealism implies that the brain, like every other material object, exists only in consciousness. Science, on the other hand, seems to declare that consciousness depends on the brain. Mr. Bray adopts both views at once. And so, to suit the exigencies of the case, there must be two brains—one the phenomenal brain, which we can feel and see, the other a noumenal brain, impalpable and invisible. But the discovery that there are two such different brains is one which the reader has to make for himself: Mr. Bray does not help him to it. He speaks constantly in some such way as this:—“There is nothing outside of us but one simple force, in various modes of action, acting upon the brain” (p. 95), as if one particular mass of white pulp enjoyed a prerogative of objectivity denied to other objects. It is as difficult to serve two masters in philosophy as in religion. If matter owes its existence to mind, mind cannot depend on matter. The idealism of our author is fatal to his materialism.

But when science refers consciousness to the brain, is she really entering the lists against idealism, and supplanting mind by matter? This point will repay a moment’s attention. For there is a loose notion abroad that she does so, whereas the great masters of science are declared idealists.

“The soul, in a sense,” as Jonathan Edwards says, “has its seat in the brain, and so, in a sense, the visible world is existent out of the mind; for it certainly, in the proper sense, exists out of the brain.” Now, we have seen already in what sense “the visible world is existent out of the mind”—namely, in so far as it

exists in other minds. Let us, then, examine in what sense it is true to say that "the soul has its seat in the brain." And let us begin by hastening to grant what Professor Tyndall tells us no profound scientific thinker, who has reflected on the subject, is unwilling to admit—namely, "the extreme probability of the hypothesis, that for every fact of consciousness, whether in the domain of sense, of thought, or of emotion, a definite molecular condition of motion or structure is set up in the brain." But does the admission of this principle mean the dependence of mind upon matter? Nothing could be further from the truth. My brain exists—but how? It exists, along with my whole bodily organism, only in my own mind and in the minds of other people. It is part of the common stock of consciousness. But that particular collection of actual or possible sense-impressions, which constitutes my bodily organism is, if rightly interpreted, a safe index of my mental capacities. There is a certain fixed and ascertainable relation between the powers of the inner individual being and the complexity of its outer manifestation in the consciousness, actual or possible, of others. Not only so, but every change in the individual consciousness entails concomitant variations in that portion of the common consciousness which corresponds thereto. The physiologist believes that feeling is always accompanied by molecular action—in other words, he believes that for every fact of consciousness there are certain sense-impressions with which he himself and others might be affected. The movements of brain-substance which attend the individual consciousness are the outward and visible sign of an inner spiritual fact; they are the objective revelation of a subjective state—objective, not in that they are of a nature distinct from consciousness, but in that they are common to the consciousness of all. Only, then, by a lame metaphor can it be said that "the soul has its seat in the brain," and what this metaphor expresses is that one series of facts of consciousness stands as an index of another. The discoveries of cerebral physiology do not in any way traverse the conclusions of idealism, as the best physiologists of the day are aware; and Mr. Bray has contaminated his metaphysic without earning the thanks of science.

Precisely the same objections apply to Schopenhauer's* system, of which our author's is, in its main features, a reproduction. The following account of that writer's theory of intelligence, which we borrow from M. Ribot (*La Philosophie de Schopenhauer*), might equally well have been written of the opinions we are considering:—

* It may not be inappropriate to remind the reader that what first drew attention to Schopenhauer in England, and, to a great extent also, in Germany, was Mr. Oxenford's well-known Article in this REVIEW.

“With Schopenhauer the theory of intelligence is a mere theory of appearances. Its object is to explain how one and the same will, the sole reality, presents itself to us as manifold and variable in the endless multiplicity of natural phenomena. He supposes that our world, with its plains, its hills, its rivers, its trees, its sentient and thinking beings—that all these, with everything of the like nature that may exist in other worlds, may be resolved in the last resort into will—that is to say, into forces; that an extremely small portion of this matter, which we call brain or ganglion, according to its degree of organisation or complexity, possesses the marvellous property of giving expression in itself to all that acts upon it; that this portion resembles a mirror wherein will is reflected, and recognises itself in all its degrees; inasmuch that the universe is only a “phantom of the brain” (*Gehirnphänomenon*), and will never part with its essential sameness, save in so far as it falls under the intellectual (or cerebral) forms of time, space, and causality, which make it appear successive, extended, and changeable.”

We are here met by the same astounding contradiction with which we have already been so much exercised. As M. Ribot remarks—“The world, with its physical, chemical, and physiological phenomena, exists, it is assumed, only in the brain; but the brain itself pre-supposes the existence of certain physical, chemical, and physiological facts. This is a grave difficulty.” Schopenhauer, indeed, has a loophole in his doctrine of the identity of mind and matter, as one and the same thing viewed from opposite sides. But then he may be confronted with his own teaching that intelligence is only a tertiary phenomenon, the first place appertaining to will, the second to the organism or body, which is the immediate objectivation of will, the third only to thought, as a function of organisation. And here, as M. Ribot justly points out, the same entanglement recurs. For an organism cannot be supposed to exist apart from the conditions of existence (time, place, and change), but these are pronounced by Schopenhauer's idealism to be elements supplied by intelligence, which is the sole source of the multiplicity and diversity of things.

But, notwithstanding the close resemblance between our author's system and that of Schopenhauer, there is still one vital difference, which imparts a different complexion to the two. For, according to Schopenhauer, the normal state of will is unconsciousness, whereas Mr. Bray views will as in its own nature conscious, and as lapsing into the unconscious only by accident. Let us call in once more the aid of M. Ribot to set Schopenhauer's doctrine in a clear light. “There is one point of the highest importance on which we ought to insist at once; for without understanding it the reader will be exposed to a complete misapprehension of all that follows. Schopenhauer employs the

word will in a sense peculiar to himself, and which might, without serious inexactness, be rendered by the word force. Will is commonly taken to mean the conscious act of an intelligent being, whereas with Schopenhauer will is essentially unconscious, and becomes conscious only by accident." Now, with our author the case is quite the reverse. The force or will which he finds in the innermost core of things, as the residual of phenomena, the ἀλήθινον of the ψεύδος of sense is originally, and in its proper nature, a conscious force or will, and only loses consciousness when the need for it is removed by the substitution of habit for intelligence. This peculiar anthropomorphism, whereby the laws of Nature are assimilated to the effect of habit in ourselves, is decidedly the most original idea in Mr. Bray's writings, and at once the most worthy and the most likely to live. One may point to sources whence his other opinions were, or might have been, derived; but this one seems a product of the soil. Dr. Martineau, it will be remembered, made use of the idea two years ago in his Article entitled "Modern Materialism,"* and ascribes his own grasp of it to Fechner's theory of protoplasm, as being not the germ but the refuse of life. He was, doubtless, unaware of the simple and vigorous expression given to the idea by Mr. Bray as early as 1869.†

On the religious views of Mr. Bray we need not expatiate. Suffice it to say that he is in the van of that movement which our age is slowly but surely accomplishing, from a theistic to a pantheistic standpoint. He looks, as we have seen, for no future reversal of the conditions of existence, but finds a present and immediate moral government of the world in his firm conviction that virtue is the gainer and vice the loser here and now.

" But sometimes virtue starves, while vice is fed !
What then ? Is the reward of virtue bread ?"

The reader will find in him none of the moroseness and misanthropy of Schopenhauer; indeed, a serene content is his main characteristic, the outcome of his assurance that the universe is sacred, and that, however queer things may look, "all is God, and therefore all is good."

Such is the writer to whom we have thought it worth while to invite the attention of a too neglectful public. If Schopenhauer, in spite of the same flaw in his system, has been able to gain so wide a renown on the Continent, surely Mr. Bray is entitled to some regard in our country, where his views were novel when he first propounded them, and have certainly not received due

* *Contemporary Review*, March, 1876.

† In a Paper in the *Anthropological Review*, incorporated two years afterwards into the *Manual*.

attention yet. Of course, no writer who follows another in a like train of thought can expect the same credit for originality, however self-evolved his views may be: for opinions go about, like diseases, in the air, and are spread by mere infection. But still, to English readers, the works of the philosopher of Coventry are very worthy of study. Mr. Bray can write with both vigour and beauty, though his diction is sometimes slipshod, and the thread of argument is apt to lose itself, chiefly through the grave fault in style of a superabundance of quotations. If he would reduce his many works to one containing nothing unessential, he would, doubtless, obtain that high place among the philosophers of our country to which his power of thought entitle him.



INDIA AND OUR COLONIAL EMPIRE.

WE propose, as briefly as we can, to complete the narrative of the events which led to the Afghan war. At first, the Russian Government hesitated. The press, which when it does not speak under the inspiration of Government, speaks in accordance with its wishes, was then engaged in discussing the new order of things which the will of the Czar would build on the ruins of the Berlin Treaty. It pointed out that, as England's hands were tied by the troubles Russia had prepared for it in Afghanistan, that impious country could no longer interfere with the designs of Providence in Europe. It suggested that Russian officers should aid the Afghans, as English officers aided the Turks. Holy Russia, fresh from the overthrow of the Turks, was prepared for a crusade on behalf of Islam, and volunteers were said to be coming forward in great numbers. From Cabul we heard that many European soldiers were there, and we have little doubt that our brave Highlanders attacked the stockades at Peiwar Kotal all the more willingly because they thought they sheltered Russians. But there was a change, perhaps in circumstances, but certainly in the attitude, of the St. Petersburg Government. At first it knew nothing of a Mission or a letter—then it had information, but was able to say the Mission was of a wholly complimentary character—then it gave our Government assurances which led it to believe that the Mission had been withdrawn; then—after distinct language from Whitehall—what remained of the Mission left, and in its train went Shir Ali. Soon the Russian papers were echoing dove-like strains of peace. The Berlin Treaty was to be carried out with that fidelity to engagements which had always characterised the policy of the Czar. Russian interests were said to lie in the development of what Russia has, not in wild schemes of territorial extension. This is very pleasing and will serve, we doubt not, as a text for many a discourse by the long-suffering friends of Russia, who attribute all our troubles to our incurable distrust. Faith, we know, removes mountains—of unfavourable evidence. We, however, think it not superfluous to thank our Government for adopting a policy which, as the event proves, has either led the Czar to adopt moderate counsels, or has been based on

. [Vol. CXI. No. CCXX.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LV. No. II. K K

clear prevision of the European situation. General Kaufmann, we suppose, has written in his simple, honest way letters of explanation, and has sent to the Khan of Khiva and the Amir of Bukhara translations of Lord Lawrence's prophecies as to the evils our intervention in Afghan affairs are certain to bring upon us. As to his original intentions there can be no doubt. In a speech to the Envoy, whom, after the arrival of the Russians, the Amir sent to Tashkent, General Kaufmann used language capable of only one interpretation—that in the approaching war with England the Czar would protect his friend and ally, the Amir. The information from Cabul, too, distinctly shows that the Amir was promised assistance.

On the 2nd of August, when the news of the presence of the Russian Mission was confirmed, the Viceroy telegraphed to the Secretary of State for instructions. He said he thought he could correct the situation if allowed to treat the question as one between the Indian Government and the Amir—probably without recourse to force. He proposed to insist on the reception of a suitable British Mission—did not anticipate that the Amir would seriously resist the proposal—thought rather that he would, adhering to his old policy of playing Russia and England off against each other, really welcome it, while outwardly seeming to yield only to pressure. The object of the Mission would be to effect arrangements of the character proposed before, but *dynastic obligations would be avoided*. If, however, the attempt again failed, the Government would then have to consider what alternative measures were necessary for the protection and permanent tranquillity of the frontier. From the claims put forward by Lord Lytton's friends in the press we hope we may assume that the word "consider" is but a *façon de parler*, and that the "well-considered" scheme already existed.

The Home Government having sanctioned the Viceroy's proposal, on the 14th August a letter was sent to the Amir informing him that it had become necessary to communicate with him fully and without reserve on matters of importance regarding India and Afghanistan. A special and confidential Envoy was therefore sent to converse personally with the Amir regarding these urgent affairs. "It appears certain that they can be best arranged for the welfare and tranquillity of both States, and for the preservation of friendship by a full and frank statement of the position." The Amir was therefore asked to issue orders to his officers to make, without any delay, arrangements for safe conduct and suitable accommodation. The Envoy was Sir Neville B. Chamberlain, to whose personal fitness for the post was added the recommendation that he had at one time been a personal friend of the Amir. The Viceroy's letter was sent by the hand of

Nawab Ghulam Husen Khan, who had been our agent at Cabul, and was a *persond grata* to the Amir.

On the 21st August, Abdulla Jan, heir-apparent of Cabul, died. A second letter of condolence was entrusted to Nawab Ghulam Husen, and in it the Amir was informed that in order that he might not be troubled by any public business, however urgent, the Envoy would delay his departure so that he would not reach Cabul till after the usual period of mourning (forty days). •

On the 25th Colonel Abramoff left Cabul. His subordinates remained.

On the 10th September our Agent reached Cabul, and on the 12th had an interview with the Amir. Towards the close of his journey he had been allowed to travel only by short stages, and the Mustaufi had written to the Commissioner of Peshawar to say that the Mission should await at Peshawar the Amir's pleasure. In reply, the Commissioner wrote to the Mustaufi and to the officers at Jelalabad, Daka, and Ali Masjid identical letters which have been made the subject of the gravest charges against the Government. The purport was that the Mission would in any case start—that its object was friendly, and that the refusal of a free passage would be regarded as an act of hostility. The object of the Amir was believed to be to cause delay, and therefore letters had to be sent direct to subordinate Afghan officials to prevent them or the Amir from subsequently alleging that there was no opportunity of giving them instructions. While Ghulam Husen was still on his way, Major Cavagnari was negotiating with the Khaibar tribes for a passage, on the understanding that no active opposition should be offered by the Amir or his officials. But on the 14th Faiz Muhamad, the Amir's commandant at Ali Masjid, summoned back the headmen from Peshawar. His object apparently was to prevent the Mission from reaching Ali Masjid. The Khaibaris were alarmed lest, if they disobeyed the order, they should lose the subsidy the Amir allowed them for keeping the pass open. The Viceroy instructed Major Cavagnari to be careful to avoid giving the Amir any plausible ground of complaint by separate arrangement with the Khaibaris before he had offered opposition to the Mission. General Chamberlain accordingly, on the 15th September, wrote to Faiz Muhamad, referring to the recall of the headmen and the recent visit of a high official to Ali Masjid, and requiring a clear reply as to whether he was prepared to guarantee the safety of the Mission to Daka. Negotiations, he says, were opened with the Khaibaris solely to arrange for the safe conduct of the Mission through the Khaibar and the tribes were given clearly to understand that the negotiations were in no way intended to prejudice their relations with the Amir. The 18th was fixed for a reply. If no answer was received by that

date, or if it proved unsatisfactory, General Chamberlain would make what arrangements he thought best for carrying out his instructions.

The Khaibaris, we may remark, are in no sense subjects of the Amir. To keep the pass open he subsidises them. We have done the same when necessary. The Amir was not responsible to us for offences committed by them. His only means of asserting his authority was his fortified post at Ali Masjid, and that had been but recently occupied by him. The Afridis of these hills had constant relations with our subjects—peaceful generally, but too often warlike.

Faiz Muhamad answered that he had received no instructions, but suggested that we should wait to see the result of Mir Akhor's approaching visit.

We return now to Cabul. At the interview with the Amir on the 12th, our Envoy presented the Viceroy's letters. The Amir handed him the letters from the Commissioner of Peshawar to the Mustaufi and the (confidential) letter to the Envoy, and seemed much displeased at their tone. He complained that the Mission was coming by force, as if to disgrace him. The Russian Envoy had come with his permission [he omitted to add that his permission had been given under precisely the same circumstances as those under which we sought it]. He was plunged in grief, he said, and had no time to think.

As Faiz Muhamad sent no answer after Mir Akhor's visit, Major Cavagnari was engaged on the 18th September in negotiating with the Khaibaris to escort the Mission as a matter of ordinary safe conduct to Ali Masjid, and back if necessary. The object was, of course, to bring to a test as soon as possible the intentions of the Afghans. On the 19th the Viceroy sanctioned measures for permanently detaching the tribes from the Amir. Meanwhile, another letter had come from Ghulam Husen. The Afghan Minister for Frontier Affairs (whose visit to Ali Masjid had been followed by the recall of the Khaibaris) had assured him on his oath that the Amir promised that if the Mission were not pressed the Amir would invite it of himself and clear up past misunderstandings. He (the Amir) had not invited the Russian Mission, but, being helpless and estranged from England, he had permitted it to come. It was purely ceremonial, and he had no wish to allow the Russians a right of way through his country. He would dismiss their Envoy at the first opportunity, and then invite the English Mission. This is plausible enough. But, knowing all we do from other sources, we think it would have been mere fatuity on our part to have placed any reliance on it. Its inconsistency with the Amir's former attitude and assertions is sufficiently obvious. Ghulam Husen was authorised to explain courteously in reply that the departure of the Mission had been already postponed, and that it was hoped

that the invitation would now meet it on the road. It would be waste of time to analyse all the Envoy's reports. Two letters of the 19th illustrate the value of such documents as materials for argument. The first recommends that a very courteous, deferential letter (of which a draft is given) should be sent to the Amir, begging him to issue orders for a safe conduct for the Mission now at Peshawar, &c. The second letter explains the origin of the first. The Envoy was allowed to write only what he heard from the Wazir or the Amir. No one was allowed to communicate with him. If the Government thought delay injurious then it ought to recall him. As to the matter of the letter thus suggested by the Amir there is no great objection. But the whole object of proposing it was obviously to procure delay. We are told that the Amir consulted the chief of the Russian Mission, and was told by him that the presence of the representatives of two hostile nations at his Court would be awkward. But a more important thing to remember is that the Amir had sent a Mission to Tashkent. By this time we had made satisfactory arrangements with the Khaibaris, and Mir Akhor (the Amir's evil genius) had arrived at Ali Masjid.

On the 22nd September, Major Cavagnari proceeded with a small escort to Ali Masjid. He was stopped by Afghan pickets, and found that the heights had been covered by armed men, and every preparation made to resist his advance. At last Faiz Muhamad came out to meet him. In the conversation that followed, the commandant, though solemnly reminded that his act would be regarded as the act of the Amir, refused to let the Mission pass. It does not seem quite clear whether he said that, but for personal friendship, he would have shot Major Cavagnari down, or merely said as evidence of his friendly feelings that he could, if he wished, have shot him down. But it is immaterial whether the repulse was attended with deliberate insult. The Amir had, by his act, declared that he would be absolutely independent of us—would receive Russian Missions and exclude ours—and this he had declared while Russia and India stood expectant of his decision. This is a doctrine of his rights in which even Liberal statesmen have at last had the courage to say they do not concur. The Mission was dissolved. The Viceroy was anxious to proceed to military measures at once, but the Home Government chiefly, we think, in deference to opinion at home, determined to give him a *locus penitentiae*. On the 2nd of November an ultimatum was delivered to Faiz Muhamad at Ali Masjid, and a duplicate was sent by ordinary post. Our requirements were (1) a full and suitable apology to be offered in writing and tendered in British territory by an officer

of sufficient rank ; (2) the reception of a permanent British Mission ; (3) a guarantee of immunity to the tribes who acted as guides to the Mission. Meanwhile, on the 19th October, a reply had come from the Amir. It merely complains of the harsh tone of the letter we had addressed to him and his officials regarding the Mission ; characterises our proceedings under the circumstances as unfriendly and malign ; says his officials have not desired to act in a hostile spirit to the British Government, but, if any Power shows unjustifiable animosity to him, he cannot help it. We have paraphrased the Persian (which, in a literal translation, sounds so subdued and devout, that many worthy British folk have been won by it into sympathy with the writer) into English as nearly corresponding in tone as possible. It will be observed that there is no answer to our requests ; no apology for the repulse at Ali Masjid ; and no explanation of the delay in answering. The ultimatum similarly remained unanswered till the capture of Ali Masjid, and an altered estimate of Russian and English power led him to adopt a less uncompromising tone. After all the considerations we have urged elsewhere, it is unnecessary, we think, to add anything in order to show that armed intervention was expedient and just. We should hardly have urged them at such length were it not that persons known to be intelligent and conscientious still maintain that we forced a quarrel on the Amir in order to carry out a mischievous policy. One remark we must add to meet an oft-recurring objection. The escort consisted of only 150 cavalry and 50 infantry—a force certainly not greater than regard to our own dignity and that of the Amir required. It was far less than the Amir brought with him to Ambala, and not more than was required to guard the necessary train and the presents for the Amir.

As no answer to the ultimatum had been received by the 20th of November our troops crossed the border of Afghanistan. We need not narrate in detail the events of the war. General Sir S. Browne's column captured Ali Masjid after a short resistance, and the Amir's garrison retreated in disorder to Cabul. Many of them were made prisoners by the hill men, or cut off by our troops on the way. No stand was made elsewhere in the Khaibar, and our army has spent the winter at Jelalabad—a strong position in a fertile plain, about half-way between Peshawar and Cabul. We are hardly in a position to criticise the military conduct of the campaign. A well-known correspondent of soldier-like instincts describes the strategy of the attack on Ali Masjid as contemptible, and ascribes our success only to the fact that the Afghan commander blundered more than his enemy. Military opinion in India has denounced such criticism in the strongest terms, and, we must add, that many other criticisms and predictions of the

same authority when judged by the event have proved captious and baseless. The not unreasonable restrictions put on the transmission of news seem to have irritated the representatives of the press, and, by a vicious process of thought, they seem to have believed that because what is true is sometimes disagreeable—what is disagreeable must necessarily be true. There was much, no doubt, to report that gave fair ground for anxiety. The Indian transport and commissariat services are organised for peace, not war, and under the sudden strain of a campaign, under wholly new conditions, the improvised arrangements did not at first work well. There were the usual differences of opinion between the political and military officers—the former looking to the future and thinking of the temper of the Afghans, the latter thinking of the present and the wants of their men. Fanatical Musulman preachers were busy among the hill tribes that bordered on the Pass. Their own love of plunder and adventure was enough to tempt them to attack our convoys and stragglers. The telegraph wires were constantly cut, camp-followers were murdered, and for several days the passage of supplies was interrupted. Our unexpected success had rendered possible so rapid an advance that the line of communication became dangerously weak. But soon the reserve of feudatory troops came up and guarded the Pass while the main column advanced onward to Jelalabad. The political officers—no doubt, by that lavish system of bribery, of which accounts from Tashkent grounded on Afghan reports speak so feelingly—succeeded in inducing the heads of the various tribes, or sections of tribes, to enter into engagements not to molest our convoys. Several powerful chiefs—impelled rather by ill-will to the Amir than by friendship for us—voluntarily tendered and accorded us their active help and countenance. But the temptation to plunder was so strong that individuals united in robber-bands in disregard of the promises of their head men. To repress these outrages several minor expeditions were necessary—one at least of which ended in something very like failure. All these things were evils, no doubt, but they were evils which were clearly foreseen by those who planned the campaign. They were difficulties we had to meet, just as the roughness of the roads or the prospects of resistance were difficulties. They have all been happily overcome. A good road runs from Peshawar to Jelalabad. It is well guarded throughout. Supplies are abundant. Warm clothing—the want of which at first caused great hardships to the native troops, many of whom for the first time encountered the real rigours of winter—was soon supplied, and now the force at Jelalabad is ready at a moment's notice for an advance, if necessary, on Cabul.

The force under General Roberts advanced unmolested through the

Kuram valley. At the Pewar Kotul it encountered the only real resistance made by any portion of the Amir's troops. For a time it seemed as if our men could not dislodge the enemy from their splendid position on the heights; but at last the gallantry of the Highlanders and Gurkhas prevailed and justified what, had the result been failure, would have seemed the recklessness of the commander. General Roberts advanced to the Shuturgardan which was undefended. From its crest he could see the fertile valley, through which the road to Cabul lay, and had the mortification of knowing that, if he had sufficient troops to protect his communications, he could have marched unresisted on the capital, and ended the war by one sudden blow. But he had to withdraw to Kuram. He took part of his force into the Khost country, where the Amir's Governor tendered submission. The tribes of the Kuram valley and of the Khost country had from the first been peaceful and submissive. But in the hills that enclose on both sides the Khost valley dwell the fiercest races of Afghanistan. These attacked with reckless courage the English camp. They were driven off with great slaughter, but alarms of further gatherings continued. At last the General saw the necessity of concentrating his small and scattered forces. He withdrew from Khost, leaving one of the Cabul Princes to rule the country in his name; but he had hardly reached his first halting-place when he had to return to rescue his nominee from the hill men, who had beleaguered his little fortress. The withdrawal undoubtedly injured our prestige. It is alleged with apparent truth against General Roberts, that at the Pewar a reverse would have been fatal to his whole force, and that his force was so weak that there was grave risk of a reverse. In marching back to Kuram the neglect of ordinary precautions exposed his rear-guard to an attack, which was repulsed only after a heroic resistance with the loss of many brave men's lives. And, again, the fruitless result of the Khost expedition, according as it did with the predictions of his critics, is matter of accusation against him. To all this he would reply that it was the part of real prudence and sound judgment to reckon on the negligence of the enemy—that his plans have been justified by success—that though we had to withdraw from Khost, yet it was worth while to see whether we could hold it, and that at least we have been able to explore and survey, and learn the condition of a tract previously unknown. What we have said of the Khaibar applies also to the Kuram. Official declarations leave no doubt that the permanent occupation of the valley is part of the rectification scheme. General Roberts has been busy in the discharge of civil, as well as military duties. The people are docile and almost friendly. Our officers have been able to ride about with as much freedom as in

an Indian district. Roads have been made, and the revenue system—the keystone of administration—works freely. Here, too, a division of feudatory troops has come up to support the first column and to set them free, if necessary, for an advance in the spring over the Shuturgardan to Cabul. Much has been done to open up communication with the Khaibar force, so that the two columns can join hands in their advance. The treachery discovered in one of our Pathan regiments and the persistent and cold-blooded attacks on camp-followers have rendered public executions of the offenders necessary, which have served as a text to those who, in their dislike to the war, are ready to seize upon any of its necessary incidents as a fresh evidence of the wickedness of those who contrived it. With such disputants it is now too late to argue.

General Roberts's conduct as a commander has been severely criticised by an Anglo journalist who served as correspondent to one of the London daily papers, and by other Indian correspondents and English military reviewers of the same paper. General Roberts, acting under the orders of the Government of India, has taken the extreme step of expelling the correspondent from his camp, on the ground that the information and comments were, to speak plainly, false. Both the correspondent and the paper have appealed to public opinion.

The column which advanced by the Bolan and Quetta to Candahar had little fighting, but had to endure much suffering from the extreme rigours of Nature. From Jacobabad to the mountains they passed through a wilderness of seething morass or scorched sand. In the hills they exchanged the hot barren rocks, only for the icy heights of Quetta and Pishin. But once they had reached the Candahar country their troubles were over. The Afghan Governor sent out some troops to oppose the advance of the head of the column, but, having made just resistance enough to give *éclat* to the occupation, they took to precipitate flight, and ultimately dispersed.

Candahar is a city of 60,000 inhabitants, in a fertile plain. The inhabitants, like most trading populations, keenly appreciate the commercial advantages of the presence of a British army. There have been some fanatical outrages—as was to be expected—but the mass of the people are, to say the least, tolerant of the change of rule. Nawab Ghulam Husen—once our Agent at Cabul and the bearer of the last message to the Amir—has been appointed to conduct the Civil Administration; and we have no doubt that, till High Courts, and Civil Procedure, and English barristers are imported, justice will be executed as it has never been executed before. But it seems a natural development of English administration that the bane should

follow on the boon. Of the commercial and strategical importance of Candahar we need not here speak. Owing possibly to the difficulty of procuring supplies, detachments were sent to occupy Khelat-i-Ghilzai (towards Ghazni) and Girishk (towards Herat). They have since been withdrawn, and the Candahar force, being considered unnecessarily strong, a portion has marched back to India. Some of the returning troops have gone by the new Thal-Chatiali (or more appropriately the Pishin-Dehra Ghazi Khan) route. This is far easier than the old Bolan route, and is no doubt that which will be most used in future. A new route from Sonmeani, on the Beluchistan seaboard, to Quetta has also been opened out.

After the result of the fighting at the Pewar Kotul was made known, Shir Ali left Cabul with the departing Russian Mission. He was intent on proceeding to St. Petersburg, and appealing to Europe against the treatment he had received from England. This, no doubt, was the result of the suggestions of his Russian friends; and we can easily understand how humiliating and painful a task it was to General Kauffman to inform the Afghan Ambassadors that Russia would not interfere in his behalf. At last, worn out by grief and pain, Shir Ali died at Mazar-i-Sharif, a town within his own northern border. Thus, within a few months all those who were prominent in action against us had passed away. The commandant at Ali Masjid was blown from a gun when he reached Cabul after his defeat. Mir Akhor was killed accidentally in the Afridi country while trying to raise the tribes against us. If to see vengeance done on our foes satisfies honour, then the stain of the repulse at Ali Masjid is wiped away.

Before leaving Cabul Shir Ali had released Yakub Khan from the prison to which his fear had for so many years consigned him. Little is certainly known as to the power or wishes of Yakub; but while his father lived he consistently refused to treat in any other character than as his father's representative. He had been left behind, he said, to continue the war. His troops were rapidly deserting; his great nobles were intent on flight; anarchy reigned within the city. On Shir Ali's death there was a fight at Mazar-i-Sharif among the partisans of the various claimants to the throne. Wali Muhamad, a half-brother of the Amir, is now in our camp at Jelalabad; and it is possible that we may support his claims to the throne.

The long negotiations with Yakub Khan have led to no result, and preparations are being made for an advance on Cabul this month. It is said that he is willing to accept our terms—including, we presume, a cession of territory—an amnesty for our partisans, and probably some advantages for Wali Muhamad. But, says report, we decline in the present circumstances of Afghanistan to give him that unreserved

recognition and support which he claims. He is aware, no doubt, of our unwillingness to advance on Cabul; aware, too, of the impossibility of our doing so at once, and hopes by a display of unwillingness to secure better terms. Or he may think that his Afghan honour requires a show of opposition in the field. Clearly he has no means of making any effective resistance. It is not regard for his power that makes us wish for peace, but the fear of the complications that are certain to arise if we occupy Cabul, and the dangers that threaten us from the hostility of the hill tribes in our rear. Meanwhile the occupation of the richest districts of Afghanistan by our troops deprives the Amir of his pecuniary resources, and is so safe a mode of applying pressure that we can patiently await the season for military operations.

What our precise terms are to be we are hardly in a position even to conjecture. We shall certainly hold the Kuram Valley. Indian opinion maintains that we must hold Jelalabad, or, at any rate, the western issues of the Khaibar. While General Hamley considers that we ought to be content with Candahar, but not with less, a recent observer has recorded his opinion that the Pishin Valley—in which all the great routes of Southern Afghanistan converge—is sufficient.

The difficulties which have met our advance will, of course, be relied on by the old Inactivity Party. We must repeat what we have urged so often—that the object of rectification is not to prevent an invasion of India, but (1) to enable us to control the hill tribes on our border;* [During the present operations there have been some embarrassing and disquieting raids into our territory.] (2) to enable us to have well-secured posts within striking distance of Cabul. If any one has still the boldness to assert that it matters nothing to us who is master in Cabul, we can only tell him that he differs, not only from us, but from authorities so respectable as Lord Lawrence and the Duke of Argyll. It is quite clear that the frontier question cannot be decided on purely military or purely political grounds; and to examine both would require more space than we can appropriately give.

The attitude of Russia has been until lately unmistakably pacific. When she consented to withdraw her Mission from Cabul the only assurance she could extract from Lord Salisbury was that the maintenance of Afghanistan as an Independent State *under British influence* was a part of English policy. All the old understandings regarding Central Asia have been revived.

In January, we mentioned among the four Russian expeditionary columns that of General Llamakin. Its movements have been somewhat inscrutable. It is certain it met with partial reverses, and in

November it was said to have returned to Chikislar. Later on we had a succession of sensational telegrams. He was said to have 15,000 men under his command, and to be entrenched within 180 miles of Merv. Our designs on Candahar had caused the Russian Government not unreasonable anxiety. Though we have not the same temptation that they would have to use our position for aggressive purposes, yet as masters of Herat we could, in the event of war, do them great injury. An agreement was said to have been arrived at by which we should abstain from occupying Herat and the Russians from occupying Merv. Candahar is only 367 miles from Herat, and possession of it would enable us to protect Herat from a surprise.

Of late there have been persistent and apparently authentic rumours that a Russian force of 20,000 men was being assembled on the Eastern shore of the Caspian for an expedition against Merv. It was natural that an attempt should be made to re-establish Russian prestige, damaged, as it undoubtedly was, by the withdrawal from interference in Afghan affairs, and by the failure of General Llamakin's expedition against the Akhal Turkomans. But the subjugation of the Akhals would probably be followed by the submission of the Tekke Turkomans of Merv, who are now nominally subject to Persia. We cannot see how we could tolerate a Russian occupation of that important post unless we had better guarantees for the safety of Herat than the very modest scheme of rectification indicated by recent official utterances is likely to give. The telegrams from St. Petersburg seem to us to confound with this Turkoman expedition a "scientific" expedition (*i.e.*, a military exploring expedition), which is intended to traverse the Eastern Khanate of Karategin—to decide on a route for a Central Asian railway—and to ascertain how far the Oxus may be made navigable or restored to its old bed. We can hardly suppose that even Russian military genius conceives it possible that the force destined to subdue the Akhals and annex Merv should then devote itself to those scientific pursuits. But we think it very probable that the scientific expedition was really intended to co-operate with the avowedly military expedition. Whatever the original design may have been the latest news is that, in deference to the strong representations of Count Schouvaloff, the plan of a campaign against Merv has been abandoned.

The Chinese Ambassador now at St. Petersburg has formally demanded of the Russian Government the retrocession of Kulja. The Czar has referred the subject to a committee of which the civilian members favour the restoration of the province while the military members oppose it. The Russians have counter-claims against the

Chinese, and as the hold of the latter on Yarkand seems to be very weak, we are prepared at any time to hear that the Russians have stepped in, or that a new Musulman dynasty has ejected them. Meanwhile the Chinese are making threatening military demonstrations on the Kulja frontier.

Before dismissing—with the delight that comes of utter weariness—the Russians from this narrative, we must note some significant facts. The Persian Government seems to have countenanced and assisted General Llamakin in his operations against the Turkomans. His force marched for some distance along the *Attrek*. Negotiations are pending with the Persian Government for the extension of the Georgian railway to Teheran. Surveys have been satisfactorily completed for a railway from Orenburg to Tashkent. The Oxus is said to have returned to its old bed, and thus there seems a possibility that with little trouble a water-way may be made from the Caspian to the northern border of Afghanistan. But we ought to add that both information and theories on this subject are regarded with suspicion even by Russians of sanguine patriotism.

The events of the war have not wholly engrossed the attention of the Indian public. An unprecedented succession of famines has injured—in many cases, it is to be feared, permanently—the condition of great masses of the native population, while the commercial depression—due, at least in part, to the extensive crop failures—has been acutely felt in the great centres of trade. The failure of Messrs. W. Nicol and Co., in Bombay, created hardly less sensation in India than the consequent failure of the Glasgow Bank in this country, and has seriously affected the general character and influence of English merchants in the East. The insolvency of several great cotton-spinning concerns followed. The sudden development of the Indian cotton industry led to the creation of a great number of spinning companies, which, starting with insufficient capital, abused their borrowing powers, and had soon to sacrifice their profits to satisfy heavy mortgage claims. The boards of directors were corrupt or incapable, and the management of the concerns was left to agents, who, by a vicious system, were paid according to out-turn instead of by a percentage on net profits. One native firm of reputed wealth, and once of the highest character, which had become in this way managers of several mills, suspended payment under circumstances of such suspicion that the members were criminally prosecuted. They were acquitted, but not honourably acquitted. The continued fall in exchange still paralyses commerce, and there is little prospect of revival.

The growing spirit of self-assertion in the native community was indicated in the results of the election by the Bombay Corporation to the

elective seats in the Town Council. All the candidates chosen were natives—though many of the Europeans rejected had admittedly superior claims. There has also been a deadlock in municipal administration—the council refusing to sanction the award of contracts for the drainage works made by the municipal commissioner. In Calcutta the prevalence of fever has been attributed by many to the system of closed sewers which was carried out at great expense. It appears, however, that the fever is of a malarious—not a typhoid character.

Babu Keshab Chandar Sen, who some time ago gave offence to his followers by consenting to the marriage of his young daughter to the Maharaja of Kuch Bihar, has, more recently, scandalised sober judgments by making claims to supernatural visitations. The history of Hindu reforms repeats itself. The man who gains influence by denouncing superstitious reverence ends by becoming the object of it.

The Famine Commission, appointed last Session to appease the excitement caused by Sir Arthur Cotton's crusade, has brought its inquiries in India to a close. It has certainly seen a good deal of India, and has come into contact with all shades of opinion regarding nearly every matter that concerns the wellbeing of the agricultural population. We doubt whether it has elicited any principle not already familiar to those who devote their lives to the tedious routine of distinct administration. The problem is to teach the people thrift. Commissioners cannot do so. Meanwhile Sir R. Temple has taken a step in the right direction. Model farms have done little to improve Indian agriculture, but the Governor of Bombay has founded an Agricultural College at Puna, and several young men, who have matriculated in the University, have applied for admission. If native intelligence could only be led to devote itself to useful industries, instead of looking to the bar or public employ as the only desirable career, English administration would have achieved its end.

After much discussion a new Law Commission has been appointed in India to codify the remaining portions of the Civil Law.

There were, for a time, reports of the discovery of rich gold deposits in the Wynaad, but later accounts show that the estimates formed were too sanguine. Mining operations could, however, be carried on with profit if the native landholders could be induced to make concessions on reasonable terms.

Government has at last decided to take over the East Indian Railway from the company which constructed it (under a Government guarantee), and have hitherto worked it to their own profit. The company has accepted the terms offered. The announcement that Government intends to construct the Ahmadabad-Pahlampur section of the

Western Rajpntana has led to vigorous protests from the Bombay merchants. The break of gauge is undesirable from a military as well as from a mercantile point of view.

There has been an addition of 15,000 men to the native army, at a monthly cost of 22,000*l.* There is reason to believe, however, that Government contemplates, as one of the results of the rectification of the frontier, a great relief to the Indian Exchequer by a reduction of the army, native as well as British. Concurrent with such a reduction will be the reduction of the armies of the native States. The importance of these have, perhaps, been over-rated; but it is clear that in some States, while powerless for good, they would, in times of trouble, be sources of great danger. A confidential circular, which by some strange indiscretion was made public last year, shows that the Indian Government then contemplated some restrictions on the maintenance of military forces by our feudatories. The present time, however, when the Panjab contingents are doing such excellent service, is peculiarly inappropriate for action. The armies maintained by princes, like Sindia, may be useless to him and dangerous to us, but he has a treaty right to maintain them, and may claim to be allowed this, as well as any other form of selfish indulgence.

The accounts of the Indian budget are too meagre to afford ground for comment. But one feature demands notice. In deference to the demands of Manchester the import duties on important classes of cotton goods have been removed. Since they brought in 200,000*l.* a year to the Indian Exchequer it is absurd to call them protective. But to this extent they may have acted protectively, that by raising the price of goods, in which Manchester could compete with India, they may have driven certain classes of consumers to use cheaper cloths, in which Manchester could *not* compete with India. The only injury to India is the inconvenience of having to raise the money from her taxpayers in some other way. Sir John Strachey, we are sure, was led to make the change not more by a desire of conciliating a powerful section of English opinion than by a consistent enthusiasm for Free Trade principles.

The increasing loss by exchange has led Government to announce its intention of applying to Parliament for further borrowing powers to the extent of ten millions. If the cause of depreciation be transitory the proposal is judicious; but if it be permanent, borrowing in this country can only lead to further burdens on the Indian Exchequer, as not only must the loan be repaid, but remittances must be made for interest.

The situation in Birma admits of being very briefly described. A weak-headed young man is suddenly taken from the society of his

womankind to exercise despotic power. In his kindred he saw possible rivals, and, either because he knew that they were conspiring or feared that they would conspire, he summarily executed over eighty of them. There is no reason to suppose that the Burmese people would ordinarily regard such an occurrence with horror, or even surprise. But our Resident at Mandalay ventured to remonstrate, and was told in reply that he had no right to interfere. Since then relations between the Residency and the Palace have been strained. The king is more than half-insane from fear and drink. Our relations with Birma have never been cordial. The province of Pegu, which we obtained possession of in the last Burmese war, has never been formally ceded to us. The turbulence of the native State has constantly harassed our frontier with thievish raids. The excitement at Mandalay and the possibility of a popular outbreak (not necessarily directed against the king) compelled all the European Residents, except the representative of our Government, to seek safety in flight. It also became necessary to increase the garrisons in our territory; for even if there were no attack from the native State, the sympathetic excitement among our own people would be dangerous. Our Resident remains, and happily has the increased guard which was lately conceded to him. The position of our Agent at Bhamo is no doubt one of peril. Even if the king's intentions were pacific our preparations would naturally alarm him. He has sent troops to the frontier, he has called out for military service all his subjects capable of bearing arms. Our military force is happily adequate for any emergency, but for many reasons we shall be slow to interfere. To annex native Birma would bring us into contact with turbulent hill tribes, and would advance our frontier to China—a Power whose suspicions it is at present very undesirable to arouse. The Chief Commissioner has announced that we shall interfere only in case of open insult or aggression. Even then we shall probably be content to replace King Theebaw by some member of the royal family who will prove more amenable to our influence.

Canada.—If experimental methods of research were in favour with parliamentary philosophers, no country would offer such a variety of "instances" of the working of representative institutions as Canada. Not only has the Confederation of the various Provinces a Parliament, but each province has a Legislature of its own. Not only has every city a municipality, but the affairs of villages and petty townships are managed by representative bodies. The divisions of party which prevail in the greater assemblies prevail also in the less, and thus politics are made to pervade the whole life of the people. The revulsion of political

feeling which found expression in the defeat of the Mackenzie Government at the elections for the Dominion was foreshadowed by the success of the Conservatives in the local Legislatures. At present Ontario alone has a Liberal Legislature. As it met before the Dominion Parliament, its debates anticipated the great questions of Dominion politics.

The Conservatives claim to be champions of economy, as contrasted with the wastefulness which characterised the administration of their predecessors. These, they allege, called themselves Reformers, but had nothing to reform. The members of the Administration had each his own hobby, but could agree in nothing except in conniving at the corruption which kept together their followers. In the debates in the Ontario Legislature these charges have taken a specific form against the local administration. A Conservative senator published a pamphlet in which he certainly succeeded in showing that there had been a considerable increase in expenditure. In such controversies it is almost impossible so to distinguish ordinary from extraordinary expenditure—so to assign to each year its proper charges and its proper income as to arrive at clear grounds for a decision as to the condition of the finances. The Liberals, we think, were able to show that if outlay had increased, it had been devoted to purposes of which public opinion acknowledges the utility—to schools, to public works, to the facilitation of immigration. The Conservatives, on the other hand, succeeded in showing that certain items of revenue—the proceeds of timber-licences, for instance—reckoned as income, were properly capital; and that, unless the outlay from them was directly reproductive, the time would soon come when either fresh burdens of taxation would have to be imposed, or violent retrenchments had recourse to. Particular items of increase in expenditure gave rise to warm controversy. The Sessional indemnity to members had been raised to an unexampled amount at a time of great industrial depression. But the Ministry were able to show that the Opposition had either advocated or assented to the increase. The Conservatives, who advocate schemes for bringing suddenly a great influx of immigrants, were inconsistent in denouncing the expenditure on immigration agencies.

Not merely in Ontario, but in every Province, there is a growing protest against the expense of the machinery of legislation; and this, as we have noted elsewhere, has in some instances taken the form of proposals for abolishing the Upper House. Everywhere, too, there is a demand for that reduction of municipal expenditure—a department too often neglected in financial controversies.

Whether the defence of the Mowatt Administration be sound or not, it seems almost certain that its appeal to the country will be unsuccessful.

[Vol. CXI. No CCXX.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LV. No II. L L

cessful. Charges of extravagance, when persistently pressed in hard times, prove fatal to the best-intentioned Ministries. Unfortunately, as to the time when the term for which the present Ontario Legislature was elected expires, a difference of opinion exists between the Ministers and their opponents. The British North America Act provides that the term of duration of the Local Parliament is four years. Now, as all the writs, save one, were returned in February, 1875, the Opposition asserts that the term expires in February, 1879. But the Government contends that, according to a local law, the Legislature is constituted only after the returns to *all* the writs have been received. That for Algoma was not received till August, 1875. In reply to this, the Opposition pertinently asks whether there was no valid Legislature between February and August. The defeat of the Liberal party at the Municipal elections at Montreal—once the stronghold of the "Grits"—was of evil omen as to their chances of success in the Parliamentary struggle. A more recent evidence of the fallen fortunes of the Liberals is the vote of censure passed in the Dominion House of Commons, by 136 votes to 51, on the Liberal Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec, for his action in the much-discussed dismissal of his Conservative Ministry in 1878.

The American Government is anxious to obtain the consent of the English Cabinet to the *immediate* abrogation of the Fishery Clauses of the Washington Treaty. By these the Americans have the rights of fishing on the Canadian coast which we described in January, while they are obliged to admit Canadian fish duty free. Their decision is to be attributed in part to their dissatisfaction at the Halifax Award regarding the value of the rights of fishing, in part to the feeling engendered by the Fortune Bay dispute, and in part to the wish to extend to their fisheries the same system of protection that they have adopted with regard to other industries.

The outbreak of the cattle plague in some of the American States, and the consequent restrictions on the import of American cattle into England, have threatened with serious injury one of the most promising departments of Canadian industry. The importation of cattle and sheep from Canada into England rose from 2767 and 2607 respectively in 1876 to 17,881 and 37,831 in 1878. To meet the growing trade, arrangements had been made for better ocean transit. The natural development of the Dominion is obviously agricultural and pastoral. The agricultural element, which formed over 36 per cent. of the population in 1831, had risen to 45 per cent. in 1861, and to 47 in 1871. The English demand for cattle has revolutionised Western farming. Pasture was formerly cheap and abundant; but here was no market for beeves, and the farmer had to look to cheer-

making for his profits. But now, so long as the export trade is free from harassing restrictions, a practically unlimited market is thrown open to Canadian stock-keepers. We need hardly explain that, while restrictions on import apply only to United States' cattle, the only loss to Canada is the loss of the profit it used to make by the through traffic.

Canada has hitherto with justice been proud of its successful management of the Indian tribes within its territory; but of late some of the tribes of the North-west have caused uneasiness. The buffalo, in spite of all the efforts to preserve it, is becoming scarce, and the prospects of consequent distress have unsettled the minds of the Indians. A party of surveyors has been attacked, and forced to retire from the territory of one of the tribes. It is proposed to organise a special service of administrators, who will have friendly and intimate relations with the red men—a service, in fact, similar in organisation and functions to that of the Hudson's Bay Company.

Some minor topics of the Quarter may be briefly referred to. There has been much excitement among the Irish population owing to the denial of a pardon to an Irishman who had been convicted of a gross and deliberate murder. There has been some discussion as to the advisability of maintaining a small regular military force. It does not, however, seem likely that Canada will cease to rely on the volunteer system, which, during the Fenian raids and other periods of trial, was found to work so well. There have been negotiations with France and Spain with a view to securing reciprocal advantages in trade.

The Session of the Fourth Dominion Parliament was opened on the 13th February. The subjects as to which announcements of Ministerial policy had been looked forward to with greatest interest were the Tariff Question and the Pacific Railway.

As to the fiscal policy, we have already offered an estimate of the *means* of Ministerial opinion on the subject. Until Parliament met the Government maintained a judicious silence as to the specific proposals it intended to make. Chambers of Commerce and Farmers' Clubs discussed the lines that changes ought to take; but the Dominion Ministers informed neither the Canadian public nor the Home Government of their plans. The Opposition papers drew inferences from this reserve which the result shows to be incorrect. It was alleged that all the extravagant promises of Sir J. Macdonald and his Ministers were intended only to catch votes, or that, if they were made seriously, the Government had found it impossible to reconcile the claims of conflicting interests. The expression of opinion at the meetings of the Farmers' Clubs was far less definitely in favour of Protection than that of the manufacturing interests. We think we summarise fairly the general feeling of the farmers

when we say that they believed that, "as times were bad, something ought to be done" to mend them. But they were determined that, if manufacturers were to be protected at their expense, they should be protected at the expense of the manufacturer. Farmers who needed imported corn for feeding purposes objected, of course, to protective duties in corn—those who grew corn demanded them. Similarly as regards manufacturers. Those who used iron as material wished to get it cheaply—those who were anxious to see Canada appropriate to itself the advantage of its magnetic-iron ores instead of sending them to the States to enable the American manufacturers to produce "first-class goods" for the Canadian market, asked for a prohibitive tariff as regards American iron. Yet the very papers that clamoured for Protection gave elaborate calculations to show that Nova Scotian coal could be laid down at the iron works at prices which would enable Canada to compete successfully with the United States.

We have now a telegraphic summary of what the Budget proposals of the Government really are. They certainly justify all the hopes of the Protectionists, and all the fears of the Free Traders. Though they profess to be directed in the first instance against the United States, they are certain to cause great injury to English commerce. To produce financial equilibrium, it has been found necessary to raise two millions by fresh taxation. Differential duties are imposed on salt and tea—as to tea, against the States; and as to salt, in favour of England. The general tariff has been raised from $17\frac{1}{2}$ to 20 per cent. *ad valorem*; and, in addition to the *ad valorem* duties, specific duties of the most protective character are imposed on several classes of goods—on cotton, silk, shawls, blankets, and ready-made clothing. Various duties, varying from $12\frac{1}{2}$ to $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., are imposed on iron in slabs, in bars, and in rails.

The anthracite, bituminous coal, and coke of Nova Scotia are protected. Cabinet furniture has a duty of 35 per cent., agricultural implements of 25, and breadstuffs and barley of 15.

The most injurious provision as regards English commerce is the duty of 10 per cent. on foreign vessels seeking registration in Canada.

On imported sugars the duties vary, according to class, from 30 to 35 per cent. *ad valorem*, and from $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to 1 per cent. per lb. This, of course, is a measure of retaliation against the United States. To countervail the American Bounty, duty is to be levied on the value irrespective of the drawback.

On the other hand, machinery for cotton and woollen mills enter free, and apparently in every department of manufacture there is a drawback on exportation of the amount of duty paid on material. New vessels are to be treated as exports.

We cannot in the absence of fuller details attempt to discuss the probable effect of these proposals. The Finance Minister believes—or professes to believe—that but a small part of the two millions raised will be paid by the Mother country. This is possible, but what we pay is no measure of what we lose. The injury to Canadian interests is far greater than the injury to ours. But though Englishmen may feel that the experiment being tried is doomed to failure, they cannot and ought not to interfere. We have allowed the Canadians entire self-government. It has assumed the most Democratic form, and, as in Victoria, has led to results which the advocates of Democratic institutions in this country regarded as most unlikely. We can sympathise with Mr. Bright in his disappointment. But we hardly see that anything can be done. The Canadians have sinned against light. Far from being disposed to listen to our expositions of the evils of Protection they affect to believe that there is a reaction against Free Trade in England. We must—unless the relation between the Mother country and the Colonies is to be wholly changed—be content to grin and bear. It may have been a mistake to commit to a Parliament at Ottawa the future of the fertile Saskatchewan plains—to give them power to exclude Englishmen from the lands which English enterprise has won and English power defends. But we have given the power and we cannot withdraw it. When Mr. Bright complains that the Canadians are entering on a war of tariffs with the neighbouring Republic, the Canadians can reply that the Americans were the first to declare it. If England suffers now in the struggle there is reason to fear that she may suffer still more by the terms of peace.

It appears that in the instructions given to the Marquis of Lorne the provision that Bills proposing differential duties should be referred home was for the first time omitted. But this, it is explained, was done before there was any reason to suppose that proposals for differential duties would be made.

The significance of the announcement in the Speech from the Throne that Government intended “to press for the more vigorous prosecution” of the Pacific Railway, is lessened by the qualification that “due regard must be paid to the financial position of the country.” The importance of this work requires a fuller account than we hitherto had space to give. A line through British territory from the coast of British Columbia to the coast of Nova Scotia would be 1200 miles shorter as a route from China or Japan to England than the United States’ Pacific line. The engineering difficulties in the way of its construction and maintenance would be far less. Unlike the American line it would pass through no arid tracts. Already the Eastern shores of Lake Huron are connected

with Halifax by a net-work of railways. Were the line prolonged westward it would open up to settlement the country north of the great lakes rich in mineral wealth—would then pass through a country rich in forests—would then traverse the fertile corn lands and pasturages of the Saskatchewan—then passing through the Rocky Mountains, by one or other of two very low passes, it would descend to the sea through British Columbia. All these tracts we have described are as yet undeveloped, but all that is necessary for their speedy settlement is a railway to bring population and take away the products of industry. At both termini and over immense tracts along the line are rich coal deposits exposed in many places on the surface. To British Columbia the line is of especial importance, not only in order to give it the through traffic of Eastern Asia and Europe, but to promote its internal development. It was, therefore, made one of the conditions on which that Province entered into the North American Confederation that the line should be constructed by the Dominion. The first attempt (in 1872) to construct it by the agency of a company having failed, the Federal Government, in 1874, decided to proceed with it as a public work. Much has been done in the way of surveys. The Mackenzie Administration decided to select as the terminus on the Pacific seaboard a port in Burrard's Inlet. But since the accession of the present Ministry it is understood that a line to Bute Inlet has been at least taken into consideration. The Mackenzie route was from Lake Superior to the Yellow Head Pass in the Rocky Mountains—thence by the Thompson and Fraser Rivers to Burrard's Inlet. The advantages of the route are obvious. It is direct and cheap. By the immediate construction of the section from Yale (on the Fraser River) to Kamloops (on the Thompson River) a route (navigable in other parts) would be opened to the rich country round the Shuswap Lake. But the disadvantage is obvious, too. No terminus on the mainland can ever be satisfactory. There would be need of harrassing transshipment at a port on Vancouver's Island, or the trade would be diverted to some port on the American coast. The Fraser route, too, as a means of internal communication for British Columbia would not be so useful as other lines to the north. If, on the other hand, the line were constructed to Bute Inlet, the straits there could be bridged or ferried over, and thus Esquimalt, the port of Victoria, would become the terminus. Whether the Fraser route be selected or not, it is admitted that ultimately lines must be constructed diverging from Fort George, as a centre to Port Simpson on the north, to Bute Inlet, and to the fertile Peace River country. "Why not," ask the advocates of the Bute Inlet river route, "construct at once the line which would be of greatest permanent utility?" The line ought either, they say, to go from

the Yellow Head Pass to Fort George and thence to Bute Inlet, or ought to proceed from Lake Superior in a direction somewhat to the north of that already surveyed, and passing through the Peace River country and the Pine River Pass (which is lower than the Yellow Head) proceed by Fort George to Bute Inlet. A glance at a good mineralogical map will show how rich in varied resources the country through which these lines pass is.

The fresh surveys necessary, if the new lines be adopted, will occupy some years. Meanwhile Government is energetically pushing forward the construction of the line from Lake Superior westward to Winnipeg. This will enable the products of the Red River country and the regions round Lakes Manitoba and Winnipeg to find their way to the sea by the great lakes and the St. Lawrence. Manitoba has been lately connected with the United States' system of railways by the junction at St. Vincent of the Pembina branch of the Canadian railways with the St. Paul and Pacific Railway.



CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

THEOLOGY.

MR. MONCURE CONWAY'S comprehensive survey of the origin, growth, and reign of Demonology,¹ attests zeal, industry, discursive reading, vivid fancy, and daring ingenuity. In his search after mythical and legendary treasures, he appears to have "wandered o'er city, and sea, and land," ubiquitous in time and space. He is on speaking terms with Lucifer and all the devils, and is intimately acquainted with the demons of the East and West, of the North and South. All human and animal demons, the demons of Hunger, the demons of Heat and Cold, the demons of the Desert, the spirits that preside over darkness, illusion, barrenness, disease, and death, are all well-known to him; and his familiarity with this diabolic race, and all related phenomena, as serpents, basilisks, dragons, dragons' eyes, and dragons' breath, does not breed contempt in him, but a wholesome orthodox hatred of the Devil and all his works. In conducting us through unexplored realms of fire and frost, Mr. Conway shows us the genii of the lamp, the devourer of the moon, swan-maidens, forsaken mermen, the Serpent-woman, the Serpent of Time, and the Towers of Silence; or introduces us to Lilith, Adam's first wife, to cobbolds, elves, pixies, nixies, preternatural cats, and portentous dogs. His tales of terror, however, are relieved with pleasant anecdote, fairy legend, classic story, Scandinavian lore and ballad song; and illustrated with snatches from the verse of Goethe, Heine, Mathew Arnold, Dante, Milton, and others. But though his book, as will be inferred from this description, is easy reading and rather intended for popular recreation and instruction than for a profoundly philosophical disquisition, it yet comprises a fair proportion of explanatory comment, curious and ingenious speculation, and grave research into the genesis and decline of the reign of the children of Chaos and old Night. In the explanation which Mr. Conway proposes of mythological enigmas, we sometimes find ourselves agreeing with him, but we as often hesitate to accept the solutions which he proffers. Mythology, as we conceive it, is frequently the product of a sportive imagination, and sermons are not always to be found in the stones which strew its enchanted ground. In his lucubrations on the Hebrew patriarchs, their ways, and their wives, we are led, as it appears to us, through an intricate labyrinth, by the thread of fancy and not by the clue of reason. In his exposition of Hebrew polytheism, on the other hand, while unconvinced as to details, we admit the general accuracy of statement. In the Elohim of the creation, as the narrative in

¹ "Demonology and Devil-lore." By Moncure Daniel Conway, M.A. Two vols. London: Chatto & Windus. 1879.

Genesis now stands, we see only the one God of exclusive Jewish worship; but in the sons of Elohim, who were enamoured of the beautiful daughters of men, in the Elohim (the plural verb accompanying the plural noun) who caused Abraham to wander from his father's house (Gen. xx. 13), we recognise a trace of the old primeval powers adored in the dim foretime of the Hebrew race. Again, we decline entirely to accept Mr. Conway's doctrine of a primitive pantheism, and we cannot discern, as he does in Turner's rapturous admiration of the sun, a survival of the adorable aspect of that luminary, or see in "Wesley's watch-night, the old culminating combat between the powers of fire and froth, once believed to determine human fates." The devouring fire of the prophet (Is. xxxiii. 14), we interpret not as a symbol of spiritualisation which has any reference to the righteous (a construction excluded by the context), but as a metaphor denoting the punishment which had fallen on the Assyrians, and the like of which menaced the unrepentant Israelites. In support of the paradox that Jesus was a person of high position, we are referred to reasons assigned in the author's "Idols and Ideals," but the perusal of these reasons has not convinced us that the less original opinion is not the more plausible, or disposed us to see in the son of Joseph and Mary "a highly-educated and well-connected young radical and enthusiast." The assertion that Nero aspired to be called the King of the Jews is, we presume, reducible to the statement in Suetonius, that some astrologers promised that Emperor in the day of his downfall the kingdom of Jerusalem; but we know not on what authority we are informed that Nero solemnly assumed the name of Jupiter. Again, Mr. Conway indulges occasionally in etymological speculations from which we are compelled to dissent. In spite of his appeal to the Septuagint, we cannot admit that the Hebrew word rightly enough translated dust, can be interpreted as "the seminal principle of the Earth," or that Pharisee and Parsee are related terms; nor is the proposed explanation (to favour a particular view) of the Hebrew idiom (Job i. 22), *offered his sacrifice without omitting the salt*, one which we think a sober scholarship is likely to prefer to the rendering of our old translators: *charged God foolishly*. The second volume of Mr. Conway's work is almost entirely devoted to a history of the Devil, and a recital of his acts and deeds as public prosecutor, prince of the world, patron of witches. The Chapter on the Book of Job contains a fair critical estimate of the significance of this magnificent poem, and that on the "Bon Diable" presents that personage to us in one of his later phases of character and not as black as he is painted. A diverting illustration of the superstitious terror for which the Devil is the subject, very cleverly opens a discussion on the compromise between new gods and old:—"A lady residing in Hampshire, England, recently said to a friend of the present writer, both being mothers: 'Do you make your children bow their heads whenever they mention the Devil's name?' 'I do,' she added solemnly, 'I think it safer.'" In tracing the influence of the Spirit of Evil in modern Europe, Mr. Conway does not fail to intimate the corrupting

and repressive action of dogmatic theology. From the many and great services which Christianity has conferred on mankind, vast deductions must undoubtedly be made on the score of its baleful and terrific accompaniments, but a belief in witchcraft, Devil-worship and eternal punishment, a proclivity to frantic superstition, and general barbarity preceded its advent, and the moral improvement which it effected, though often at the expense of intellectual progress, must be regarded as some compensation for the misery which the savage autocrat or fanatic persecutor inflicted. Mr. Conway's verdict, accordingly, on the value of Christianity is, we think, prejudiced. He sees little but evil in its action during fifteen hundred years. He does not seem to allow for the inherent ignorance, cruelty, and credulity of men, and in indicting Christianity, he indicts human nature. He may call the recognition of the services of the Church a cant, but it was and is the cant of men who know as much of history and as much of philosophy as he does. In one startling passage he intimates that the nations of the West were converted by the application of instruments of torture, an assertion which, unqualified as it is, cannot be allowed to pass uncensured. Apart, however, from occasional expressions of bitter antipathy, Mr. Conway's book will be found a valuable repository of remarkable facts, and curious speculations on a sad, but inevitable, chapter in the history of human race, a race, which if the old puritan judgment be correct, has a "little of God and a great deal of the Devil in it."

It is difficult to say exactly what is the form of the Christian religion which Professor Max Müller³ wishes to see triumphant; but, less hostile than Mr. Conway to the old creed, he believes that Christianity will bring from the crypt of the Past a most valuable contribution to the Church of the Future. In furtherance of the object of the founder of the Trust, which bears his name, Mr. Robert Hibbert, the distinguished author of the volume before us, was induced to deliver in 1878 a series of lectures on the religions of India. These lectures, which display a talent, a research, and a culture which are the privilege of the few, are informed by a spirit of lofty charity and liberal intelligence. Hindoo, Mussulman, Buddhist, Jew, Christian, and even the "honest atheist," are all appreciated with a judgment as just as it is kindly. Quick to discern good wherever it exists, the lecturer concedes that "nothing can be more eloquent, and in some passages really more solemn and sublime than the religion of Humanity, as preached by Comte and his disciples;" candid in dealing with the orthodox theology, he asserts that most of the Old Testament writers make it their object to hide the traces of the old Jewish polytheism, rather than to display them; and endeavour to place the religion of the Jews before us, as ready-made from the beginning, and perfect in all its parts, instead of depicting the various stages of growth and decay which it traversed. The cardinal ques-

³ "Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion as Illustrated by the Religions of India." Delivered in the Chapter House, Westminster Abbey, 1878. By F. Max Müller, M.A. London: Longmans & Co. Williams and Norgate. 1875.

tion of the volume—the origin of religion—is discussed in the first lecture. Not in the Dependence of Schleiermacher nor in the Freedom of Hegel, but in the Perception of the Infinite, does Professor Max Müller discern its primary element. Religion he defines to be a subjective faculty for the apprehension of the Infinite, the Infinite being, as he contends, an affirmative, and ~~not~~ a negative concept. On both these points we join issue with him. It is true, as he says, that logically the Not-Blue means more than the negation of Blue. It covers the whole field of colour. But the colours which it denotes are given in experience, and in spite of our author's eloquent description, we are not convinced that the Infinite, as a supersensuous reality, is apprehended by us. In a certain sense we have, indeed, the idea of Infinity. We think of space and time as infinite, because, however distant the points we select in them may be, the idea of points still more distant is inevitably present to our mental eye. Thus, we get indeed an ideal infinity, but the objective infinity, its desired correspondent, is wanting. Moreover, we invariably find that in the many poetical illustrations of the Infinite proffered by the author, the Remote, the Intangible, the Inaccessible, the Beyond, whether in earth, ocean, or air, are so many Continuable Finites, which appeal to our impatience of boundaries, our yearning for a Beautiful denied us, our love of mystery, our hope of discovering some secret treasure on the other side of the sea, or the mountain, or the sunset. And, though we know perfectly well that the veiled limit is on "the other side," yet the haunting spirit of the subjective Infinite, aided by the emotional imagination, persuades us into the belief that there is a real Infinite corresponding to our dream. Thus, explaining both the faculty that apprehends and the concept that is apprehended, the Experiencalist is dispensed from accepting Professor Max Müller's Genesis of Religion. In the following lecture our author inquires, "Is Fetishism a primary form of religion?" and answers the inquiry in the negative. Here, again, we join issue with him, though willingly granting that his correction of the misconceptions of this doctrine is not without justification. To those who affirm all Fetishes to be stocks and stones, or as our author calls them—*rubbish*, or who believe that Fetishism ever existed in an absolutely pure state, without any polytheistic admixture, the reproof may come home; but to those who include in Fetishism the worship of river and mountain, of the earth and the heavenly bodies, the objection is not very formidable. Nor need they have much trouble in answering the question: How came men to see in inanimate objects something apart from the object? for the object invested with life, consciousness, and will, is all that they saw, and the Deification, which we are told could not precede the idea of Deity, consisted, in its inception, precisely in the assimilation of natural agencies to their own voluntary activities, and, in its development, in the exaltation of the objects of their worship, so as to conform to the growing ideal of their worshippers, who made the gods in their own image, and perfected that image as they perfected their own moral and intellectual type. The

other topics discussed in these lectures, which are full of refined and beautiful observations, are the ancient literature of India, the worship of natural objects: Henotheism, Polytheism, Monotheism, and Atheism, the concluding lecture dealing with philosophy and religion.

The heterodoxy of lay authorship is supported by clerical and even episcopal aberration from the highway of traditionary faith. The Bishop of Natal, who in 1862 startled a sleeping public with the first part of "The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua,"³ now completes his examination by the publication of a seventh volume. The doctrine of plenary inspiration is evidently dying a natural death. It appears that the late Dean Alford acknowledged the composite character of at least a portion of the Pentateuch, and detected points of variance in the Elohist and Jehovistic documents; and it seems to be admitted by bishops, archbishops, and Regius professors of divinity, that insertions of a later date were made after the captivity by the arrangers and editors of the Old Testament Scriptures. Our readers, therefore, will not be surprised to learn that Dr. Colenso regards Moses as the imaginary leader of the people out of Egypt; in fact, as a personage quite as shadowy and unhistorical as Æneas, in the history of Rome, or our own King Arthur. It is by the unscrupulous falsifications of the "Chronicler" that, according to Dr. Colenso, the credit of the Levitical legislation has been in great part maintained. Not only the Pentateuch as a whole, but its constituent parts, are, he tells us, of post-Mosaic origin. The age of the Deuteronomist he fixes in the first years of King Joshua; the whole of Leviticus, and all the priestly portions of Exodus, Numbers, and Joshua, were written during or after the captivity. The first Elohist wrote in the days of Samuel, the second in the beginning of David's reign. The Jehovist in the time of that king and his successor. Dr. Colenso differs from Kuenen as to the antiquity of the Elohist narrative, dating it before and not after the exile; and advancing in his recent pages additional arguments in support of the earlier period, some of them, as it appears to us, not without weight. Dr. Colenso's concluding volume exhibits all his well-known minuteness of research and patient endurance of labour. He is to be congratulated on the completion of a valuable, though not attractive work.

The late Dr. Rowland Williams seems less sceptical of the existence of Moses than his ecclesiastical brother in arms, but he makes the first Adam an idea rather than a person, and sees clearly the necessity of modifying or transforming certain dogmas of the Church. The little volume of "Stray Thoughts,"⁴ edited by his widow from his note-books, will be welcome to all who share his liberal creed.

The Rev. T. W. Fowle, known to some by an "Essay on the Reconciliation of Religion and Science" (though he has not yet learned to

³ "The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua," Critically Examined by the Right Rev. John William Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal. Part vii. London: Longmans. 1879.

⁴ "Stray Thoughts from the Note-Books of Rowland Williams, D.D." Edited by his Widow. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1878.

spell the name of the founder of Positivism without a *p*), has sustained an original, if perverse, argument in vigorous and intelligible language. Untroubled by doubts as to the historical existence of Moses, he has produced in his "Legation of Christ," a counterpart to the paradoxical work of the celebrated Bishop of Gloucester. Maintaining the unity of the Old and New Testaments, Mr. Fowle discovers in the revelation of Jesus the same exceptional phenomenon which Warburton found in the revelation of Moses. Both religious systems relate only to the life that now is; our Lord's language is messianic, and not eschatological; the last days are the days of Messiah closing the age; salvation is security from impending ruin; hell perishing in sin without any reference to a future world; the day of judgment is the destruction of the Jewish nation; and the resurrection the resurrection from spiritual death. Rejecting the popular or, as he calls it, pagan theology of an existence after death of everlasting pain or bliss, Mr. Fowle contends that our Lord's life and teaching correspond to five demands of philosophy—knowledge, justice, freedom, philanthropy, and a progressive and spiritual, but not dogmatic religion. As, however, a doctrine of immortality is necessary to a complete and universal Faith, the resurrection of Christ is held to be an historical fact. Exemplifying economy of force, and illustrating the law of the survival of the fittest, this resurrection of the typical man guarantees the immortality of the human race; and evolution and Christianity, thus happily combined, afford a sufficient explanation of the mysteries of life.

In a somewhat similar spirit writes the nameless author of the book entitled "Shadows of the Coming Truth."⁶ With a singular capacity for reading out of old records what he has first read into them, our anonymous philosopher affects to demonstrate that, far from being newly-discovered facts of Nature or freshly-invented hypotheses, the laws of development and natural selection are discoverable to a certain extent in all religions, and more particularly in the Jewish and Christian. In his view matter is, not certainly, but perhaps, decomposed space, being an aspect of imperfect mind, of which space, pure and homogeneous, is the perfection. A literal resurrection is, he holds, a physiological impossibility. Immortality he conceives to be not strictly personal, but generic; "for in the glorified body which is to be finally incorporated with the Good will be contained the united spirits of all life that has ministered by its toils and sufferings to its ascension."

The stormy and defiant rhetoric of the author of "Extra Physics" is a relief after speculations so vague and visionary, that they seem shadows of fiction rather than shadows of truth. The wicked imaginations of Matthew Arnold and Darwin, Tyndall and Huxley, have so

⁵ "The Divine Legation of Christ." By Rev. T. W. Fowle, M.A. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1879.

⁶ "Shadows of the Coming Truth." London: Elliot Stock. 1878.

⁷ "Extra Physics and the Mystery of Creation," &c. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1878.

vexed the righteous soul of the author of this polemic, that, red-hot with theological indignation and extra-physical rage, he unsheathes the sword of the spirit, and prepares to smite these philosophical Philistines hip and thigh. In conducting his attack, he pleads passionately for an ontological agent, because physical activities are inadequate to solve the inquiries of life and mind. Having, as Wordsworth says, "a vision of his own," he insists that he can discern, though he admits that he cannot demonstrate, the existence of the human soul. After exposing the shortcomings of his principal opponent, and instructing him in the modes of operation of force and the genesis of life, he winds up with a grandiloquent vindication of human responsibility and free-will, and the magnificently scornful rejection of what he pleasantly calls "the bumptious hobbledehoy theory of the universe." Thus, to use his own language, having thrown Dr. Tyndall out of his "intellectual window," he leaves him to his reflections prostrate on "the impregnable dust-heap of his all-sufficient molecules."

To Mr. Oxenham Professors Tyndall and Huxley seem to be still more objectionable persons than to the author of "Extra Physicis." This gentleman, at least, in his Introduction to "An Eirenicon of the Eighteenth Century,"⁸ ranks them "among the most pronounced and most ruthless advocates of the modern horrors of vivisection," and is half inclined to hold them responsible for the impending "revival of the license and cruelty of the darkest age of paganism." From this point of view, Mr. Oxenham, once an Anglican, now a Catholic, desiderates the future unity of Christendom, insisting that the real contest lies with the enemies, not simply of revelation, but of theism, and arguing that Catholic and Protestant can only wage war successfully with the giant power of unbelief with their forces united. In the hope of contributing to the corporate reunion of the Churches, he has republished with introduction, notes, and appendices, a suggestive and interesting Eirenicon, or proposal for Catholic Communion, conjecturally ascribed to William Bassett, Rector of St Swithen's, London, and first printed in 1704.

To Mr. Oxenham also the theological world is indebted for "An Essay on the Doctrine of Future Retribution,"⁹ a learned reply to the arguments of annihilationists and universalists, already noticed in this REVIEW, and which now in a second edition once more solicits attention. The witness of tradition, and the witness of Scripture alike, appear to us, as to the author, to support the once popular dogma of everlasting punishment. The cogency of the reasoning on the true signification and use of the Greek word *αἰώνιος* is, in our opinion, irresistible. But if the doctrine be, indeed, an integral part of the teaching of the Church and the Bible, the fact supplies an additional reason for rejecting a creed which on other grounds is destined to a certain and, if slow, yet irrevocable abandonment.

⁸ "An Eirenicon of the Eighteenth Century." Proposal for Catholic Communion by a Minister of the Church of England. New edition. Edited by Henry Nutcombe Oxenham, M.A. London, Oxford, and Cambridge: Rivingtons. 1879.

⁹ "Catholic Eschatology and Universalism." By Henry Nutcombe Oxenham, M.A. Second edition. London: W. H. Allen & Co. 1878.

From Mr. Oxenham we learn through the medium of Dr. Stoughton, that in Keenan's "Controversial Catechism," the doctrine of Papal Infallibility was, prior to 1871, repudiated as an article of Christian faith, and treated as a Protestant calumny, but that since that year the leaf containing this assertion is cancelled and another substituted. That every decision of the Pope was not regarded as obligatory, in this sense, was maintained by Piers de Gerardin of the Sorbonne at the beginning of the last century. Both Gerardin and Dupin, also of the Sorbonne, about 1717, considered a reconciliation with the Church of England not impracticable; and Wake, then Archbishop of Canterbury, appears to have shared their aspirations. These, as well as other attempts at a Christian Eirenicon, are recorded by Dr. Stoughton in his meritorious work entitled "Religion in England under Queen Anne and the Georges."¹⁰ Catholic spirituality, for obvious reasons, is but little reflected in the mirror of the age which the author holds up; but the religious life of the Episcopalian, Presbyterian, and other communions is imaged often in clear outline, and distinct though quiet colouring in the historical picture presented to us. Eminent Churchmen—Warburton, Berkeley, Paley, Butler; learned champions of the sects—Calamy, Matthew Henry, Price, Priestley, Lardner, Watts, Doddridge; and the representative men of the great religious revival—Wesley, Whitfield, Fletcher, Newton, Cecil, Scott, are all portrayed with a light but skilful touch. The political and social events, the abuses which discredited, and the piety and learning which adorned the Church; the fanaticism and bigotry of faction, the struggle for religious freedom, the great controversies, notably the Bangorian and the Deistic, are described with a detail that in general satisfies, while it does not weary. In his estimate of Churchmen and Nonconformists Dr. Stoughton endeavours to be impartial, and in our opinion achieves the success which his effort deserves.

A volume of Sermons, in convenient and inexpensive form, bearing Dr. Newman's name, requires only to be known to be read and prized by all who share a common faith with him. The present Selection,¹¹ comprising fifty-four of the "Parochial and Plain Sermons," is adapted to the seasons of the Ecclesiastical year.

The illustrator of a more liberal theology than that of Dr. Newman, the late Professor Ewald, has now many readers in England who willingly learn of the great Orientalist. The third volume of his "Prophets of the Old Testament,"¹² one of the valuable series of works published by Messrs. Williams and Norgate, contains the commentary on a portion of Jeremiah, and some of the minor prophets, rendered

¹⁰ "Religion in England under Queen Anne and the Georges," 1702—1800. By John Stoughton, D.D. Vol. I. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1878.

¹¹ "Selection adapted to the Seasons of the Ecclesiastical Year," from the Parochial and Plain Sermons of John Henry Newman, B.D. London: Rivingtons. 1878.

¹² "Commentary on the Prophets of the Old Testament." By the late Dr. George Heinrich August von Ewald. Translated by J. Frederick Smith. Vol. III. London: Williams & Norgate. 1878.

into English by Mr. J. F. Smith, who was personally acquainted with Ewald, and who is the translator of his Introductory Hebrew Grammar.

"A Classical Revision of the New Testament"¹³ by Mr. Millar Nicolson, described by him as suggestive rather than exhaustive, may be found of use by novices in the study of the Greek Testament. It aims at strict accuracy of translation, and undertakes to correct numerous mis-renderings in the English version. These emendations are often acceptable, but we think his renderings sometimes rudely and unnecessarily literal, and we cannot, as he does, translate the corresponding Greek words, Matt. ch. xi. ver. 12, *plunder it: i.e., the kingdom of heaven.*

The genuineness of the Book of Daniel was long since questioned in this country by Dr. Arnold, and more recently by Rowland Williams and Mr. Despréz—all ministers of the Church of England. It appears that another ecclesiastic (the Rev. Brownlow Maitland) now admits that "it may be doubted whether we are to place the apocalyptic visions of the Book of Daniel at this epoch (the time of the captivity), or whether they belong to one which follows two or three centuries later; and the anonymous clergyman who cites this admission in his "Notes on the Defence"¹⁴ of this controverted Book arrives at the conclusion that its defenders have failed on every point on which he has tested them, and, without absolutely giving up its genuineness, advises that there should be a perfect liberty of opinion in the church on this point. The "Notes" are written in a candid and temperate spirit; and as the examination of witnesses is dispatched in the brief compass of a pamphlet, a perusal will not exhaust the patience of the least critical of inquirers.

From the critical brochure just reviewed we learn that the Rev. George Rawlinson has abandoned the inscription supposed to support the story of Nebuchadnezzar's madness. Evidence of this kind is ever liable to revision, and even surrender. Dr. Tristram, however, seems confident that the testimony on which he relies is not of this precarious character. In a Paper¹⁵ on the definite results of recent archaeological discoveries on the interpretation of Scripture, the Canon refers the impugners of the historical accuracy of Genesis to the Assyrian Tablets, and insists that there is not an incident touched on from primeval chaos to the call of Abraham which is not illustrated and confirmed by the utterances of a language which speaks again after a silence of four thousand years. The hypothesis of a composite authorship of the Pentateuch he considers as for ever exploded by the deposition of the ancient records in which the Elohist and Jehovistic portions are alike successively embodied. We venture to predict that in no long time the testimony of the "Assyrian Brick-kiln," far from disproving the

¹³ "Classical Revision of the Greek New Testament." By W. Millar Nicolson, M.A. London: Williams & Norgate. 1878.

¹⁴ "Notes on the Defence of the Book of Daniel." Addressed to the Clergy by a Clergyman. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co. 1878.

¹⁵ "Genesis and the Brick-kiln." A Paper read at the Sheffield Church Congress, 4th Oct. 1878. By H. B. Tristram, M.A., &c., Canon of Durham. London: Hatchards. 1878.

main contention of Dr. Tristram's opponents, will confute the logic on which, with rash and premature defiance, he now exultingly relies. Meanwhile we submit that such an expression as "a cloud of cobwebs" is hardly the phrase to be applied to the general result of the oft-tested erudition of Ewald, Bleek, Tuch, De Wette, and other eminent theologians in Germany, to say nothing of the researches of Kalisch, Bishop Colenso, and Dr. Davidson in our own country.

PHILOSOPHY.

FEW students of philosophy were, we should imagine, familiar with the name of Professor Herbert¹ during his brief lifetime. But we shall be much mistaken if his name be not in future ranked high among metaphysical inquirers. Nowhere, at least, will the English reader find a more searching examination of materialistic explanations of the world than in the "Realistic Assumptions of Modern Science"—the work from Mr. Herbert's pen which his colleague Mr. James M. Hodgson has wisely edited. Professor Herbert shows more than ordinary skill in detecting fallacies: and he drives his opponents into corner after corner in a manner which almost perforce carries the reader along with him. But there is nothing of the sledge-hammer in Professor Herbert's style of argument. Throughout we are dealing with a subtle-minded critic, who is well acquainted with the different forms of the doctrine which he is exposing and whose earnestness and deep conviction never seem to make him blind or partial.

Professor Herbert's main thesis is that materialism is untrue to itself when it attempts to give an explanation of phenomena of mind. "To recognise a single mental fact is," he writes, "implicitly to dismiss the materialistic hypothesis." The question, in fact, of the relation between mind and body, between cognitive or emotional states and physiological processes is one which materialism is incompetent to put. Least of all, shows the writer, does the extreme materialism, which resolves thought into a motion of matter, solve the problem as to the relation of mind and body. "To recognise no distinction between mental and material changes is to render the assumption of a world external to consciousness superfluous, for the profound distinction between them is the only ground of that distinction. Matter is annihilated if it be identified with mind." Particularly does Professor Herbert insist upon the fact that science when it seeks an explanation of the connection between physical processes and psychical feelings is really mixing up two separate modes in which the objects of cognition may be regarded. The following passage shows the writer's meaning:—

¹ "The Realistic Assumptions of Modern Science Examined." By Thomas Martin Herbert, M.A., late Professor of Philosophy in the Lanchashire Independent College, Manchester. London: Macmillan, 1879.

"It is not true that two sets of facts are before us in so-called external phenomena—material objects and a mental picture of them. Only the mental picture is actually before us, and to regard the contrasts as external is to make the materialistic assumption respecting them. We may proceed on that assumption and treat the phenomena as material objects, or we may regard them strictly as they are presented to us—that is to say, as parts of consciousness; but we cannot do both at the same time, because we are not dealing with two sets of facts, but with the same set of facts regarded in these two different ways, and we take them twice over if we reckon up a mental as well as a material series" (p. 101).

We have been able to touch on nothing but the foundations of Professor Herbert's argument. Had we had more space at our disposal we should have liked to note how the writer (in the words of Mr. Hodgson's preface) "proceeds to show that it is necessary to transcend phenomena and recognise efficient cause or power in order to escape idealism and arrive at anything external," and how finally the belief in God is shown to depend upon a recognition of efficient causation and of a permanent ego. But we have said enough to prove that the work is a real addition to the philosophical literature of England. The "Realistic Assumptions" should have a place in every metaphysician's library.

Professor Janet's work on "Final Causes," of which we have to welcome a translation into English,² deals to some extent with the same problem as Professor Herbert's volume. The book strikes us as a somewhat tedious, while not really exhaustive, treatment of the question of teleology, but we can at least endorse the words with which Professor Flint introduces the English version, and allow that "it is the most comprehensive work which has been written on the subject." M. Janet, it must be further conceded, is quite alive to the objections which can be brought against the teleological theory of Nature, and devotes considerable attention to that "new wave" of evolutionism which in the minds of some makes final causes altogether nugatory. As against such superficial thinkers M. Janet's reasoning is particularly valuable. The theory of evolution, he shows, neither excludes nor supersedes final causes, rather, indeed, it implies them. Matter and mechanical movement cannot, in short, explain the realization of intelligible organisms.

"The hypothesis of evolution does not give in the end one reason more than every mechanical system to explain by agents purely physical the order of the universe. It does not explain better how from a primitive chaos a regular system should have emerged. Its ideal would be to reduce all to the laws of motion; but the laws of motion, taken in themselves, would not produce one form rather than another, and do not at all contain the idea of a formation of systems. . . . At the least, a third principle would have to be added—namely, the *idea* which will serve for directive cause; and this would be to revert to the doctrine of finality."

It need scarcely now be said that M. Janet's final causes are not those of popular natural theology. Physical and final causes, he teaches,

² "Final Causes." By Paul Janet. Translated from the French by William Affleck, B.D. With Preface by Robert Flint, D.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1878.

mutually require and appeal to one another: and the permeating spirit of his work comes out in the remark—"apologies for Providence make more atheists than believers." Janet, however, is not content with proving finality to be a law of Nature: he further shows intelligence to be the cause of this finality, and so leads upwards to morality as the final end of all existence. "Thus," he concludes, "the terminus of the divine action is Nature: the terminus of Nature is God." Mr. Affleck seems to have done his work tolerably well: and may be congratulated on having produced an intelligible version of the original.

Stuart Mill has become the subject of a new assault.³ Dr. McCosh, Mr. Alexander, and Professor Jevons have all in turn levelled lances at him; and now Mr. W. L. Courtney has entered the lists in order to examine and, where possible, refute Mill's "Metaphysics." This examination is not unlike, in principle, that of Professor Green's Introduction to the Philosophy of Hume, to which, indeed, the writer fully acknowledges his obligations: and we should imagine that readers already familiar with that work will not find much new matter for reflection in Mr. Courtney's little volume. Such statements as "thought has to make sensations real before they can be associated"—"a 'succession' of feelings is only possible to a self-consciousness, which remains constant and identical throughout all successive sensuous modifications"—or "knowledge is abstract before it becomes individual and concrete," reveal clearly enough the sources of their inspiration. In saying this, however, we do not wish to undervalue Mr. Courtney's labours. Many readers who are repelled by Mr. Green's exhaustive discussion of sensationalism will find this smaller work of considerable value: and the very defects of the work—its "lecture" style and elementary excursions—will be to them real merits. To junior students, particularly, it can be confidently recommended.

Dr. Doherty's volume⁴ strikes us, we fear, only as an instance of misspent ingenuity. After four volumes of "Organic Philosophy," of which the first dealt with Epicosmology, the second with Ontology, the third and fourth with Biology, we have now a fifth devoted to "Organic Method." There is, we learn, one *universal method* which applies not only to geometry, arithmetic, and algebra, but also to anatomy, physiology, and palaeontology: and this last it is the object of Dr. Doherty in his latest volume to expound. The task the writer sets before himself is of no slight character.

"We shall have (he says) to analyse complex organisms, and their genealogical connections in successive generations: as well as the potential continuity of indestructible physical and vital forces, liberated by death from the mortal remains of these same organisms. We shall have to establish correlations and analogies between all kinds of organisms and evolutions, as a means of rising from the known facts and laws of life in this natural world to the con-

³ "The Metaphysics of John Stuart Mill." By W. L. Courtney, M.A., Fellow of New College, Oxford. London: C. Kegan Paul. 1879.

⁴ "Organic Method." By Hugh Doherty, M.D. ("Organic Philosophy, or Man's True Place in Nature." Vol. V.) London: Trübner. 1878.

templation of unknown facts and laws of life in the unseen world of potential forces. We shall have to learn that all *transitory* living forms of organism are types of *permanent* ideas."

This last conception—the reduction of transitory forms to permanent ideas—seems at first sight to promise something like a metaphysic which would give a meaning to the discoveries of science. But if Dr. Doherty has fulfilled this part of his programme, he has done it with so dense a scaffolding of endless divisions and sub-divisions that the structure of his work is kept almost entirely out of sight. We fail at least fully to apprehend a passage like the following :—

"We state the problems of evolution more mystically and universally than Darwin, but the question of transformism does not affect the question of potential correlations fundamentally in any way. The perfect soul and body of a man exists potentially before it enters into the evolutive cycle of embryogenesis, and after it leaves the mortal body in the necrological phase of dissolution. The same may be said of the potential epicosmic unity of all the realms of Nature on this planet, before the phases of palaeontological evolution commence, and will continue to exist as an indestructible unity of vital forces after the final extinction of all the species of animals and plants upon this planet."

"Paradoxical Philosophy"⁸ is a work which would be perhaps regarded more favourably from the side of literature than it is possible to view it from the standpoint of philosophy. There are, no doubt, readers who will find pleasure and instruction from a work which represents a number of persons discussing in no very novel vein those questions which relate to God and immortality, and which finally marries the materialist, Dr. Stoffkraft, in order that he may become a student of spiritualistic phenomena, seed the untenability of his materialistic hypotheses, and conclude that "Consciousness is *no* mistake, and conscience is one of the most precious of our endowments." For ourselves we confess that we have had of late enough of this kind of literature, and trust that Dr. Stoffkraft will see that his promised exposition of the "Relations between Religion and Science" is a "thoroughly matured production" before it comes under our notice.

M. Caro, whose examination of naturalistic ethics in his *Problèmes de Morale Sociale* attracted considerable notice some three years ago, has now extended his studies to the pessimistic phenomena of our century.⁹ These he has considered with special reference to Leopardi, Schopenhauer, and Hartmann, of all of whom he has compiled a satisfactory account. The chief importance, however, of the volume lies, in the writer's judgment, on the grounds and prospects of our present pessimistic tendencies. Disagreeing with Mr. Sully's "physiological" solution of the problem, he finds the chief ground of pessimism in the "continual advance of the critical philosophy which has destroyed *metaphysical* ideas with the same skilful hand as that with which it had undermined 'religious idols.'" Thus, adds M. Caro, "The Christian, the Deist, the disciple of Kant find reasons for living even if life be

⁸ "Paradoxical Philosophy. A Sequel to the Unseen Universe." London: Macmillan. 1878.

⁹ "Le Pessimisme aux XIXe. Siècle: Leopardi—Schopenhauer—Hartmann." Par E. Caro. Paris: Hachette. 1878.

unhappy. Life for such has in itself an absolute value as determined by the idea of probation, the education of the human personality through resistance and through suffering, the certainty of a transcendental sphere of being." Pessimism, on the contrary, "presents itself before us as the last term of a philosophical movement which has destroyed everything—the reality of God, the reality of duty, the reality of the Ego, the morality of science, progress itself, and with it effort and labour, of which this philosophy proclaims the absolute inutility." But M. Caro remains sanguine even amid his study of the grounds of pessimism. The very extravagance of these negations indicates, he thinks, the artificial and temporary character of such a doctrine: and he concludes by holding pessimism to be a mere "transitional philosophy" from which the human mind will awake more vigorous than ever.

Professor Kym's little work on "Evil"⁷ forms a valuable supplement to those able *Metaphysische Untersuchungen* which the same writer gave us some three years ago. The present essay connects itself particularly with that study on the freedom of the will to which we called special attention at the time of its appearance. Evil, Professor Kym maintains, can be discovered only in the field of mind: only a being endowed with free will is capable of moral evil. Thus the question of evil really becomes a question as to the nature of our moral cognition, and the writer throws considerable light upon the place of experience in developing our moral ideas.

Colonel Gay's work on "Instinct"⁸ is one which will be found of great value by the student of comparative psychology. He has collected a great variety of anecdotes in support of his main thesis, that the intellectual faculties of brute animals are of the same order as those of human beings; and he has given a simple definition of instinct as "a mental faculty, which being innate—that is to say, hereditary in the animal—leads it spontaneously to an action apparently intelligent and reasonable." But the work is not merely a description of the instincts of different animals; its second part deals with man, and gives us a kind of anthropology which ends in a statement of the Ministry required to secure the welfare of the French Republic! The author remarks that he does not pretend to write for *savants*, but for *l'honnête homme* in every country; and gives us an amusing list of the different places in which the work has been compiled as an apology for the defects of form it may present. We do not quarrel with the form; but we confess we should have liked the book better if Colonel Gay had confined himself to a simple statement of the facts he had collected. The question of the relation between reason and instinct is one that cannot be discussed without a clear understanding as to the sense in which human reason is to be

⁷ "Das Problem des Bösen. Eine Metaphysische Untersuchung." Von A. L. Kym. München: Ackermann. 1878.

⁸ "Observations sur les Instincts de l'homme et l'Intelligence des Animaux. Souvenirs de Voyages." Par Henri Gay, Colonel de Cavalerie. Paris; Sandos et Fischbacher. 1878.

understood, and this Colonel Gay does not seem to have seriously investigated.

Imagination, some of our readers may remember, was recently made by Professor Frohschammer, of Munich, the basis of a metaphysical explanation of the world. This somewhat novel application of imagination led, it seems, to considerable misunderstanding and unfavourable commentary on the part of German critics; and the writer has therefore compiled a second work in further elucidation of his views.⁹ He has tried to show that his appeal to imagination does not exclude the action of the understanding with its laws or categories, and he has given additional emphasis to his claim to have satisfied at once the postulate of the essential unity of the world, and of the actual reality of the individual within it. Particularly he has developed his views in this new volume by comparing the character of his reduction of the world to imagination with the different forms of monistic teaching as it is to be found in Leibnitz, Herbert, and modern science.

Dr. Wigand has conferred a real benefit on general readers in compiling for the series of works on questions of the day, which Dr. Mühlhäusser and Dr. Geffcken are editing, a popularly written abridgment of his well-known work on Darwinism.¹⁰ Apart from the value of his criticisms, it is well that the objections of a thoroughly competent student of science should have as wide a circle of hearers as possible. Dr. Wigand does at least make out a strong case for the charge he brings against Darwinism of using an *à priori unscientific method*, which explains facts from principles, instead of deriving principles from a close observation of the actual facts.

Mr. Grant Allen's "Colour Sense"¹¹ has reached us too late to let us examine it further than see that it is a work of genuine research and bold originality. Mr. Allen, though not himself a student of biology, has ransacked the works of naturalists, particularly as bearing on the relation between the colours of fruits and the tastes of animals; and has even counted up all the colour epithets in Mr. Swinburne's "Poems and Ballads," in order to show that red is pre-eminently the poetical colour. The chief interest, however, of Mr. Allen's volume lies in the opposition which it offers to Dr. Magnus' attempt to view the colour-sense as a late development in human history. As against such a restriction of the colour-sense, Mr. Allen argues that even the humblest little insects have possessed for ages the sense of colour.

"The insect has spread himself over every land in a thousand shapes, and has made the whole flowering creation subservient to his daily wants. His buttercup, his dandelion, and his meadow-sweet grow thick in every English field.

⁹ "Monaden und Weltphantasie." Von J. Frohschammer. München: Ackermann, 1879.

¹⁰ "Der Darwinismus ein Zeichen der Zeit." Von Albert Wigand, Professor der Botanik in Marburg. (Zeitfragen des Christlichen Volksebens. Heft 17 u. 18.) Heilbronn: Henninger. 1878.

¹¹ "The Colour-Sense: its Origin and Development. An Essay in Comparative Psychology." By Grant Allen, B.A., Author of "Physiological Æsthetics." London: Trübner. 1879.

His mint clothes the hill-side; his heather purples the black, grey moorland. High up among the Alpine heights his gentian spreads its lakes of blue; amid the snows of the Himalayas his rhododendrons gleam with crimson light. . . . The insect has thus turned the whole surface of the earth into a boundless flower-garden, which supplies him from year to year with pollen and honey, and itself in turn gains perpetuation by the baits that it offers for his allurements."

And what holds good of the insect holds good equally of man.

"The earliest historical nations discriminated and employed in decoration every chief prismatic hue, at an age long anterior to that in which we are asked to believe that the colour-sense was unknown. Throughout all historical times, in Egypt, Assyria, China, India, Peru, Mexico, and Western Europe, colour has been distinguished and used just as it is at the present day."

The grounds of this conclusion must be read in the work itself. Mr. Allen is quite a master in style, and deserves to have a large and increasing circle of readers.

Messrs. Kegan Paul and Co. deserve the hearty thanks of English readers for the handsome translation of Professor Haeckel's "Evolution of Man,"¹² which they have published. Whatever may be thought of Darwinism generally, there can be no doubt but Haeckel is one of its most successful expositors, as he is one of its most ardent advocates; and it is well that his writings should be placed within the reach of English students of biology. We have not been able to test the English version with the German, but it appears to preserve the lucidity and directness of the original. It will form a worthy companion to the "History of Creation," of which the same firm are the publishers.

Professor Eucken's "History of Philosophical Terminology"¹³ is a work which involves an amount of patient labour of which it is impossible to give an idea here. Those only who have attempted to trace the development of philosophy as expressed in language, will know the real value of Professor Eucken's volume. His work is really a valuable commentary on the history of philosophy, and throws no slight light upon the general development of thought.

POLITICS, SOCIOLOGY, VOYAGES, AND TRAVELS.

EVENTS have followed each other so rapidly of late that the public interest, which in the early part of last year was centred in the East of Europe, travelled in the latter part of the year to Afghanistan, and is now mainly directed to South Africa. What is called the Eastern Question seems as if it were already passing from the region of politics into that of history—though many a transition of this sort has

¹² "The Evolution of Man: a Popular Exposition of the Principal Points of Human Ontogeny and Phylogeny." From the German of Ernst Haeckel, Professor in the University of Jena. Two vols. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1879.

¹³ "Geschichte der Philosophischen Terminologie im Umriss dargestellt." Von Rudolf Eucken, Professor in Jena. Leipzig: Veit & Co. 1879.

to be effected before the whole Eastern Question, extending as it does from the Danube to the Ganges—if not to the Yang-tse-Kiang—is matter only for patient reflection and not, as at present, for the most anxious political speculation. The Duke of Argyll,¹ late Secretary of State in Mr. Gladstone's Government, has made a valuable contribution to the discussion of the Eastern Question by transforming into a continuous history most of the relevant matter which, between the years 1854 and 1879, is only to be found scattered up and down the interminable pages of ponderous Blue-Books, or in the more desultory and unmanageable shape of letters by newspaper correspondents. The work is, of course, performed from the point of view of an opponent of Lord Beaconsfield's Government, and, no doubt, some skilful arrangement of details is resorted to in order to present the iniquities of that Government in as highly-coloured an aspect as possible. Nevertheless, the evidence, when drawn from authoritative quarters, speaks for itself, and the view of so able a man, and so influential a member of his own party as the Duke of Argyll cannot but be matter of considerable interest, even to those least disposed to agree with his view of the whole situation. Commencing with the Treaty of Paris in 1856, the Duke disposes satisfactorily of a fallacious argument, which has a good deal clouded the discussion, to the effect that the Treaty of Paris for the first time recognised Turkey as an equal and independent member of the European Society of States. He shows that the Seventh Article of the Treaty by which Turkey was admitted to participate in the advantages of the "Public Law" of Europe was nothing more than a tardy remedial measure for the exclusion of Turkey from the benefit "of the healing acts of 1814 and 1815, under the protection of which civilised and Christian Europe reposed after her long dissensions, and saw her Governments united by the recollections of common glory, and a happy identity of principles and views." These words, borrowed from the Czar Nicolas' Declaration of War in April, 1828, indicated—innoent as they sound—a special danger to which Turkey was, and continued, liable in being the only State with which other States were brought into constant connection, and yet which was wholly unprotected by any general concert with other States. The result of this omission was manifested not only in the Treaty of Adrianople in 1829, but in the assumptions of Russia with respect to the Holy Places in 1853, which was one of the chief causes of the Crimean war. The Duke points out that the dominating purpose of that war, and the only explanation of the Treaty which closed it, was to be found in the determination of Europe not to elevate Turkey to a platform of independence and irresponsibility, but to place her and all her subject dominions under the protectorate and the vigilant supervision of Europe as a corporate whole. At the same time, by a clause which has been most falsely interpreted, the Powers abstained from all internal interference with Turkish administrations

¹ "The Eastern Question, from the Treaty of Paris, 1856, to the Treaty of Berlin, 1878, and to the Second Afghan War." By the Duke of Argyll. Two vols. Strahan & Co., 34, Paternoster Row, London. 1879.

without in the least relaxing the duty of Turkey herself to institute a series of reforms which, by the terms of the Treaty itself, she promised. Upon this basis the Duke goes on to review the continuous history of the relations of Europe and the Porte between 1856 and 1876, and, recalling the constant animadversions of the British Government on the mal-administration of Turkey, and the minute circumstances of the interference of France and England in Syria in 1860, and of the principles confessed, but not practically acted upon, in the case of the Cretan insurrection of 1867, he shows that the invitation on the part of Russia to the Powers to intervene in the case of the Herzegovinian insurrection, the Bulgarian calamities, and the Servian war, was wholly in accord with the letter and spirit of the Treaty of 1856. The Duke reviews the whole course of the negotiations which terminated in the Congress and the Treaty of Berlin. In criticising the provisions of this Treaty—of course from his own point of view—he regards them as beneficial in many respects, but mainly failing in conferring too much advantage on Russia, and impairing to no small extent the dignity of England. The Treaty was advantageous in that it “took a long step forwards in the direction of the final partition of the Sultan’s European dominions, redeeming from even the forms of vassalage the old Danubian Principalities, and establishing in two other important provinces institutions which must lead to future independence. It embodied also in the public law of Europe the fertile principle that the Sultan is under pledge to the other Powers in respect to the good government of all the dominions that remain to him, whether in Europe or in Asia.” The Duke notices that unfortunately every one of the elements of good has been due to the interests, to the power, and to the policy of Russia. On the other hand, the Treaty has postponed the settlement of some points which were ripe for solution, which can only be settled in one way, and which it is only too probable cannot now be settled without another war. It has clogged the institutions of autonomous administration which it professed to confer upon Eastern Roumelia with provisions conceived in the interests of the Turks which are incongruous and inconsistent, and are sure to be the source of future trouble. The Treaty has furthermore left the joint and several rights of the Signatory Powers in respect to the protectorate over the subject populations of Turkey in a state of utter confusion, without the indication even of any methods of operation, or any provision whatever against the intrusion of selfish and exclusive action as opportunities may arise. The Duke regards it as the crowning evil of all that the whole proceedings of the Congress exhibited the English Government as jealous of, and hostile to, the growing power and advancing freedom of the Christian populations, and Russia as the only Power which is heartily on their side. In reference to the Afghan war, the Duke of Argyll has prepared the heaviest indictment against Lord Lytton personally, which has been brought against him from any quarter. Reviewing all the transactions which took place from the beginning of Lord Lytton’s vice-royalty, in April, 1876, to the war in November, 1878, the Duke considers that

a climax of political iniquity and dishonesty was reached in what is known as the "Ultimatum Letter," addressed to the Ameer, and dated the 30th October, 1878. After criticising the terms of this letter, and showing not only how contradictory its language was of known and admitted facts, but also how inconsistent it was with another account of the transactions alluded to, given by Lord Lytton himself, in what is known as his "Simla Narrative," the Duke writes as follows :—

"The unfairness and inaccuracies of the Cabinet Ultimatum do not end even here. It proceeds thus—'Yet the British Government,—unwilling to embarrass you,—accepted your excuses.' So far from accepting his excuses, the Government of India began addressing to the Ameer a set of letters and messages, one more imperious and insulting than another, until, as we have seen, they ended by suspending all diplomatic relations with him, and were now about to declare war against him, because he claimed his right to consider as binding upon us the pledges of the British Crown. I confess I cannot write these sentences without emotion. They seem to me to be the record of sayings and of doings which cast an indelible disgrace upon our country. The page of history is full of the proclamations and manifestoes of powerful Kings and Governments who have desired to cover under plausible pretexts acts of violence and injustice against weaker States. It may well be doubted whether in the whole of this melancholy list any one specimen can be found more unfair in its accusations, more reckless in its assertions, than this ultimatum letter addressed to the Ameer of Cabul by the Cabinet of the Queen."

In a series of re-published Essays by Mr. Gladstone, entitled "Gleanings of Past Years,"² the writer incidentally travels over some of the same historical ground already occupied by the Duke of Argyll. Mr. Gladstone defends the policy of the Crimean War against the imputation, on the one hand, that it was waged solely for the purpose of British interests, and, on the other, that it was a mere quixotic enterprise engaged in solely in the interests of humanity, and apart from all concern for the advantage of England and France. Mr. Gladstone, in commenting on the third volume of Mr. Martin's "Life of the Prince Consort," is at great pains to show that the movement for checking the assumptions of Russia proceeded at first from Austria, and expressed itself in what is known as the Vienna Note. France and England at the outset were in close association with Austria and Prussia—the only other Great Powers who, in proceedings which were adverse to Russia, could, by the nature of the case, have any concert with themselves. Mr. Gladstone says that in spite of the restrained, and in some instances mysterious, conduct of Austria, her occupation of the Principalities had, at least, the air of a qualified co-operation, and her menace of an entire junction with the allies had to do with the final succumbing of Russia, while her moral weight was with them throughout.

"It was Prussia which, at the critical moment, to speak in homely language, bolted; the very policy which she had recommended she declined unconditionally to sustain, from the first moment when it began to assume the character of a solid and stern reality. In fact she broke up the European concert, by

² "Gleanings of Past Years, 1843-78." By the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P. Vols. I. and II. London: John Murray. 1879.

which it was that France and England had hoped, and had had a right to hope to put down the stubbornness of the Czar, and to repel his attack upon the public law of Europe. The question that these allies had now to determine was whether, armed as they had been all along with the panoply of moral authority, they would upon this unfortunate and discreditable desertion allow all their demands, their reasonings, their professions, to melt into thin air."

In comparing the circumstances of the Crimean War with those of the late Russian War with Turkey, Mr. Gladstone notices that the desertion of Prussia in 1854 had a baleful effect similar to the assurances conveyed to Turkey from England, in 1876-7, that only moral suasion was intended.

"The difference was, that in 1854-5, two Great Powers, with the partial support of a third, prosecuted by military means the work they had undertaken; in 1877 it was left to Russia alone to act as the hand and sword of Europe, with the natural consequence of weighting the scale with the question what compensation she might claim, or would claim, for her efforts and her sacrifices."

Mr. Gladstone enters further on an interesting inquiry with which he is peculiarly competent to deal, as to the increase of annual expenditure on the army and navy since the Crimean War. He observes that the average annual expenditure is now more than twice the amount at which it was placed in 1835 by the Conservative Government of Sir Robert Peel, and that the average annual charge for the years 1830-50 did not greatly exceed half of what it has been for the years 1857-77.

"Something considerable is due to the change in armaments and the increased value of labour. Yet we believe it to be the fact that the altered humour of the public, assiduously wrought upon by the professional spirit, and by the promoters of expenditure in general, has been the main cause of the alteration, and not a real and substantive necessity."

In the chapter entitled "Kin Beyond Sea," originally published in the *North American Review*, Mr. Gladstone enters upon an interesting comparison of the American and English Constitutions. He takes occasion to explain what he believes to be the true theory and history of the English Cabinet, and incidentally recommends the adoption of some such flexible medium between the Legislative and Executive authorities in America. Mr. Gladstone naturally abstains from expressing any emphatic views as to what is the really difficult problem in the structure of the American Constitution, and that is the competing claims of centralisation and federalism. The question has, of course, a strictly historical aspect, to which Mr. Gladstone is fully awake. But it is not often remembered by those who parterryise English institutions that the mere area of the American territory, and the probability of a constant growth of fresh States, might render so powerful a central executive as the English Cabinet inapplicable, or even dangerous.

A book written by a General³ whose active service in South Africa dates from the war with Langalibalele to last year, and written so

³ "My Command in South Africa, 1874-8." By General Sir Arthur Thurlow Cunynghame, G.C.B. London: Macmillan & Co. 1879.

lately that the preface speaks of the Isandula defeat, is sure of an eager reception, and is worthy of it. The details of the warfare of which our present struggle is but the sequel are important at the present moment, when all are anxious for such information as will help in forming a fair judgment of Lord Chelmsford's doings or leavings. General Cunynghame is in favour of the Federation of the South African Colonies. He thinks the cost of this whole war ought not to rest principally upon the English taxpayer, but rather on the wealthy Colonies in whose professed interest it is undertaken. Mr. Aylward's enthusiasm for General Cunynghame will be remembered by his readers, and will make them doubly disposed to learn more from this volume.

As preface to Dr. Schweinfurth's two fascinating and well-illustrated volumes about his African travels,⁴ Mr. Winwood Reade—himself to the end of his days a well-known African traveller—dilates upon the geographical enthusiasm of the Khedive, whose firman is at the service of explorers, and is most useful so far as it bears authority. Beyond such limits, the name of Egypt brings hostility rather than friendship, because this same geographical interest on the part of the Khedive is as well understood by African potentates to mean future annexation as is a similar zeal on our own part, or that of Russia in Central Asia. Dr. Schweinfurth, who was drawn to Africa by the attractions of botanical study, has written his name among those of the most distinguished explorers, and he and his translator offer to the world a more than usually adequate account of his work.

Mr. Fisher is to be thanked for an admirably compendious small volume on Afghanistan.⁵ He is a free and independent critic both of our former and our recent policy towards Afghanistan, and of its present advocates, and especially pours contempt upon the fear of Russia in Asia. The careful account of all the possible claimants to Shere Ali's throne and their political relationships has immediate interest. Mr. Bellew⁶ views the matter from a different point of view, and insists upon the incapacity of the Amir of Cabul to stand alone, and the familiar suspicion of Russia. His volume is more allusive and less informing than Mr. Fisher's. Mr. Farley's opinion about Eastern affairs has its own weight.⁷ He presses the question what the English "Protectorate" of Asia Minor means. Is it a protectorate of Pashas, leading to all oppression? or of the people, leading to a direct administration by Englishmen? "Tancred" suggests that it means the latter, with annexation in the background. Mr. Farley

⁴ "The Heart of Afr.ca." By Dr. George Schweinfurth. Translated by Ellen E. Frewer. Two vols. Third edition. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, & Rivington. 1878.

⁵ "Afghanistan and the Central Asian Question." By Fred. H. Fisher. London: James Clarke & Co. 1878.

⁶ "Afghanistan, and the Afghans." By H. W. Bellew, C.S.I. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1879.

⁷ "Egypt, Cyprus, and Asiatic Turkey." By J. Lewis Farley. London: Trübner & Co. 1878.

advocates,—like the author of a pamphlet on the subject⁸—the immediate prosecution of a “Euphrates Valley Railway Scheme,” though he appears to prefer the route proposed by Sir Macdonald Stephenson to that proposed in the pamphlet. He depicts Beyrout as by far the best sanatorium known for consumptive patients, and Cyprus as a healthy island for cautious people. Of the Turks he says “they have simply become effeminate without ceasing to be barbarous.”

It is with regret that we find a carefully written pamphlet by an Indian gentleman,⁹ adopting a tone of admiration for all things English, which reads something like mockery at home. He delights in the supremacy of England in India, and looks for its permanency, and he puts forth a proposal that the Native States should put their armies under British control, paying their cost, and reserving only a small police force. It will comfort some among us to notice the distaste which this most thoughtful and able, though somewhat sanguine, fellow-subject shows towards Russia.

In Bengal, not far from Augrezábád, there exist, almost buried in the jungle, magnificent ruins of the ancient capital of Eastern India, Gaur, a city stretching ten miles along the banks, probably, of a former bed of the Ganges, containing 1,200,000 inhabitants three centuries ago, and owing its fall conjecturally to some epidemic which scared away the population it failed to kill. Its buildings have been, like so many other remains of antiquity, a quarry for modern builders, but there yet remain gateways and ruins of mosques and palaces, the photographs of which, by Mr. Ravenshaw, excite the fancy both by their beauty and by a certain severity of style unfamiliar in Eastern scenes.¹⁰ The volume which Mr. Ravenshaw's widow publishes, in order to carry out her husband's plan, is a gorgeous one so far as the photographs go, and is full of special interest to the Indian antiquary; but the letterpress is, for the common reader, too scrappy and too purely descriptive of each picture, one after another, to be as attractive as it would appear capable of having been made. Such books are welcome, in the hope that they may help to raise the popular mind to the pitch of regarding India as something more than either a place to make money in, or a burden on the British taxpayer.

Mr. Grant Duff's desultory *Essays and Speeches*¹¹ are often far more systematic and weighty, not to say ponderous, than the finished treatises of other authors. His lately published volume of *Miscellanies* contains some papers well worthy of being preserved in a permanent form. In an interesting address on the present condition and immediate prospects of our commercial treaties, Mr. Grant Duff takes occasion to trace the history and economical consequences of the French Commercial Treaty of 1860. France and England each knew

⁸ “Asia Minor and Euphrates Valley Railway.” London: W. H. Allen & Co. 1879.

⁹ “The Forces of the Native States of India.” London: Trübner & Co. 1878.

¹⁰ “Gaur: Its Ruins and Inscriptions.” By the late John Henry Ravenshaw, B.C.S. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1878.

¹¹ “Miscellanies: Political and Literary.” By Mountstuart E. Grant Duff, M.P. London: Macmillan. 1878.

at the time of concluding the treaty that the other thereby had given up charging one duty on the same product if it came from one nation, and a different duty if it came from a different nation. The new treaty, accordingly,

“was an absolute disclaimer and repudiation of all that desire for exclusive advantages,” which was the essence of the previous policy. “As, then, France had got rid for all other nations, of nearly all English duties on their products, so France got rid for England of a great part of the duties levied upon English products in the ports of most European nations, and as almost every nation had taken care to stipulate that it should be in the position of the most favoured nation, the benefit went on extending itself very rapidly.”

Mr. Grant Duff notices that in the year 1870 all the great trading nations of Europe—England, France, the Zollverein, Austria, Holland, and Belgium—were one great International body by all the parts of which the principle of stipulating for exclusive advantages for its own commerce seemed to have been abandoned, and not one part of which could take off a duty without every other part at once enjoying increased facilities for its commerce; while, within this body the operation of a favoured-nation clause was such as to make the arrival at almost unlimited freedom of exchange merely a question of time. In 1873 our trade with France had risen from 26,000,000*l.*, at which it stood the year before our Commercial Treaty with that country—viz., 1859, to 73,000,000*l.* Our trade with Belgium had risen from 8,000,000*l.*, at which it stood the year before our Commercial Treaty with that country—viz., 1861, to 27,000,000*l.* Our trade with Italy had risen from 8,000,000*l.*, at which it stood the year before our Commercial Treaty with that country—viz., 1862, to 12,000,000*l.* In a paper on Emilio Castelar, in which Mr. Grant Duff gives an exhaustive account of his political opinions and general situation in reference to current European politics, he says:—

“If a man (who has drunken of the modern spirit, as no English statesman of first-rate importance has done) were to rise amongst us with the oratorical genius of Señor Castelar, and that acquaintance with affairs which almost every one gets in the House of Commons, he would, in ten years, be the most powerful man in England.”

The new name for Protection is “Justice to Native Industry,”¹² and naturally a Northern Agriculturist and ex-M.P., who, in a letter to the Earl of Derby, wishes to make a return to Protection seem as respectable as possible, urges that “those who may advocate ‘reciprocity,’ or under certain circumstances even Protection, need not be tied to names.” He himself would plead rather in the name of justice to native industry which, says he, may or may not involve restrictive tariffs or duties for the sake of revenue. The writer criticises rather sharply the French Treaty negotiated by Mr. Cobden, and objects that the French took good care to give us no real reciprocity. “The treaty was made chiefly for the sake of our cotton interest, and

¹² “Justice to Native Industry.” A Letter to the Right Hon. the Earl of Derby. By a Northern Agriculturist and Ex-M.P. London: Hamilton & Bogue. 1879.

besides ruining smaller industries, it has only in a smaller degree than expected, and of which the benefit seems now almost entirely disconnected, promoted that important industry of your Lordship's native Lancashire especially." The writer, while trying to make a Protectionist policy palatable, intimates that "it might not be easy to rebut those who would advocate a moderate duty on foreign products of the land, especially a differential one in favour of our colonies, Canada, Australia, or India, against non-reciprocating nations."

In a book intended to "describe in a popular fashion the condition of the British Army of to-day,"¹³ Major Griffiths so entirely fails to rise—or fall—to an appreciation of the possibilities of ignorance about the Army that it is not till his three hundred and sixty-first page that he gives any information about the number of men and of officers in a company, battalion, or regiment; and it is a pity that he has neither an index nor a table of contents, for the ordinary outside public does not want to read through and digest a thick volume of discussions on flogging and pipe-clay and the rank of different branches of the artillery, however easily the rivulet of words may flow. A book easily referred to, and full of facts, without individual opinions, would be useful now-a-days to enable men of peace to realise what "our army" means.

It is a work of supererogation to speak of the charms of Charles Waterton's American adventures.¹⁴ Mr. Wood, too, is so old and lively a friend to all young naturalists that a conjunction of their names on the title-page of a book promises all that this volume affords, pleasure and solid and certain instruction. In truth, Mr. Wood's name will probably lead many to acquaintance with Waterton, because he always tries to do what he has done here—to make the rough places of natural history plain by his explanatory index to the native names of birds, beasts, and fishes which were used by Mr. Waterton, but which conveyed no meaning to most readers.

Decidedly the most superb of all the books published by various members of the scientific company of H.M.S. "Challenger" is that written and illustrated by Mr. John James Wild,¹⁵ and his publishers, Messrs. Marcus Ward & Co., have admirably seconded him by their characteristic reproductions of his coloured sketches. Small woodcuts abound on every page, and are each a source of distinct delight. The large and luxurious volume does not attempt to give the complete history or results of the Expedition, but simply to convey vivid impressions of the different parts of the world touched at during the famous cruise, and the descriptions are scarcely, if at all, second to the pictures in forwarding the writer's aim. Happy are the young people who have access to this beautiful book.

¹³ "The English Army." By Major Arthur Griffiths. London: Cassell, Petter, & Galpin. 1879.

¹⁴ "Wanderings in South America." By Charles Waterton, Esq. Edited by the Rev. J. G. Wood. London: Macmillan & Co. 1879.

¹⁵ "At Anchor." By John James Wild, Ph.D., F.R.G.S. London: Marcus Ward & Co. 1878.

A certain usefulness may be ascribed to a volume of sketches of English vagabond-life by "Thor Fredur,"¹⁶ though the authenticity of the statements is not obvious. It is not easy to believe that any but a scamp could make himself familiar with scamps, and their ways and thoughts in the manner which "Thor Fredur" leads us to suppose he has done. And it is scarcely wholesome simply to describe with a studiously colourless impartiality towards right or wrong lives which are a misery and a curse to our modern civilisation.

Mr. Robertson's "Lectures on the Government, Constitution, and Laws of Scotland"¹⁷ comprise a vast quantity of matter in a very small space, and in fact we should be disposed to think that much of the book was rather of the nature of notes for lectures than lectures themselves. The laws of Scotland seem much to resemble those of England, if what Mr. Robertson says is true—that they have nothing corresponding to the XII. Tables of Rome, "but rather a heterogeneous mass of statutes, decisions, and customs, from which a clear and well-defined system is not easily extracted." As an historical treatise the work is exceedingly comprehensive, commencing with a reference to Herodotus' and Aristotle's designation of Britain and Ireland as the *Cassiterides*, and closing with an account of recent statutes defining the rights of innkeepers, and admitting the principle of limited liability in regard to Industrial and Provident Societies. Mr. Robertson does not forget to cite the celebrated language of James I., on his return to Scotland after an eighteen years' imprisonment in England. Informed of the universal rapine and plunder which prevailed, he is said to have exclaimed:—"Let God but grant me life, and by His help I shall make the key keep the castle, and the furze-bush the cow throughout my dominions, though I should lead the life of a dog to complete it."

It is eight years since Sir Joseph Hooker, the director of Kew Gardens, was sent out, with all authoritative assistance, in company with Mr. Ball, Mr. Maw, and a young gardener from Kew, to attempt to bring the botany of the Great Atlas within scientific range. In a pleasant volume,¹⁸ Mr. Ball narrates what they were able to accomplish in their special work, but recommends himself still more to the general reader by the minute and large-minded account he gives of the condition of the land and people of Morocco. The climate appears to approach perfection, the people—but for some instances of religious intolerance—to be mild and kindly, the soil abundantly fertile; the Government so execrable that it is a comfort to turn from Mr. Ball's excuse for long delay in publishing this book—to the effect that time makes no difference to Morocco, because it brings with it no change—to turn from this to the recent news of a revolution there. It may be

¹⁶ "Sketches from Shady Places." By Thor Fredur. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1879.

¹⁷ "A Course of Lectures on the Government, Constitution, and Laws of Scotland, from the Earliest to the Present Time." By Alexander Robertson, M.A. London: Stephens & Haynes. 1878.

¹⁸ "Journal of a Tour in Morocco and the Great Atlas." By Joseph Dalton Hooker, K.C.S.I., C.B., &c., and John Ball, F.R.S., M.R.S.A., &c. London: Macmillan & Co. 1878.

that the result of the rising may be to open the country to many good influences, and to make it possible for future scientific travellers to pursue their studies with less difficulty and danger, and, therefore, more completely than this party, with all their solid gains, were able to do.

If gold is not sought in the ancient mining districts of Midian, it will not be the fault of the eccentric traveller who prefixes two lines of "Mother Shipton's" prophecies as motto to his book—"Gold shall be found, and found In a land that's not now known." The present volumes are intended by Captain Burton¹⁹ to rest upon the base of his former volume called "The Gold Mines of Midian." He does not appear to have obtained very surprising results from the specimens of ores he brought to England with him, and falls back upon hints of the best specimens not having passed the English Customs House, and upon suggestions that M. Marie did not choose specimens wisely. At least, there is at present no danger of a "gold rush" to Midian, however ready the Khedive may be to spend Egyptian taxes on the forlorn hope of a "find." Otherwise than as a brief for Midianite gold-mining, these volumes possess the usual characteristics of Captain Burton's writings: they are vivacious, enthusiastic, to a certain depth learned, and well decorated with woodcuts and coloured pictures. Captain Burton is a warm admirer of the Khedive, who has lent him much help in his expeditions to Midian, and repeatedly expresses his preference for the old state of things in Egypt rather than for the present *régime* of European control.

Mr. Clark²⁰ was one of the earlier American professors who entered the service of the Tycoon, and his lively account of what he saw and did in Japan has an added value from the fact that he lived in the interior of the country, where a foreigner was absolutely rare, and lived in close contact with people of all ranks as they were before Western ideas had at all sensibly taken hold upon Japan. He was professor of chemistry for some time at an educational centre, from which he and his pupils were subsequently removed, much against his will, to the University of Tokio, of which he gives a picture or two, and many interesting details. He joins in the universal account of the ability and genial, though respectful, amiability of the Japanese youth. His volume would seem to have been prepared originally for publication in some religious juvenile magazine in America; but writing for young people is often a good receipt for giving interesting and fairly complete accounts of strange matters—a writer is not tempted to take little things for granted, and he puts in the comic as well as the serious view of everything. A rather unsuccessful expedition up Fujiyama, not unattended with danger, enabled Mr. Clark to estimate its height at 11,560 feet. He evidently anticipates that Christianity will prevail in Japan.

¹⁹ "The Land of Midian Revisited." By Richard F. Burton. Two vols. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1879.

²⁰ "Life and Adventure in Japan." By E. Warren Clark. London: James Nisbet & Co. 1879.

If Herr Beerbohm's pages do nothing to relieve the mind from the impression of dreary, limitless, barren, waterless wastes that rises before it with the name Patagonia, they dispel the notion of these wastes being tenanted by savage giants.²¹ The Tehuelches do not average six feet, but they are abnormally strong, and their bright and friendly faces proclaim the gentle intelligence which prompts them to use a dignified and affable politeness among themselves and towards strangers. Herr Beerbohm emphatically pronounces them "immeasurably superior"—all their disadvantages being taken into consideration—to the general run of civilised white men." He was much among them, and sums their character up in the words "the happy savage." Ostrich and guanacho hunting is the source of their wealth, which is expressed in the number of their horses. And yet Herr Beerbohm might well be excused had he written with less *bonhomie* of Patagonia, for he tells such a tale of struggle for life against hunger and cold while waiting, and then in going on without waiting, for the subsidence of a flooded river which crossed their path through a wide desert, as few travellers live to tell, and, as probably prompts his vehement resolve never—spite of the attractions of the Tehuelches—to return to Patagonia.

Colonel Prejevalsky's story of his travels in search of Lob-Nor²² is prefaced by a valuable paper from the pen of one of the few people competent to write with authority on the subject of Central Asian Geography—Sir Douglas Forsyth. Such exploration as both these travellers have attempted is rendered doubly difficult by the natural jealousy of Russian and English encroachment, as also by the fact that there exists, at least, a tradition of gold to be found. Colonel Prejevalsky denies the name of Lob-Nor as applied to a lake or river, and appears to use it as designating a swampy region inhabited by a sparse and wretched people, the home of the wild camel, and a perfect paradise in spring for the ornithologist, whose eyes are gluttoned by the variety and numbers of the migratory birds who choose this narrowest point for crossing the Thibetan highlands on their passage from the trans-Himalayan countries. Baron Richthofen denies that Colonel Prejevalsky reached Lob-Nor, but the Colonel holds to it that he has done so, and is now gone back to Central Asia to bring fresh results to further geographical knowledge, and maintain his own views. The controversy rests to some degree upon the accuracy of Chinese maps, and is made much more intelligible than it otherwise would be by the admirably clear map compiled by Mr. Weller.

An exhaustive work on the antiquities of America,²³ from the point of view of an historian, ethnologist, a geologist, and a traveller, in

²¹ "Wanderings in Patagonia." By Julius Beerbohm. London: Chatto and Windus. 1879.

²² "From Kulja Across the Tian Shan, to Lob-Nor." By Colonel N. Prejevalsky. Translated by E. D. Morgan, F.R.G.S. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, & Rivington. 1879.

²³ "Die Culturländer des Alten America." Von A. Bastian. Berlin: Weidmann, 1878.

two large, thick, closely printed volumes, admits only of being mentioned as erudite and attractive in the space which the pressing affairs of three other Continents afford to America.

Sir Archibald Michie's "Readings in Melbourne"²⁴ is a reprint or collection of lectures, delivered in that city on the advantages of colonial life in Melbourne; against the theories now called "protection—or justice—to native industry," a paper useful to many among us at present; on loyalty and the attitude of the ordinary mind towards royal persons, containing useful strictures on the Royal Marriage Act as harmful to morals; and on the present condition of Victoria,—a paper intended specially for the use of possible emigrants thither. Sir Archibald Michie's matter is good and his style pleasant.

Mr. Hayter is becoming famous for the completeness of detail, accuracy, and almost poetry, of his statistics.²⁵ He is now followed by other colonial statisticians. It is difficult to conceive of any subject open to statement in figures upon which reliable and interesting information is not afforded by this "Year-Book," but unhappily the Index is not perfectly accurate. An alphabetical list of the diseases and discomforts to which Australian flesh and blood is heir, is a really curious piece of statistical work. A table of principal events in 1877 is in itself a graphic picture of Colonial life.

Lieutenant Thomas W. Gudgeon supplies, in a smoothly flowing narrative, an account of the military encounters of the New Zealand Colonists,²⁶—and at one time the home troops,—with the Maories, in which he was personally engaged, from 1860 to the present date. The political side of the history he purposely omits. The portraits of natives and Colonial celebrities are interesting.

Most travellers on the Continent are familiar with the convenience experienced through the use of the franc as a monetary standard in France, Italy, Switzerland, and Belgium; but they are also equally familiar with the inconvenience experienced through the impossibility of getting rid of their Italian paper lire in any of the other countries mentioned, or even in inducing Italian station-masters to receive Swiss coin. The history of the franc dates from the decree of Napoleon Bonaparte as First Consul in the year XI. The later history of this standard dates from the convention known as the Latin Union between France, Italy, Switzerland, and Belgium, and dated December 23rd, 1865. S. Cagnetti de Martiis, in a compact little pamphlet,²⁷ discusses the last convention of the same sort, dated November 5th, 1878, between Belgium, France, Italy, Switzerland, and Greece. The principle of the Convention is to establish the franc as the basis of international measurement, but no obligation rests upon the several

²⁴ "Readings in Melbourne." By Sir Archibald Michie, Q.C., K.C.M.G. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1879.

²⁵ "Victorian Year-book for 1877-8." By Henry Heylin Hayter. Melbourne John Ferris. London: Geo. Robertson & Trübner. 1878.

²⁶ "Reminiscences of the War in New Zealand." By Thomas W. Gudgeon. With 12 portraits. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1879.

²⁷ "Il Nuovo Patto della Unione Monetaria Latina." Studio di S. Cagnetti de Martiis. Rome, Turin, Florence: Ermanno Loescher. 1879.

parties to circulate one another's coins. The convention is to come into force in 1880, and continue till 1886. M. Cernuschi, well known as the author of "Bi-metallic Money," in a pamphlet entitled "Monetary Diplomacy in 1878,"²⁸ objects to the renewal of the Latin Union as putting off to a greater distance of time the general adoption of Bi-metallism. "Let France," M. Cernuschi says, "conclude her arrangements with the Italian Government which has given proof of fidelity to Bi-metallism; but let us shake off the idolaters of Mono-metallism,—the Swiss and Belgian Governments." If all the changes needed to introduce a general reign of Bi-metallism are brought about, M. Cernuschi prophesies "that that very instant France will for ever resume the coinage of silver; and that very instant silver will for ever recover its old value; and that very instant twenty silver shillings and one gold sovereign will for ever possess the same intrinsic value; and that very instant the rupee will for ever become worth 1s. 10½d.; and that very instant the exchange between India and England will for ever become as stable as the exchange between London and Paris. These are not oracular prophecies; they are mathematical predictions like those of Astronomy." Mr. Lindsay discusses a closely-allied subject in a pamphlet on "A gold standard without a gold coinage in England and India."²⁹ The pamphlet, written as it is by a banker, displays the thorough acquaintance with the subject, and the absence of all flightiness and speculation, which are rather exceptional pleasures to meet with in treatises on money. Mr. Lindsay's main proposition is, that while the existing gold sovereign is retained in England as a standard of measurement, the coinage of gold should cease, and paper notes of a very small value—say 10s. or £1—should be circulated instead. Mr. Lindsay holds that whereas the chief requisites of media for home circulation are (1.) Acceptability, (2.) Equality of value with gold, (3.) Ready convertibility into gold for foreign payment purposes, (4.) Self-adjusting capacity; all these requisites can be satisfied by circulating paper convertible at the bank, not for sovereigns, but for uncoined gold ingots. "The scheme proposes to abolish all restrictive rules in force regarding currency material" (that is, presumably, to repeal the Bank Charter Act), "and, while facilitating the employment of gold whenever gold is actually required, to encourage the use of paper, silver, and copper when these are most suitable. All experience tends to prove that small notes will be most generally acceptable; and any parties obstinate or distrustful enough to prefer gold in the home exchanges can use it in shapeless lumps, but must not expect the State to pamper their private predilections at the public expense by the manufacture of convenient and artistic coins." Admitting, for the moment, that there is no economical falsity in this reasoning, it still remains to be proved that in the circumstances of modern life, when manufacturing

²⁸ "Monetary Diplomacy in 1878." By Henri Cernuschi. London: H. S. King. 1878.

²⁹ "A Gold Standard without a Gold Coinage in England and India." By A. M. Lindsay, Bank of Bengal. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1879.

skill is no State monopoly, a diffusion of small notes must not afford an unprecedented temptation to forgery, and the precedent of Scotland cannot prejudice the question as considered in reference to England and the Colonies.

Professor Bain³⁰ is so great an authority in all discussions concerning the mind that it may appear outrageous to suggest that his study of mind in children must have been pursued under singular circumstances. He rests upon malevolence as an elemental factor in children, and as one which is to be recognised and utilised. Is it possible that he has ever been a sufferer from an ill-trained set of schoolboys? It must also be noted that his style is certainly so verbose as to be obscure beyond the power of the bulk of teachers to penetrate through, and profit by his thought.

Miss Yonge's name again promises intelligent and sprightly work for the young. Her little contribution to Messrs. Macmillan's series of *History Primers*³¹ is sufficiently well done, and fairly impartial, though a more "Protestant" writer would have more to say about Henri IV., and about the Huguenot matters generally, and a more "Republican" one would find a severer tone natural about the First as well as the Second Empires.

The accomplished Russian lady who wrote the letters on Slav politics, called "*Is Russia Wrong?*" publishes a sequel named "*Friends or Foes,*"³² which is a spirited remonstrance against the unfriendly feeling towards Russia prevalent in some English circles. Even those most reluctant to be swayed by her must enjoy the skill and delicacy with which she uses her materials, as well as the fluent intimacy she shows with English opinion and taste. Probably all will be astonished to hear from her that Siberia is a rich and smiling country, far more suitable for English emigrants than Australia, and for invalids equal to Venice.

Mr. Stevenson is not to be congratulated on the line of his literary march since he published "*An Inland Voyage.*" Probably it is because he is neither advanced enough in years nor in philosophy to write suitably about his native town and townspeople. His pictures of Edinburgh are pleasing,³³ and he evidently does not know how much he owes to her, and loves her, nor how he respects her inhabitants.

Professor Hearn's elaborate treatise on the "*Structure and Development of the Aryan Household*"³⁴ is an important and erudite contribution to the discussion of a topic which, since the appearance of Sir H. S. Maine's "*Ancient Law,*" and Professor Max Müller's better

³⁰ "*Education as a Science.*" By Alexander Bain, LL.D. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1879.

³¹ "*History of France.*" By Charlotte M. Yonge. London: Macmillan & Co. 1878.

³² "*Friends or Foes.*" By O. K. London: P. S. King. 1878.

³³ "*Edinburgh.*" By R. L. Stevenson. Illustrated. Seeley, Jackson, & Halliday: London. 1879.

³⁴ "*The Aryan Household.*" By W. E. Hearn, LL.D. London: Longmans. Melbourne: Geo. Robertson. 1879.

known writings, is no longer unfamiliar to the English reader. There is no absolutely new proposition in the treatise, though the literary pains which Professor Hearn has been at to substantiate theories hitherto rather guessed at than logically proved, raise the work to a higher standard of merit and usefulness than is reached by many a book more full of vague, though original conjectures. The treatise may be described as a generalisation of the position first taken up in Germany, and afterwards occupied in its relation to the history of Roman and Indian Law in this country, by Sir H. S. Maine, that the progress of Aryan Societies is denoted by the gradual substitution of individual liberty for the corporate unity of the family and the clan, of individual ownership for a community of property in land, and finally of the paramount state for the separate and dislocated system of clanship. The proof of these propositions is brought down by Professor Hearn to very recent times, and the author notices that the success of Christianity may have been largely due to the fact that it incorporated at an early stage the Roman Law of the Empire which gave it the centralising force needed to overcome the centrifugal tendencies of paganism.

A Protestant clergyman's little work on Heredity³⁵ points to a lurking social danger, perhaps somewhat exaggerated by him, owing to the operation of natural selection at present in mating the more thrifty, but less well-developed, physical manhood with the less well-favoured women who are not selected for domestic service.

Mr. Matthew Arnold has republished a series of Essays³⁶ which appeared some time ago, and some of the more important of which exhibit the strong and, we are inclined to think, the transitory influence of impressions derived from his well-known visit of inspection to Continental Schools. In his Essays on "Democracy," on "Equality" and on "Irish Catholicism and English Liberalism," Mr. Arnold incidentally shows that his political and social *bête noir* is the British middle class. He objects to their individualism, and repugnance to accept "the alliance of the State for their own elevation;" he objects to their Puritan inclinations; and he objects to their general want of education, especially in the sort of Middle Class Schools which Mr. Arnold is ready to provide them with. The deep-rooted vice which infects the whole of this reasoning is that Mr. Arnold propounds all sorts of reconstructive measures not in pursuit of solid political well-being, nor of a healthier public morality in all classes, but simply in order to dispel a few fleeting and superficial odours which are offensive in the nostrils of Mr. Matthew Arnold himself, and the half-dozen or so persons who constitute his school of thought.

Mr. Sullivan, M.P., is a far more bracing, not to say drastic, politician than Mr. Matthew Arnold; and he describes the Social and Political Movements in Ireland during the last half-century with the

³⁵ "Heredity." By a Protestant Clergyman. London: Remington & Co. 1878.

³⁶ "Mixed Essays." By Matthew Arnold. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1879.

enthusiasm of a patriot, and the zeal of an honest and eager partisan.³⁷ On the whole Mr. Sullivan takes a sanguine view of the effect of recent legislation. He says, "the painfully sharp distinctions and classifications of old times have softened down; and the different social classes and religious denominations no longer resemble so many warring tribes encamped upon the land."

We have received the Report of the Minister of Public Instruction of Victoria for the year 1877-8.³⁸ The work is almost a miracle of detailed classification and minute supervision. It may be compared with the Report which has reached us of the Public, High, Normal, and Model Schools of the Province of Ontario for the year 1877.³⁹ The English Colonies are certainly far in advance of the mother country in respect of exhaustive educational statistics and the centralised management of education.

The Report presented by the Italian Minister of Finance⁴⁰ to the Chamber of Deputies on what in England would be called Joint Stock Companies and Banks will be read with interest by those who are following closely, or who ought to follow closely, the inquiries already inaugurated by the House of Commons with the view of passing a measure, such as has been already hinted at by the Government, for reforming and consolidating the innumerable and incongruous statutes by which the existing English Law on Banking and Public Companies is determined.

We have also been furnished with the three volumes of the Second Series of the Italian Annual Statistics supplied by the Minister of Agriculture, Industry, and Commerce.⁴¹ The second volume contains a comprehensive report of all the statistical materials from foreign countries which were laid before the Department.

³⁷ "New Ireland." By A. M. Sullivan. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, & Rivington. 1878.

³⁸ "Report of Education in Victoria, for 1877-8." John Ferres, Government Printer, Melbourne. 1878.

³⁹ "Annual Report of Education in Ontario, for 1877." Toronto: Hunter, Rose & Co., 25, Wellington-street, West. 1879.

⁴⁰ "Relazione Sull' andamento del Consorzio, durante l'anno 1877." Presentata del Ministro delle Finanze. London: Trübner's. 1878.

⁴¹ "Annali di Statistica, 1878." Serie 2. Vols. I., II., and III. Roma: Eredi Botta. London: Trübner's. 1878.

SCIENCE.

MR. Moseley's notes by a naturalist on the *Challenger* were, we learn in the preface, mainly written on board ship, and sent home from time to time in the form of a journal. Coming after the various works which have been already published, there will necessarily be some appearance of repetition in a volume covering the same ground; but the character of the work is altogether different from that of Sir Wyville Thomson, and takes for its pattern Mr. Darwin's voyage of the *Beagle*, except that, as might be expected in these days, much more attention is given to the various animals which were observed. There are twenty-two chapters, each devoted to a separate geographical area; and at the end of each chapter are a few bibliographical references. A contour map of the bottom of the ocean copied from Dr. Wild's "Thalassa," a couple of plates of icebergs, and a large number of wood cuts increase the interest of the work. It is so full of facts that it would be impossible within the limited space here available to give anything like a systematic analysis of the subjects of which it treats. It gives a better idea of the natural history part of the work of the *Challenger* than anything that has been previously published, but is hardly so complete a work as might have been expected at so long an interval after the completion of the voyage. It may be that the characteristics of a journal do not allow of generalization, but one cannot help feeling that the naturalist to the *Challenger* might have been expected to discuss philosophical questions as well as the detailed facts which were open to every one to observe. It is a book that will hold an enduring place in English literature, and gives a vivid picture of the natural history of those parts of the globe which the author has visited.

A pamphlet on the Cause of Life, Structure, and Species², the author informs us, gives a concise statement of conclusions embodied in a larger work which awaits publication. In an introductory note we learn that Tyndall by including life as a mode of motion in his well-known work on heat has roused the Rev. Mr. Towne into a highly combative frame of mind. The pamphlet is in three parts, entitled (1) The Oxygen Storm and Protoplasmic Electricity; (2) The Formation and Union of Reproductive Patterns; (3) Creative Parentage, Creative Motherhood. In the first section the author tells us that he thinks he has discovered how the motions of animate life in protoplasm cells are entirely due to a form and condition of electrical force, and further adds that the initial cause of animation in proto-

¹ "Notes by a Naturalist on the *Challenger*. Being an account of various observations made during the voyage of H.M.S. *Challenger*, round the world, in the years 1872-76." By H. N. Moseley, M.A., F.R.S. London: Macmillan & Co. 1879.

² "New Biological Discoveries: the Causes of Life, Structure, and Species." By Rev. Ed. C. Towne, B.A. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co. Manchester: Tubbs & Black. 1878.

plasm cells is the beating into them of oxygen atoms with their peculiar energy in what may be called the oxygen storm. To this statement succeeds an assurance that the current idea that all our available energy is due to the sun is quite baseless. The second section elaborates similar ideas with regard to plants and animals, but here and in the third section we alike have a dominance of hypothesis instead of an investigation of scientific facts. One of the great difficulties of the author seems to be the circumstance that his knowledge of physics is very limited; and, notwithstanding liberal quotations from authorities, his acquaintance with natural history is not sufficiently practical to make his discussion of the aspects of evolution against which his efforts are directed, a profitable study. It is an illustration of the supposed antagonism of religion and science which must always exist when the religious advocate has not the training which would enable him to appreciate science.

In the latest instalment of Bronn's *Klassen und Ordnungen des Thier Reichs*, Dr. Hubrecht, of Leiden,³ continues his account of the structure of fishes—describing the gills, and their arches, the hyomandibular arch, the suspensory arch of the lower jaw, and then passes to an exposition of the vertebral column, following with some account of the unpaired fins, and the skeletal elements of the limbs which are usually known as paired fins. It is an excellent summary of the structure of Elasmobranch fishes as far as it goes, and is illustrated with three good plates of figures.

The present instalment of a *Dictionary of English Plant Names*⁴ extends as far as the letter F. It is prefaced by an Introduction, in which the authors state that they have been engaged for more than ten years in collecting the vernacular names of British plants. They purposely exclude names that have been coined by recent writers, and ignore the translations of Latin names found in botanical works. Some of the names do not appear to be capable of explanation; and the work may be considered to err rather on the side of brevity, though apparently the fullest reliable information is in each case given. The book commences with an index of scientific names of plants with the corresponding popular names, from which it will be seen that while the majority of species have but one or two names, there are a considerable number which have ten, twenty, thirty, or more vernacular equivalents. Thus the *Narcissus* is known as *Affadil*, *Affrodile*, *Asphodel*, *Averill*, *Belleblome*, *Bellflower*, *Bellrose*, *Bulrose*, *Butter and Eggs*, *Cencliffe*, *Chalice Flower*, *Churn*, *Cowslip*, *Yellow Crowbells*, *Daffadilly*, *Daffadowndilly*, *Daffodil*, *Daffodilly*, *Daffydilly*, and *Downdilly*. The index is followed by a goodly list of authorities quoted and abbreviations under which they are referred to, and then

³ "Dr. H. G. Bronn's *Klassen und Ordnungen des Thier Reichs*, Fortgesetzt." Von Dr. A. W. Hubrecht, Conservateur des Reichs, Museum zu Leiden. Leipzig und Heidelberg: C. V. Wintersche Verlagsbandlung. 1878.

⁴ "English Dialect Society, Series C. Original Glossaries, and Glossaries with fresh additions. A *Dictionary of English Plant Names*." By James Britten, F.L.S., and Robert Holland. London: Trübner & Co. 1878.

the work begins following the usual alphabetical arrangement. It is difficult to convey any idea of the amount of learning and patient research which an undertaking of this kind represents. Some names merely have their scientific equivalents with the name of the authority for the vernacular usage, and sometimes the name of the county or district in which the word may be met with, but the more important names are treated at greater length, and it often happens that several distinct plants are known by the same popular term. The meaning of words shifts with every age, and the meaning of flower names is no exception. Forget-me-not has been changed from flower to flower. The primrose was not always so called. The cowslip has been transferred from the mullein. One plant has robbed another of its name. Eglantine did not always mean a particular species of rose. Few things are so curious as this change of the names of flowers. When, too, we look at their English provincial names, we find that they are to be counted not by hundreds but by thousands. Each country supplies a goodly list. Messrs. Britten and Holland have evidently ransacked all the local glossaries. What care they have taken may be seen by the fact that when they give the north-country expression "brambles" for blackberries they are careful to add that in the north "blackberries" mean black currants, and "berries" gooseberries, and a "berry-tree" a goose-berry tree. The philological portion, too, is carefully done, though here and there we are inclined to differ from the authors. Thus, for instance, we are disposed to think that Dr. Prior's derivation of "Crazy" (*ranunculus acris*), from *oculus christi*, the mediæval name of the marigold, is far more probable than the one which they give. At all events, it ought not to have been omitted. So carefully, however, is Messrs. Britten and Holland's work done that they leave very little room for the critic to say anything. We have, however, noticed one or two trifling omissions. The Cleveland term of "black may" for the blossom of the black thorn (*prunus spinosa*) ought, perhaps, to find a place. The "bog-buttercup" and "bog-flower" of the same district, both local names for the marsh marigold (*caltha palustris*), should not be omitted. "Bottom-grass" not to be confounded with Shakspeare's "bottom-grass" in his *Venus and Adonis*, but meaning young tender grass in the spring, and "brich" a species of fungus growing on oak-trees, both of them north-country words, should, perhaps, be inserted in the new glossary. "Black-man's bread" should be added to the "Deil's oatmeal," applied in the north-east of England to Fool's parsley (*æthusa cynapium*), and to many of those plants, which in the midland counties will be called "kexes." Messrs. Britten and Holland give us no less than seventy flower names in which dog is compounded. Here is one more—"dog-weed," used in Cleveland for the common mercury (*Mercurialis perennis*). "Dog-oak," which is given, we may add is common in the midland counties for the maple, which in Cleveland is called "dog-tree." Last of all we must not forget to mention the well-known north-country cottage garden plant "Capten-ower-t'-keal-pot," a species of aconite, so called from its poisonous qualities, which certainly should take a place in this book.

Here we must stop. The work when completed promises to be one of the most important and interesting dictionaries of its kind that has ever been produced.

The eleventh volume of the *Journal of the Royal Society of New South Wales*⁵ contains a large number of original memoirs, which are chiefly geological. One of the more interesting is a paper on the Forest Vegetation of central and northern New England in connection with geological influences. The most characteristic trees belong to the genus *Eucalyptus*, of which the author has collected twenty species, and believes that many more remain to be found. The genus does not flourish in the elevated and colder regions, nor are the species found to the north or west of Murrurundi. The greater part of central New England consists of granite, which easily breaks up into a clay. Here the *Eucalyptus Amydalina* grows to a large size, with undergrowths of *Acacia* and *Banksia*. Another species of *Eucalyptus*, locally known as the Peppermint, is invariably found on granite soils, and the author finds that on these soils sheep are especially liable to the diseases called "foot rot" and "bottle." The "bottle" is contracted by the sheep from eating the *Drosera pellata*, which feeds on gnats, mosquitoes, and similar insects. As a first attempt to show the relation of plants and trees to soils in the northern part of New South Wales, we trust the memoir may lead to further research. There are interesting papers by the Rev. J. E. Tenison Woods on the Tertiary Deposits of Australia, a short account by Professor Liversedge of Chalk in the New Britain group, a paper by Mr. Dixon on a method of extracting gold and silver from iron pyrites, on a variable star on the constellation *Ara*, by Mr. Tebbutt, besides many other memoirs of interest. If a larger amount of illustration could be given, some of the papers would appear to greater effect.

The first fasciculus, issued by Professor Nicholson and Mr. Etheridge on the Silurian fossils of Ayrshire,⁶ promises to be one of the most sumptuous of palæontological works. It addresses itself exclusively to the technical scientific man, and describes the Foraminifera, Corals, and Trilobites. There are nine excellent plates of fossils and several wood-cuts, illustrating details of fossil structure. No scientific book so beautifully printed and carefully prepared has come under our notice for a long period. It is in part the result of one of the money grants from the Royal Society Fund for scientific research, and will prove of the greatest value in further stimulating investigation in an important district, and will add considerably to the knowledge of every palæontologist who may consult the monograph.

⁵ "Journal and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New Wales, 1877." Vol. xi. Edited by Prof. Liversedge. Sydney: Thomas Richards. 1878. London: Trübner & Co.

⁶ "A Monograph of the Silurian Fossils of the Girvan district in Ayrshire, with special reference to those contained in the 'Gray collection.'" By H. Alleyne Nicholson, M.D., D.S.C., F.R.S.E., Professor of Natural History in the University of St. Andrews, and Robert Etheridge, jun., F.G.S. Fasciculus I. (Rhizopoda, Artinozoa, Trilobita.) Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh. 1878.

Mr. H. B. Malet, under the title of "Beginnings,"* has issued a small volume dealing for the most part with fundamental conceptions in geology and physical geography. The book is preceded by a polemical preface, in which the reviews of one of the author's previous volumes are criticised, and then follow chapters entitled "The Age of this Earth," "Laplace," "Gruithuisen," "The Separation of the Elements," and Conclusion. The author is one of those readers of science who, from lack of imagination, is incapable of conceiving a science as a whole, or even of its methods of work. He, therefore, takes the iconoclastic hammer and batters away against certain hypotheses because he finds certain discrepancies in the writings of scientific men which have engendered doubts in his own mind as to the value of the conclusions founded on hypotheses. His first difficulty is in finding that mathematicians and geologists are not altogether agreed as to the period required for the elaboration of the earth, or the evidences on which its antiquity may be estimated. But it scarcely needed an essay to inform scientific men, or the public, that the views hitherto put forward on this subject are only tentative, and are only meant to be stepping stones for further investigation. The author clears up no difficulties, and refers to the "siliceous nucleus of our earth," "the siliceous dust of forameniferæ," and speaks of the "coral insect" as though coral were formed by an animal with six legs and thirteen segments in its body! It is difficult to deal with one who criticises such great questions and yet has not mastered such elementary matters. The chapter on Laplace is a similar assault on the nebular hypothesis. It is not too much to say that in this chapter the author shows himself incapable of comprehending the nature of gravitation, and on this innate inability to understand the fundamental conception which he is dealing with rests the futility of his attack. As in the previous chapter we are only permitted to reason about observed facts, and of these the author has but a limited supply accessible. Next follows a similar attack on the cosmogeny of Gruithuisen, only with the object of showing that the views which he discusses are no more capable of explaining the formation of the earth by the accretion of cold matter than the views of Laplace were when dealing with heated matter. Though the next chapter is called the Separation of the Elements, a good deal of it is occupied with a discussion in a varied form of several questions which had incidentally been referred to in the earlier part of the book, for the author's notions of elements are rather the ancient four, than those of modern science. The conclusion is an epilogue in verse in which the Creator, Vapour, and Light express themselves to the author's satisfaction concerning the origin of the earth. The book is the produce of an unscientific habit of seeking knowledge at second hand, or from popular sources in which it may be found, not with a view of comprehending, or elaborating, but only in the hope that science may out of these materials be discredited. But the antagonism

* "The Beginnings." By the author of "New Pages of Natural History," "The Interior of the Earth." Trübner & Co. London, 1878.

of the author and his genius to science will be no more harmful than the "cry of the thousand choughs assailing the old rock of granite."

Professor Thurston's *History of the Steam Engine*⁸ is an excellent addition to the volumes forming the International Scientific series. Founded upon lectures addressed to a mixed audience it is essentially popular, and includes a good deal of interesting biographical matter. The work is copiously illustrated so as to exhibit the successive stages of improvement of the various kinds of engine out of which the present types have been evolved. The work is divided into eight chapters, the first treats of the speculations found in the earlier writers from Hero to Worcester, and the earlier efforts to apply steam practically by Worcester, Papin, and Savory. The second chapter treats of the modern steam engine, as developed by Newcomen, Beighton and Smeaton, while the third deals with the work of James Watt and his contemporaries. This brings the history down to the beginning of the present century, and the fourth, fifth, and sixth chapters are devoted to the use of steam on railroads, for ship propulsion, and the improvements made in the last quarter of a century. The last two chapters treat of the philosophy of the steam engine, and give a history of the growth of theoretical ideas and their application. The work is clearly written, full of details of the greatest interest, and fills a space on the borderland of literature and science, which will make it accessible to a large number of readers who wish to be placed in possession of professional engineers' views concerning the steam engine.

The little volume of experiments in Sound,⁹ issued in the Nature series by Mr. Mayer, is an endeavour to render the study of sound practical in elementary schools, by showing how apparatus at a small cost can be constructed and used. The book is divided into nineteen short chapters, the second of which gives a summary of the contents. The fourth chapter treats of vibratory motions, as shown by the pendulum and similar means. Then follow experiments with a tuning fork and other substances, to illustrate the origin of sound in vibration. The fifth chapter concerns the transmission of sonorous vibrations, and the seventh the velocity and mode of their movements; then succeed the interference of sonorous vibrations, the reflection of sound, the pitch of sound, formation of the gamut, experiments with the sonometer, the intensities of sound, co-vibration, changes in pitch and many other subjects, in which in all one hundred and thirty experiments are to be made. The style of the book is very clear, and the experiments interesting. It cannot fail to have an important educational influence.

Under the title of a *Manual of Practical Chemistry*¹⁰ Mr. Blyth

⁸ "A History of the Growth of the Steam Engine." By Robert H. Thurston, A.M., C.E. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1878.

⁹ "Sound Series of Simple, Entertaining, and Inexpensive Experiments in the Phenomena of Sound, for the Use of Students of every Age." By Alfred M. Mayer, with illustrations. Macmillan & Co. London: 1879.

¹⁰ "A Manual of Practical Chemistry. The Analysis of Food and the Detection of Poisons." By Alexander Wynter Blyth, M.R.C.S., F.C.S. London. Ch. Griffin & Co., 1879.

has produced a work of great interest devoted in about equal portions to the adulteration of food and the detection of poisons. Though primarily addressed to the various classes who are professionally interested in these subjects, the work is full of interest, and treats of matters which command general attention. The subjects explained in the first division of the volume are sugar and starch, flour and bread, milk, butter and cheese; tea, coffee and cocoa, alcohol and alcoholic liquids, vinegar, mustard, pepper, and a few condiments and flavourings. The method of treatment appears to us to be excellent. The relative advantages of different methods of analysis are given, and occasional legal cases concerning adulteration and the influence of the food on health. At the end of each article is a somewhat copious bibliography. The second part discusses poisons from a somewhat similar point of view, especially dealing with their detection and the various effects of doses on men and animals. The poisons are grouped according to the methods used for their detection. The list commences with hydrocyanic acid, chloroform and phosphorus, and then deals with alkaloids, such as opium, nux vomica, tobacco, aconite, ergot of rye, digitalis, &c. The chief animal poison noticed is cantharides. The inorganic poisons discussed are the usual ones, arsenic, antimony, cadmium, lead, copper, bismuth, silver, mercury, zinc, and barium. The volume is illustrated with about twenty figures of apparatus and microscopic appearances of foods and substances used in their adulteration. The work has been carefully prepared, and gives just that amount of information which those able to appreciate it will usually desire.

After all that has been written and preached, perhaps nothing will have so great an influence in the reformation of our sanitary conditions as this capital book by Mr. Teale.¹ Mr. Teale, like other surgeons and physicians, found how mischievously the common air of ordinary dwellings affected his patients, and the causes of this were neither obscure nor far to seek. They were such as sanitary reformers had pointed out and declaimed against for years, and had almost become weary of reiterating. Mr. Teale has, however, hit upon another way of arousing the public to a sense of the invisible poison which surrounds us all. In a series of happily conceived plates, each one so arranged as to give expression to a single defect, he has appealed to the eye of the reader, and in these diagrams the most careless must be startled by the snider fire of vicious looking little arrows, which spring from floors and skirtings and jump down our throats, fly up our nostrils, pierce our meat, wriggle in our milk and butter, dissolve in our drinking water, and all take their origin at some weak place in the drainage of the house. The recklessness and stupidity of the architect and workman who are responsible for many of these defects are well satirized, and the truthfulness of the whole is upon the face of it.

¹ "Dangers to Health in our Houses." By T. Pridgin Teale, M.A., &c. Churchill. 1879.



We sincerely hope that this little work will have a large sale, for with it in his hand, every householder may test his own security and that of his family; and the cost is surprisingly small, considering the profusion of the illustrations, and the finish of the little volume.

Messrs. Hardwick and Bogue have sent to us a number of shilling primers or hand-books on Health¹² subjects, written by eminent physicians and men of science. Those in our hands deal with "The House," "Alcohol," "Premature Death," "Exercise and Training;" "Personal Appearances" and "Baths and Bathing," and they seek to deal with these important subjects in a simple and popular way. Like all books in a series by different hands they must vary in merit, but it seems to us that these primers are on the whole very fairly done, and will meet a general want. Perhaps in time the public will learn that the security of health is of as much importance as the security of property.

Dr. Bucknill's¹³ criticism of the cruder notions of those who seek to restrain drunkards by forcible seclusion was well-timed and has done a great deal of good. The manly force of his arguments and his no less forcible testing of alleged facts have naturally aroused much antagonism in those whose confusion of purpose and ready credulity have been exposed. It is a most dangerous thing that a handful of well-meaning, but far from able men should have any chance of putting legal sanctions in force against social sins or of suspending the liberty of the subject on inadequate grounds. That no legislation is needed for the diminution of drunkenness, nor that under certain circumstances the liberty of drunkards might be curtailed, is denied by Dr. Bucknill, but he does irresistibly contend that curtailments of individual liberty must be based not upon philanthropic intentions, but upon the strictest investigation of facts. He shows without difficulty that the working of "inebriate asylums" has really never been duly tested at all, and indeed that so far as he could personally test them they have been anything but successful, and he shows with equal ease that those who talk lightly of defining a drunkard or of distinguishing classes of drunkards from classes of lunatics have scarcely begun to think on the matter at all. Dr. Bucknill has received from those most interested in these questions but scurvy gratitude, but he is no doubt aware that his arguments must have great weight with thoughtful people not partisans, and must count for much in any future discussions in the Legislature.

Dr. Bennet's book¹⁴ and Dr. Bennet's practical labours in the field of consumptive disease of the lungs are too well known and appreciated to require any long notice at our hands. The present edition, however, contains a good deal of new matter which does not seem to us to be at all equal to the old. To Dr. Bennet we owe not only much teaching on his special subject—teaching vividly pointed by his own experi-

¹² "Health Primers." London: Hardwick and Bogue. 1878.

¹³ "Habitual Drunkenness." By Dr. Bucknill, F.R.S. London: Macmillan. 1878.

¹⁴ "On Pulmonary Consumption." By J. H. Bennet, M.D., Third Edit. London. 1878.

ence—but also we owe to him a gift even yet more valuable, the medical enthusiasm required to make us realise and work upon the belief that phthisis is often curable and cured. Dr. Bennet's teaching had so far entered into the mind of the present generation that we are not sure that a republication of a treatise necessarily a little behind the present day was desirable, while, on the other hand, the new parts of the book seem to us distinctly unworthy of the author. A great many pages are given to descriptions of Swiss resorts almost as well known to the public as Taplow or Grasner, and the descriptions are founded upon visits so hasty and observations so crude as to be positively inferior to those to be found in a good guide-book such as that of Mr. Ball. Of the great drawbacks of the climate of the Riviera we could scarcely expect Dr. Bennet to say much, and he would have done wisely to forbear all reference to the mountain curse until he had studied the facts which are at his command. But we owe too much to Dr. Bennet in years gone by to carp at him in the present.

It may be "twenty years since any English work has appeared on the subject of Diphtheria,"¹⁵ if by work we mean a separate volume, but the articles in Reynolds's system and Ziemssen's Cyclopædia are surely "works" in the practical sense of the word. At the same time we do not deny that Dr. Mackenzie has hit upon a want and has fairly supplied it, for it may be useful to the profession to have a separate handy volume to turn to when they have to deal with this awful disease. The little book seems to us to contain a fairly good *résumé* of our knowledge of the subject, and perhaps scarcely professes to add anything to our knowledge. The treatment prescribed is that which has been universally adopted for the present on the strength of Dr. Oertel's experience. It has yet to be tested by time and farther investigation. That points of importance should be omitted in a first edition is scarcely a matter for surprise; several omissions occur to us, and none more serious than the lack of any description of the fearfully sudden death from syncope not uncommon in the convalescence from diphtheria, and of the precautions to be taken against the chance of such a calamity.

The papers by Dr. Woakes¹⁶ on the above subjects, published recently in the medical journals, must have attracted the attention of careful readers, and we are more than glad to receive them from the publisher in a connected form. We presume that Dr. Woakes has recast his essays; for the present little book shows no trace of being a hasty collection of fugitive papers, but possesses a unity and a due proportion of parts which mark a complete treatise. No class of affections are more wearisome to the patient or more disheartening to the physician than vertigo and tinnitus, and we have no hesitation in saying that these affections are better described, explained, and prescribed for in these pages, than in any other book which we have seen. Dr. Woakes writes not as a mere aurist, but as an intelligent

¹⁵ "Diphtheria." By Morell Mackenzie, M.D. Churchill, 1879.

¹⁶ "On Deafness, Giddiness, and Noises in the Head." By E. Woakes, M.D. London. Lewis. 1879.

physiologist, pathologist, and physician; hence, although we know little of ear diseases as a speciality, we feel confidence even in the author's treatment of his speciality, for the chapters we can appreciate seem to us to be well conceived and well finished. For instance, Dr. Woakes instead of seeing ear disease in many, or most, cases of vertigo and tinnitus, points out that "Nature has in the labyrinth created a signal-box in which a note of warning might be sounded," by much abused or enfeebled viscera elsewhere. The cases described by Dr. Woakes are as full of interest to the physiologist as to the clinician, and we think that Dr. Woakes deserves our thanks, not only for putting forth our realised knowledge in a convenient and clear method, but also for distinctly advancing our knowledge and our means of relief.

This little volume¹⁷ consists of an address delivered on Harvey, at the opening of the session of the Jefferson Medical College. It is very pleasant to us in reading this essay to feel that the eminent American physician not merely recognises Harvey as his own ancestor, but speaks throughout as if there were no breach of continuity between the English and American schools of medicine. Nor indeed is there. The writings of Da Costa and his distinguished colleagues flourish in England as freely as those of Paget and Jenner flourish in America, and with no sense of strangeness on either side. The Americans have as much right to their pride of Harvey as we have in England, and they are worthy of him both in their scientific labours, and in the literary culture which enables them to adorn their art with occasional profusions as elegant and as learned as the present.

We scarcely know how to deal with this book:¹⁸ fortunately we have not the space to review it. If, in trying to deal briefly with it, we call it a clever book the author may be angry with us, and not unjustly angry, for it is something more than clever. Something more, because the author is not flippant or smart; he really means what he says, and he has an ideal—a high ideal. Moreover, there is much in these pages one may read with sympathy and with profit, however vexed one may be by the rest of them. For it seems to us a fine intelligence is ineffective for lack of seeing anything from any point of view but its own. The author scourges the supposed opinions of most of the able men of the day, but the misfortune is these able men do not hold such opinions as Mr. Strickland Constable puts into their mouths. They would have no difficulty in proving that Mr. Constable has attacked them on partial statements and not upon a careful survey of their full meaning. Hence, so far as this book is controversial, it must fail to convince.

¹⁷ "Harvey and his Discovery." By J. M. Da Costa, M.D. Lippincott. 1879.

¹⁸ "Fashions of the Day in Medicine and Science." By H. S. Constable. Hull & Co. 1879.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

MR. M'CARTHY, in attempting a record of the period beginning with the accession of our present sovereign,¹ has undertaken a task of no common difficulty. It requires a very large mental grasp and the utmost delicacy of judgment to discuss the character and acts of men who are still living, and to comprehend transactions which are still, so to speak, incomplete. To judge by the two volumes now before us the author is executing his task with success. These are to form one half of the complete work, and they carry the history down to the Treaty of Paris in 1856. The work opens abruptly with the death of King William IV., and with a pleasant narrative of the proclamation of his girl successor. A sketch of the state of parties then follows, in which due importance is given to the position of Lord Durham, a man who, owing to his early death, is generally less known than his character merited. The first social events treated of are the introduction of penny postage and the development of steam on sea and land; and the famous "Bed-chamber Question" affords the first important political incident of the reign. It is amusing to read to-day of the extraordinary utterances which public men allowed themselves on this and other topics forty years ago. Feargus O'Connor

"boldly declared that he had excellent authority for the statement that if the Tories had got the young Queen into their hands by the agency of the new ladies of the bed-chamber, they had a plan for putting her out of the way and placing the bloody Cumberland on the throne in her stead."

Who of the younger generation would believe how, in days long anterior to his retirement to the stately gloom of the Upper House, Lord Beaconsfield lavished strong words? In his controversy with O'Connell, the latter

"denounced him as a 'miscreant,' as a 'wretch,' a 'liar,' 'whose life is a living lie;' and finally as the 'heir-at-law of the blasphemous thief who died impenitent on the cross.' Mr. Disraeli begins his reply by describing himself as one of those who 'will not be insulted even by a yahoo without chastising it;' and afterwards, in a letter to one of Mr. O'Connell's sons, declares his desire to express 'the utter scorn in which I hold his [Mr. O'Connell's] character, and the disgust with which his conduct inspires me;' and informs the son that 'I shall take every opportunity of holding your father's name up to public contempt, and I fervently pray that you or some one of your blood may attempt to avenge the inextinguishable hatred with which I shall pursue his existence.'"

It is worthy of notice that increased freedom of the press has not in any way increased the license of the press since the earlier part of the century. Young Republicans are wont to point with pride, and their young opponents with loathing, to the scandalous or abusive passages about high persons which are occasionally to be found in obscure or vulgar publications; and both parties are apt to dilate upon the

¹ "A History of Our Own Times, from the Accession of Queen Victoria to the Berlin Congress." By Justin M'CCarthy. Four vols. London: Chatto & Windus

growing freedom or license (as they respectively regard it) of the times. Any one, however, who will take the trouble to examine the caricatures, the squibs, and certain portions of the high-priced press of the first four decades of the century, will find that the extremest utterances of the Republican papers and the dirty insinuations that are occasionally interspersed in the slaving of the "society" journals are to their predecessors as water unto wine. The Queen's marriage serves Mr. M'Carthy as a peg on which to hang a very appreciative chapter on the Prince Consort. The first Chinese war is briefly described; the Cabul disasters, on the other hand, receive worthy and opportune treatment. O'Connell's extravagances, the contest of Free Trade and conquest of Peel, a severe sketch of Mr. Disraeli's rise, the distresses of 1846-7, the miserable "Spanish marriages," fill up the remainder of the volume. The second volume is devoted almost exclusively to the Crimean War and to Lord Palmerston, whom it treats with somewhat less admiration than his name generally commands, though still with respect. The war is narrated in a rapid and facile, but nevertheless discriminating manner. A chapter on the literature of the early Victorian period closes the volume. We are on the whole well pleased with this, especially with the few pages devoted to the development of our contemporary, *Punch*. Mr. Carlyle the author seems to us to treat with less than due respect. Mr. M'Carthy's work is undoubtedly good. He belongs to that new school of history, represented by Mr. J. R. Green, which paints with a large and free brush with the endeavour to give a broad and justly proportioned idea of the whole, and scorns detail; and his work would be of as little value as a book of reference as the "History of the English People" itself. Any of his chapters would make an excellent popular lecture. He undoubtedly shows his healthy Liberal sympathies, but he has escaped the charge of bias in a way which is remarkable in a man writing of contemporary matters. And in no part of his work has he been more judicious than in his excellent chapters on Irish affairs in 1843 and 1848.

Mr. S Hubert Burke publishes the first of three proposed volumes of "Historical Portraits of the Tudor Dynasty."² We cannot assign any great value to the portion that we have received, which consists merely of a series of disconnected chapters of the history of the reign of Henry VIII., written in an unattractive gossiping style, and displaying little research. Mr. Burke tells us that

"in the course of some erudite and thoughtful observations I was specially moved by the remarks of a learned and accomplished High Church lady who averred her strong objection to the past and existent mode of imparting historical knowledge."

It is not clear whether it was Mr. Burke, or the High Church lady (we thank him for that phrase) who was both learned and accomplished, that made the erudite and thoughtful observations. Grammar would

² "Historical Portraits of the Tudor Dynasty and the Reformation Period." By S. Herbert Burke, Author of "The Men and Women of the Reformation." Vol. I. London: John Hodges.

assign them to Mr. Burke, while Modesty prefers to think that the lovely and accomplished representative of Catholicism uttered them. However this may be, if it was the High Church lady who inspired Mr. Burke to write this book with a view of "making history interesting," and he has any other demands on his time, we think the lady incurred a grave responsibility; for he has produced only a feeble specimen of magazine padding.

Dr. McDonnell tells us that he is in his eighty-third year, is an Irish Protestant and Whig; that he has never failed to promote the cause of equal justice to his Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, and that he sees the true interest of Ireland in a firm and affectionate union with England and Scotland. Being such, he has felt himself bound to produce a book on the Ulster Civil War,³ in order to demolish Mr. Froude's mischievous production, "The English in Ireland." Like most books of controversy, it is lively and readable, but not very convincing. It is generally not difficult to lessen materially the numbers in Irish narratives of massacre; and Dr. McDonnell undoubtedly shows that the estimates of the Protestants massacred by the Roman Catholic rebels in Ulster are ludicrously overstated both by Sir John Temple and Lord Clarendon. A large part of the book is devoted to the exploits of the Irish who served under an ancestor of Dr. McDonnell in Montrose's campaign. The author concludes a not very important book with some sensible remarks on the hopelessness of a separation of Ireland from Great Britain.

Mr. Philip Smith edits a translation of Brugsch-Bey's "History of Egypt under the Pharaohs,"⁴ which was left almost complete by the late H. Danby Seymour. Brugsch-Bey published the first part of this work in French some twenty years ago. The period that has since elapsed has brought to light immense stores of knowledge; and he found it advisable to publish a greatly enlarged edition of his work, in his native German tongue, three years ago. It is a translation of this newer work which is now before us. It is obviously impossible in the space and time allowed to us to do much more than note the appearance of so important a work. Perhaps the chief proposition which it lays down is the statement that the remotest Pharaohs of Memphis must, with the present evidence, be accepted as undoubted historical personages; and the author gives a list, for which he claims full authority, of no less than seventy-six sovereigns before Ramses II. in the fourteenth century before Christ. There is no lack of maps, illustrative tables, pedigrees, and translations to support these statements. The professor of a science which is studied by very few, has the advantage of being, to some extent, able to say what he likes; he suffers, however, at the same time from a corresponding disadvantage: his theories

³ "The Ulster Civil War of 1641, and its Consequences; with the History of the Irish Brigade under Montrose, in 1644-46." By John McDonnell, M.D. Dublin: Gill & Son.

⁴ "A History of Egypt under the Pharaohs, derived entirely from the Monuments." By Henry Brugsch-Bey. Translated from the German by the late Henry Danby Seymour, F.R.G.S. Compiled and edited by Philip Smith, B.A. Two vols. London: John Murray.

are liable to be completely upset by his next successor. It is not at all probable that such a fate will strike a man who has made such a long and thorough examination of the Egyptian monuments, under such singularly favourable circumstances; but Brugsch-Bey's book can hardly be placed in its right rank until another Egyptologist of equal eminence has followed him; and this is likely not to come to pass for many years. It is admirably arranged, and bears every sign of being worthy of the author's reputation. To the work is appended a lecture on the Exodus and the Egyptian monuments, which the author delivered before the International Congress of Orientalists, in London, in 1874. This lecture proves and confirms every detail of the Exodus, and accounts for the passage of the Red Sea in so clear and convincing a manner that we become suspicious, and wish it had not been appended to a purely historical work.

The fifth edition of the second volume of Duncker's *History of Antiquity*⁵ has been published. It contains the third and fourth books of the work. The former treats of the foundation of the Assyrian power, and the states and towns of the Syrians, including the history of Israel. The fifth book describes Assyria at her height of power, and the revival of Egypt and Babylon. We need say little of a book which has obtained so extraordinary a success. It is marked by the same clear breadth of view and by the same interest which the first volume showed.

Miss Lang sends us a translation of M. Rambaud's "*Histoire de la Russie*,"⁶ which we are disposed to rate as a poor book. The first part, which is in great part ethnographical, is perhaps fairly good; but when the author comes to deal with the history of modern Russia, he is painfully insufficient. He seems scarcely to know that the private character of Catherine II. was in any way remarkable. The assassination of Paul receives no further mention than this:—

"An event still more extraordinary broke up the coalition, the death of the Emperor Paul in the night of the 23rd-24th of March, 1801. . . . England could not help being satisfied by the simultaneous news of the destruction of the Danish fleet and the terrible death of the Tsar."

In like manner the conduct of Alexander I. with Napoleon, and of Nicholas with reference to the Anglo-French War, is told in a flavourless manner that seems designed only to avoid offence in Russia.

Colonel Malleon's "*History of Afghanistan*"⁷ is a book at which we look somewhat suspiciously, owing to the extreme opportuneness of its publication. The author, however, disarms us in part by referring to a statement published by him in 1875, in which he announced that

⁵ "*Geschichte des Alterthums.*" Von Max Duncker. 2ter Band. 5te verbesserte Auflage. Leipzig: Duncker and Humblot. London: Trübner & Co.

⁶ "*The History of Russia from the Earliest Times to 1877.*" By Alfred Rambaud, Professeur à la Faculté des Lettres à Nancy; Membre Correspondant de l'Académie des Sciences de Saint Petersburg. Translated by Leonora B. Lang. Two vols. London: Sampson Low & Co.

⁷ "*History of Afghanistan, from the Earliest Period to the Outbreak of the War of 1878.*" By Colonel G. B. Malleon, C.S.I. London: Allen & Co.

the history of Afghanistan would possibly engage his attention at a future period. In view of that probability he had collected notes; and these form the chief sources of the present volume, which he owns having written more hurriedly than he could have wished. About three-quarters of the book are devoted to the geography and early history of the country. The remainder treats of the events from the last British invasion in 1859 to the present war. Colonel Malleon has a most wholesome distrust of Russian intrigue on our Asiatic frontier, and warmly supports the policy of the present Government. He writes with a graphic pen, and his book will be much used and quoted for months to come.

The United States Congress, by a resolution, recommended that the Centennial Anniversary of Independence should be marked in every town by the delivery of an address on the history of the place. At San Francisco such a lecture was deemed insufficient, and Mr. Hittell was deputed to write a History of the City^s of some hundreds of pages. This book now lies before us. California was discovered, it appears, by the Spaniards in 1542, and received its name from an imaginary land in an obscure romance. Drake seems to have visited it in 1579; and the author thinks that the Spaniards, who speak of a bay of San Francisco shortly after his voyage, named it after him. Before believing this possible, we should like to satisfy ourselves that the name of San Francisco, as applied to any part of California, is to be found before the settlement there of the Franciscan monks from Mexico in the middle of the last century. These missions governed the Indians and administered the district until 1813, when the Mexican Government announced that they would be secularised. Nothing, however, was done until five-and-twenty years later, when all the pure Indians had disappeared, and there was little left to secularise. The Mexican Government made the first grant of land to a private citizen in 1835. An Englishman, named Richardson, who came there in 1835, and an American named Leese, in 1836, appear to have been the earliest settlers on the site of the present city. The admirable nature of the soil of California soon began to be commented on by American travellers, and it became clear that in the event of a war with Mexico it would be a great step for the United States to seize the province. When that war did break out, the United States fleet in the Pacific occupied Monterey and San Francisco; and the treaty of 1848 gave California over into the power of the States, with a population of some thirteen thousand. In January of that year an American, J. W. Marshal, discovered gold. Such a fact quickly spread, and within six months a quarter of a million of dollars' worth of the precious metal had been sent to San Francisco. In 1849 the population of the city jumped to fifteen thousand; in the harbour were seen four hundred vessels deserted by the sailors; and the citizens voted themselves a State constitution. Next year their representatives were

^s "A History of the City of San Francisco, and incidentally of the State of California." By John S. Hittell, Historian of the Society of California Pioneers, &c. &c. San Francisco: A. L. Bancroft & Co.

received at Washington, and California became the thirty-first State in the Union. The years 1851-2 were famous for the activity of the Vigilance Committees, which were formed to carry out by popular process that war against robbery and murder which the police failed to wage. Commercial frauds and panic marked the year 1854. The next year but one saw the revival and final extinction of the Vigilance Committee. In 1860 the population of the State had risen to nearly four hundred thousand, that of San Francisco being some fifty-seven thousand. For several years previously the yield of gold had diminished; on the other hand, silver was being raised in enormous quantities, and its supply at the present day dwarfs the yield of the yellow metal. It need hardly be said that California chose the winning side in the War of Secession, and that her career has been one of extraordinary increase in prosperity ever since. The population of the capital city is now some four hundred thousand. Silver and wheat have become her principal exports. Mr. Hittell's book is not particularly well written, but it narrates in a straightforward manner one of the most extraordinary stories in the history of the world.

We recently had to speak very favourably of an edition of Goethe's "Egmont," published with English notes by Dr. Buchheim.⁹ The same distinguished editor has now brought out an admirable companion volume, containing Schiller's "Life and Death of Count L. von Egmont," and his "Siege of Antwerp." The latter of these pieces and part of the former are usually printed as appendices to the "Revolt of the Netherlands." It is, however, remarkable that the whole of the paper on Egmont (Schiller's only biography) is printed in only one edition (Goedeke's) of the poet's collected works. There is a fitness in its appearing in connection with Goethe's play, for Schiller himself says in his preface:—

"Das Andenken des durch die Schlachten bei St. Quentin und Gravelingen, und durch sein unglückliches Ende in der niederländischen Geschichte so merkwürdigen Grafen von Egmont. . . . ist durch das Trauerspiel dieses Namens neuerdings weider aufgefrischt worden."

There is a further fitness in placing side by side the prose and verse treatment of the same historical subject, and still more in so placing works on the same subject by the two illustrious rival-friends; and few better selections could be made for a fairly advanced student of German than these two volumes. Dr. Buchheim has greatly helped the full understanding of them by historical analysis, and by a liberal supply of excellent notes. We may remark that the text is printed in Roman type.

In Mr. Adams's "*Wykehamica*"¹⁰ we find one of those pleasant, gossiping books about his old school which every public school man

⁹ Schiller's "Egmont's Leben und Tod: die Belagerung von Antwerpen." Edited, with English notes, &c., by C. A. Buchheim, Ph.D., F.C.P., Professor of the German Language and Literature in King's College, Examiner to the University of London. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

¹⁰ "*Wykehamica*. A History of Winchester College and Commoners, from the Foundation to the Present Day." By the Rev. H. C. Adams, M.A., late Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, &c. &c. Oxford: Parker & Co.

loves to read, if he has not time to write. It is not very well arranged, and has little to say on the present state of the school; but it is full of interesting talk about the ways of the venerable foundation in days that are gone. Every Wykehamist will read it with eagerness, and non-Wykehamists will wile away several pleasant hours with it. We note a strong undercurrent of discontent with "Tom Brown at Rugby" for claiming for Arnold the invention of a decent and pious life at a public school. We think Mr. Adams might have been satisfied with the glory reflected by Arnold on his own old school.

It was our pleasant task two or three years ago to notice with warm praise Karl von Gebler's biography of Galileo. Mrs. George Sturge has just produced a translation¹¹ of that excellent work which seems in every respect a worthy representation of the original. We notice with regret the early death of Karl von Gebler shortly before this publication appeared.

Southey's "Life of Nelson"¹² has been edited as a school-book by Mr. Mullins, of Marlborough College. It contains very few notes, and, indeed, requires none. It is printed in type which is far too small; and, as we remember a prettier edition of about the same size in our boyhood, we fail to see a good reason for Mr. Mullins's exertions.

Captain L. J. Trotter complains that the memory of Warren Hastings¹³ has been loaded by several writers with undeserved obloquy. This is to some extent true; but we are bound to express our surprise when we find him name Macaulay among those who have unjustly reviled the great Proconsul. That illustrious man was certainly not faultless, and it has always seemed to us that Macaulay went as far as he justly could in emphasising his great qualities and great acts in extenuation of obvious wrongs. Captain Trotter's "Biography," as it seems to us, does not attempt to contradict any of Macaulay's assertions, and he appears to agree with the conclusions of the latter, when he remarks, with reference to the unjust Kohilla War, that Hastings "dealt with the case before him as a statesman rather than a moralist." Seeing that the views of the two authors are so much alike, bearing in mind Macaulay's superior style, we give the earlier writer the preference.

Mr. Hamilton's book about the Poets Laureate¹⁴ is a collection of somewhat scanty chapters on the holders of that office from Ben Jonson down to our own times. It shows us that of the thirteen

¹¹ "Galileo Galilei and the Roman Curia. From Authentic Sources." By Karl von Gebler. Translated, with the sanction of the author, by Mrs. George Sturge. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co.

¹² "The Life of Nelson." By Robert Southey, Esq., LL.D., Poet Laureate, &c. &c. Edited by W. E. Mullins, M.A., Assistant Master at Marlborough College. London: Rivingtons.

¹³ "Warren Hastings: a Biography." By Captain Lionel James Trotter, Bengal Half-pay, Author of a "History of India," &c. London: Allen & Co.

¹⁴ "The Poets Laureate of England." By Walter Hamilton, Fellow of the Royal Geographical and Historical Societies, &c. &c. London: Elliot Stock.

poets laureate since Jonson there have been scarcely three that we should style poets at all.

The series of Foreign Classics for English Readers, edited by Mrs. Oliphant, bids fair to attain as high a degree of success as the companion series of Ancient Classics recently published under the editorship of Mr. Lucas Collins. We recently had to speak favourably of General Hamley's "Voltaire;" and we have now before us an excellent little volume on Molière,¹⁵ the joint work of Mrs. Oliphant and Mr. Tarver. It gives a very bright and sufficient biography of the most comic poet since Aristophanes, with a good analysis of his plays, and a few translated extracts. The book will do much to make Molière even more popular amongst us than he is—especially since the admirable translation of Mr. H. van Laun. If we were obliged to find some fault, we would hint that it is hardly possible to say of any three of his comedies that they are the best; and, if we were to say so, we should hardly add "Le Festin de Pierre" to "Le Tartuffe," and "Le Misanthrope" to complete the trilogy.

Mr. Minto publishes in "English Men of Letters," edited by Mr. John Morley, a very good sketch of Defoe,¹⁶ a work for which there was plenty of room. Three laborious biographies of this great writer have been published within a century; but, nevertheless, there is scarcely any eminent man of letters of whom so little is generally known, although the name of none, save, perhaps, Shakspeare and Bunyan, is so often on our lips; and nine-tenths of those who have read it believe his "Journal of the Plague" to be an authentic narrative. Mr. Minto says comparatively little by way of description or summary of Defoe's writings, but he gives a very clear idea of the connection of the man and his writings with the political events of his day, and analyses the peculiar literary power of Defoe in what seems to us a very convincing manner. We warmly recommend Mr. Minto's book. We will cite one singular fact for the benefit of the careless: Defoe was fifty-eight years old when he wrote "Robinson Crusoe."

Mr. Huxley's monograph on Hume,¹⁷ in the same series with the book last noticed, is likely to have less success. People in general are indisposed to enthusiasm over matters of abstract thought. Hume cannot be said to have a school at the present day, and the number of those who swear by him is not larger than that of those who really study him. His chief claim to rank as a man of letters would be found in his "Essays" and "History." Mr. Huxley has, however, devoted himself almost exclusively to the works on *the Human Understanding*; and, criticising these with great minuteness, has produced a book which may be called controversial. He brings much learning to bear on this part of Hume's writings, and exhibits an attractive, if somewhat absolute, style; but both the subject and the mode of treating are likely to hinder a large sale of his book.

¹⁵ "Molière." By Mrs. Oliphant and F. Tarver, M.A. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons.

¹⁶ "Daniel Defoe." By William Minto. London: Macmillan & Co.

¹⁷ "Hume." By Professor Huxley. London: Macmillan & Co.

Mr. Morley's series contains also a sketch of Goldsmith and his writings¹⁸ by Mr. William Black. Goldsmith has had no lack of biographers; and amongst all who have written about him there is a fair consensus, Lord Macaulay and Thackeray having had the last words and crystallised the general conception of the man. No wonder, then, if Mr. Black has nothing very strikingly new to say. He has, however, given us a very lively and interesting sketch.

In the same series of "English Men of Letters" appears a biography of Shelley,¹⁹ by Mr. J. A. Symonds. We have, indeed, had many sketches of Shelley, but not yet a commanding life. Almost all have been written either by acquaintances who were disposed to glorify themselves in the light reflected from the poet, or by enthusiasts who can see only the most perfect poetry in every word that Shelley wrote, and in the man himself the perfect type of human excellence. We prefer the tone of Mr. Symonds's little book to that of any previous writer on Shelley. His critical outline of his poetry is admirably just, and if the biographical part of his work is, as it seems to us, not quite so just, yet it is fairer than that of any earlier writer.

Mr. P. G. Hamerton, in his biography²⁰ of Turner, has written the story of the development of the artist, rather than the life of the man. And in this he has been wise; for few human careers have been less worthy of contemplation or imitation than that of the man Turner, while any record of the steps of such a genius must be valuable. The late Walter Thornbury told us, very efficiently, as much as need be known about Turner's personal history; and for that history Mr. Hamerton refers the world to his predecessor in a manner that is chivalrous. Of his own book we can say that it is excellent, and that it is the work of a true critic. The great painter's changes of style or method are noted, and justly tracked to their causes. The influences that worked on him are developed convincingly. Mr. Hamerton writes with a thorough admiration of his subject, but does not share the wild enthusiasm of the youthful years of Mr. Ruskin. Indeed, he has more than a slight tilt with the Oxford graduate, against whom he brings one or two damaging charges of inconsistency. We should mention that the volume is adorned by nine etchings of great beauty by Mr. Brunet²¹Debaines.

¹⁸ "Goldsmith." By William Black. London: Macmillan & Co.

¹⁹ "Shelley." By John Addington Symonds. London: Macmillan & Co.

²⁰ "The Life of J. M. W. Turner, R.A." By Philip Gilbert Hamerton, Author of "Etching and Etchers," &c. &c. London: Seeley, Jackson, & Haldiday.

BELLES LETTRES.

IF a parrot were to write an opera it would probably introduce as many imitations as the author of "Saul Weir"¹ does in that remarkable novel. In the early numbers the writer appeared as an imitator of Dickens's worst style. He then made a change, and discovered poets and similes and metaphors in the manner of the late Rev. George Gilfillan. In the eighth part he assumes a fresh style, and breaks out after the manner of the author of "Spiritual Wives." We do not know which is the worst—the blank verse writer who tumbles down into prose, or the prose writer who scrambles up into blank verse. Here is a specimen of the latter from a description of a storm at sea, at the beginning of the eighth part of "Saul Weir":—

"The great expanse of heaving, spectral ridges,
The shrill flight of winds, the ghastly underplay
Of shadows only seen on dark nights, when" . . . (p. 82).

Martinus Scriblerus has given us a receipt for making a storm at sea. "Take," he says, "Eurus, Zephyr, Auster, and Boreas, and cast them together in one verse; add to these rain, lightning, and thunder the loudest that you can. Mix your clouds and billows well together till they foam, and thicken your description with a quicksand." The author of "Saul Weir" has improved upon this receipt. He has added some most wonderful moral thunder of his own, such as Martinus Scriblerus could never have contemplated. He should not, however, we think, in this sceptical age, have introduced what almost looks like a miracle. Noeba Edred, saved from the wreck, is dying of thirst in an open boat—"when a tired sea-bird fluttered above her, its wings fanned her burning brow; it alighted, and its plumage was damp with the coolness of the clouds. In its beak it bore fruit, culled from some far distant island, and it left the delicious morsel upon her breast when it winged its way onward" (p. 95). We think that there is in this passage something else besides the coolness of the clouds.

Mrs. Cudlip² writes in her old style, neither better nor worse. Her last book is essentially what may be called a "Society Novel," using the word Society in its newly-acquired sense, which it has obtained since "Society Papers" were started. We know very well what is in store for us, when in the first chapter we read that "Arch Saltoun's gaze goes hungrily after the lady who has been so zealously looking after her cattle." The lady, we need not say, is not a dairy-maid, but a woman of the highest fashion, who has been looking after her horse and her big dog.

¹ "Saul Weir." (The Cheveley Novels). Parts viii. and ix. William Blackwood and Sons: Edinburgh and London. 1879.

² "Mrs. Cardigin." A Novel. By Annie Thomas. (Mrs. Pender Cudlip.) In three volumes. London: Chapman and Hall. 1879.

The author of "Blue Roses" always writes delightfully. In her present tale³ the Scotch scenes are particularly well done. Only those who know Scotland well will be able thoroughly to appreciate their truthfulness. Dr. Fairlie is excellently done, although at one or two points of the story we confess that we have been somewhat puzzled as to what his true age is. The short description of the literary and scientific society at Edinburgh, when "young Robert" is at the University, is particularly good, and is not overdone by fine writing. We can most strongly recommend the story to all persons seeking for a sound, wholesome novel to put into the hands of young people.

"The World She Awoke In"⁴ is a fair novel, rather above than below the average. Miss Aldridge has an eye for character, and this quality puts her above the line. "The Family Sayings" are quaint enough in their way, but will hardly bear the strain which the author puts upon them. Mrs. Des Anges is one of the best drawn characters, and we thoroughly sympathise with her remarks upon the tradespeople with whom she is obliged to deal. We are introduced to "missions" of all kinds, training nurses, and literary ladies, and the reading-room of the British Museum,

"The Muses' temple and Bohemian's home."

All these things are described in a pleasant, gossiping way. The writer, too, shows no little amount of culture, as may be seen by her quotations.

"Near the Lagunas"⁵ is a capital tale for those, whether old or young, who love adventure. The narrative never flags. Incident follows incident. Some of them we should suspect were in part true. At all events they have a life-like air about them. We have a capital description of a horse-race, with all the ins-and-outs of cheating. This is soon afterwards followed by an equally good description of a scene *à monte*, at which gentlemen who wished, as the author suggestively remarks, "to inspire a little skill in the game," played. This is nearly as good as Thackeray's remark upon Rawdon Crauley's skill at billiards, "nobody liked to play with one who possessed such remarkable recuperative powers." The writer, however, of "Near the Lagunas" can do better things than describe horse-racing and gambling. He has a true eye for the picturesque. His descriptions of scenery are worthy the pages of any of our best and most observant travellers. In the first volume, at page 228, will be found a most graphic description of the onbu-tree. Whether there really is such a tree, or it is the offspring of the writer's imagination—for we suppose novelists may invent trees as well as men and women in their works—it is equally well described.

³ "Within Sound of the Sea." By the Author of "Blue Roses." London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1879.

⁴ "The World She Awoke in." By Lizzie Aldridge. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1879.

⁵ "Near the Lagunas; or, Scenes in the States of La Plata." A Novel. By the Author of "Ponce de Leon." London: Chapman & Hall. 1878.

Only the very greatest skill could have enabled Miss Collins to have triumphed over all the medical and legal difficulties in "In This World."⁶ A female doctor is, as far as we are aware, quite a new personage in fiction. This one, too, is a most decided character. When a lady tells a minor poet to write a sonnet to a sunset, and she will extract money from a publisher for it, we feel that she is equal to any of the emergencies of life. We cannot say very much for the jokes. They somehow hang fire. When a lady compares a frown on the forehead to the Greek letter *pi*, we feel that she is neither learned nor witty. She has simply strained her own forehead in vain. The English, too, is in places rather slipshod. "Devoted" is curiously used in the phrase "a manuscript book, devoted to scribbling," which occurs at the beginning of the first volume. If Miss Collins herself would write upon things she knows, and not scribble about things which she does not understand, her next novel may probably be more amusing.

"The Mysterious Rubies"⁷ is not a novel, but a collection of four very poor tales. The last is, perhaps, the best. They are all, however, disfigured by a lackadaisical style of sentiment, and a want of backbone.

The author of "The Rose Garden"⁸ always writes with culture and knowledge. We think that, as a matter of art, she has unnecessarily burdened herself in "Cartouche" in making the dog so principal a character. "Crab" in "The Two Gentlemen of Verona" only plays a very small part. The writer's descriptions of Italian scenery are done with real feeling and much taste. Her characters, too, act like human beings, and are not mere puppets. Taking it all in all, no more readable novel has appeared for some time than "Cartouche." Like "Within Sound of the Sea," we can recommend it to all mothers who are in doubt as to what to order from the circulating library for family reading.

Messrs. Strahan and Co. have sent us a novel⁹ which, as far as appearances go, is the very model of binding. At a little distance the cover might be taken for real morocco. To make it quite perfect, the leaves, however, should be cut. We deeply regret that the inside of the present novel does not correspond with the outside. In this particular case the leaves are not worth cutting, either by the binder or anybody else.

"Croomaboo"¹⁰ must be a delightful place. It is, the author tells

⁶ "In this World." A Novel. By Mabel Collins. London: Chapman & Hall. 1879.

⁷ "The Mysterious Rubies." By Alice A. Neste. London: Remington & Co. 1878.

⁸ "Cartouche." By the Author of "The Rose Garden." London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1879.

⁹ "Phœbe's Fortunes." By Mrs. Robert O'Reilly. London: Strahan & Co. 1879.

¹⁰ "The Croomaboo Mail Carrier." A Canadian Love Story. By James Thomas Jones. London: Trübner & Co. 1879.

us, the most blackguard village in Canada. It is inhabited by the lowest class of Irish and Dutch. Every other word is an oath, and every other child illegitimate. There were, however, two good men in the place, and about them the story is principally concerned. The writer has some eye for character, and no little humour, but we are doubtful whether his story will be popular in England. In Canada, we should imagine, it might be a success.

Two translations of German novels remain to be noticed. Miss Ness is indefatigable in her attempt to introduce German novels to English readers. We think that she has made a far wiser choice in "Withered Leaves"¹¹ than in her previous selections. The novel, however, which we think will have most interest for Englishmen, is Fritz Reuter's "An Old Story of My Farming Days."¹² We can most strongly recommend it.

"The Epic of Hades"¹³ fully deserves all the honours of an illustrated edition. It is without doubt one of the most popular poems of the day. Not only have professional critics praised it, but at least one statesman and one bishop has sung its praises. The reasons of its popularity lie very near the surface. Tennyson may be said to have prepared the way for its success. The blank verse, without possessing any special characteristics of its own, is sufficiently melodious to hold the ear of the reader. The thoughts, without being very original or very new, keep sufficiently above the average common-places of the day to make us always expect that the next page will contain something very good. Hope, in this case, makes good the saying of Thales—it stays with us to the end. If, however, a poem succeeds in possessing these qualities for the critical, what must it not do for the uncritical—that is, for the great mass of mankind who read poetry, not because they really care about it, but because they have learnt that it is the right thing to read it. To them "The Epic of Hades," with its pre-eminently readable blank verse, its plain and easily understood sentiments, comes like a revelation after all the flame and smoke of Swinburne, and the mystical, esoteric vagaries of Browning. "The Epic of Hades" hits the right moment for its appearance. We have already given our opinion of its merits in this REVIEW (April, 1877, pp. 589-90), and find nothing whatever now to add. The beginning and the end are the best. If we may use such an irreverent comparison, "The Epic of Hades" is like a strawberry pottle, in which you find one big strawberry at the bottom, and two or three large ones at the top, whilst all between are of an average size. Of the illustrations we cannot say much. Perhaps "Psyche and Eros" is the best.

¹¹ "Withered Leaves." By R. von Gottschall. Translated by Bertha Ne-s. London: Remington & Co. 1879.

¹² "An Old Story of My Farming Days." By Fritz Reuter. Translated by M. W. Macdonel. London: Low, Marston, Searle, & Co. 1879.

¹³ "The Epic of Hades." In Three Books. By the Author of "Songs of Two Worlds." With Seventeen Designs by G. R. Chapman. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1879.

In "Gwen"¹⁴ the author of "The Epic of Hades" has struck a very different note. Here too again, Tennyson has prepared the way for his success. It would be very easy to show the resemblances of "Gwen" to "Maud." This, however, is not the point. The writer has evidently felt the wants of the age,—a novel in verse. The attempt has been made once or twice. "Aurora Leigh" is, perhaps, the most successful venture, and, after that, Mr. Walter Smith's "Hilda," a book to which it is very difficult to do justice. It is with "Hilda" rather than with "Maud" that we should be disposed to compare "Gwen," not so much by way of likeness as of contrast. "Hilda" is, we think, decidedly the higher poem of the two, but "Gwen" is likely to be the most popular. "Hilda" goes further below the surface. If Mr. Smith will but give himself more time, will but take more trouble in the workmanship of his verse, we think that he will be able to solve the problem of the age, and give us the novel in verse, which will be the counterpart, age for age, of the Elizabethan drama. To return, however, to "Gwen." The writer is more homely than Mr. Smith. He has, therefore, set himself a more difficult task. The motto which he has chosen for "The Epic of Hades," "*difficile est proprie communia dicere*," might be far more appropriately applied to "Gwen." It would be easy to pick out many bald passages in which the writer has been beaten by the inherent difficulty of the subject. It remains to be seen whether he or Mr. Walter Smith will succeed in setting the prosaic details of modern life to poetry. That they will be set, and harmoniously set, we entertain not the slightest doubt. There is the same fault in the flow of the lyrical verse in "Gwen" which we noticed in "Hilda." "Gwen," however, is an attempt in the right direction, and the writer deserves no stinted praise for the boldness of his venture.

"Brian Boru"¹⁵ is certainly a remarkable work, and, as a first production, something more than remarkable. It would have been well, however, if the author, before he had written it, had remembered what Goethe said with regard to the English drama, that, had he been an Englishman, he would have been prevented from attempting to write a play, as the merits of Shakspeare would have weighed down his faculties. It would, of course, be foolish to compare the author of "Brian Boru" with Shakspeare, yet we do not hesitate to say that he has produced the most Shakspearian tragedy which we have had for many years. But here, strange⁸ as it may at first sound, lies the very fault of "Brian Boru." It is too Shakspearian. It too often puts us in mind of Shakspeare. We do not for a moment mean that the writer is a plagiarist. Far from this. All we mean is, that in reading "Brian Boru" we are inevitably reminded of certain scenes in "Macbeth" and "King John." It is not a similarity of thought, but a similarity of manner. The only modern work to which we can compare "Brian Boru" is Wells's "Joseph and his Brethren." "Brian

¹⁴ "Gwen." A Drama in Monologue. By the Author of "The Epic of Hades." London: C. Kegan Paul. 1879.

¹⁵ "Brian Boru." A Tragedy. By J. T. B. London: Longmans & Co., 1879.

Boru," although it lacks the brooding beauty—the Keatsian beauty, if we may so call it—of Wells's poem, possesses exactly what it lacks—vigour, fire, and movement. If any one would wish to see how different the treatment of the two authors is, let them compare Wells's description of a falcon towering in the air, and the description of the prisoned eagle in "Brian Boru." Before, however, we point out the beauties of the latter poem, let us say a few words on another point. Does the author of this most dramatic of plays really think that there is any chance of a resuscitation of the glories of the English stage? "Brian Boru" is an acting play in contradistinction to a closet play, of which so many are yearly produced. We suppose that he must do so, or he would not have spent so much time and labour on his work. We are aware that Véron, the admirable French critic, whose book on "Æsthetics" we shall presently notice, holds some such doctrines with regard to the French stage. We are afraid that there is no chance of any revival of tragedy on either stage. The history of the drama forbids us even to hope for such a thing. There may be openings in other directions, such as that pointed out by Mr. Gosse, but we fear that tragedy is dead. It therefore behoves us to give a double meed of praise to the author of "Brian Boru" for his labour spent in vain, just as it has been said that we should doubly applaud the virtuous man by way of making good his deficiency of happiness. We are afraid that the author of "Brian Boru," like the virtuous man, will reap more applause than solid advantages from his drama. Yet it is a poem which ought to be read, and which nobody who really cares about poetry can possibly afford to neglect. Its beauties will be, perhaps, best seen by extracts. Here is the speech of the Archbishop of Armagh on the woes and distractions of his country:—

"Affliction oftimes purges
Both men and states; the hammer strokes of Fate
Ring on the world's great anvil, and knit close
The smitten nation; sparks of strife fly off,
And sundered parts are welded into one,
In the white-heat of anguish; but our chiefs
Are like rough flints—no union possible,
And at each stroke the scattered fragments fly
In wider severance."—(pp. 69, 70.)

It would be difficult in contemporary poetry to find a piece of more dramatic and effective writing. We seem to hear the ring of Marlowe's voice. Connor's dream in the second scene of the fourth act shows real imaginative power. It is, however, too long for us to quote. Here is a shorter passage upon one of the many effects of the death of one who is near to us:—

"We know not our own hurts, till Fate cries out
'No more! no more!' Then memory's flood-tide
Rolls up, and casts upon the soul's wide shore
The wreck of old affections, and the relics
Of childhood long ago."—(p. 76.)

It is, perhaps, in the analysis of the feelings that the writer is the strongest. We cannot, however, find room for any longer extracts,

and must again content ourselves with a short passage. Here is a bit in which Brian Boru describes the conflict of his passions, when he first entertains the thought of killing his brother:—

“ High thoughts and foul imaginings may not
Dwell side by side like brothers in one breast :
For the foul reptile brood, not crushed at once,
Will strike with venom’d fangs, and soon devour
The nurslings of the day.” (p. 45.)

We think that we have now quoted enough to make good the high praise which we have bestowed on “ Brian Boru.” Its faults are simply the faults of all first works, a want of restraint and a want of repose. Most of its faults, in short, can be remedied in a second edition by the simple process of cutting out the defective passages. Whether the writer possesses true lyrical power is a more serious question. He can, however, most certainly write very effective blank verse.

Mr. Todhunter¹⁶ gave unmistakable signs in “ Laurella ” that he possesses some of the true gifts of the poet. Above all, he showed a real power for describing Nature in some of her more delicate aspects. He has acted rightly in making his “ Alcestis ” an English and not “ a pseudo-Greek play.” Mr. Swinburne’s splendid error has not misled him. Higginson in his excellent little volume of “ Atlantic Essays,” a work not nearly so well known in England as it deserves to be, first pointed out the incongruities of “ Atalanta.” No lyrical sweetness, no splendour of diction, no imitation however close can call the dead to life. The Athenian drama is a closed book. Mr. Todhunter has, therefore, done wisely in not imitating Greek tragedy. But has he done any better in imitating English tragedy ? This is the question which we would put to him and the author of “ Brian Boru.” Who now reads closet plays ? A very small edition would suffice, we fancy, for such students. Mr. Todhunter apologises for putting modern sentiments in an ancient setting. No apology is needed. It is not the setting which is ancient, not the legendary story of Alcestis, that can never grow old, but the form of the setting which is out of keeping with the time. As we before hinted, the stage may see some revival, though not a revival of its old state. Mr. Todhunter, we perceive, follows Tennyson in putting prose into the mouth of some of his characters. This we do not think will be one characteristic of the drama of the future. It will become more and more poetical, certainly as far as form goes. It is often brought as an accusation against the English language that we have no intermediate speech on the stage between blank verse and mere prose. This is rather the fault of the dramatist than the language. Mr. Todhunter’s blank verse is flexible and easy. In places he shows dramatic force. His similes, too, are often very happy, as when Admetus says—

¹⁶ “ Alcestis.” A Dramatic Poem. By John Todhunter, Author of “ Laurella, and Other Poems.” London : C. Kegan Paul. 1879.

" We are crushed
Like flowers in eager children's glowing hands
When most they favour us." (p. 59.)

But we much fear that he has spent his labour in vain, as far as the general public is concerned. We shall, however, hope to meet him again, and trust he may find some other form than the drama in which to mould his thoughts. He has something to say, and we think that there is a future for both him and the author of " Brian Boru."

Dr. Hake¹⁷ holds a unique position among the poets of the day. He belongs to no school, although in the popular estimate he is generally classed with Rossetti and Swinburne. His present volume will most certainly raise his reputation. It is more likely to be popular than any of its predecessors. The finest poem in it is, in certain respects, " New Souls." It deals with the religious questions of the day. Its burden is—

" That when old thrones are tumbling down,
Man mocks the last that wears the crown."

After this the " Psalmist" stands next highest. But every poem in the volume is marked by Dr. Hake's peculiarly subtle tone of thought, which is, perhaps, more akin to Blake's than any other writer whom we know.

The most remarkable thing about " South-Western Pennsylvania"¹⁸ is that it contains a long index in double columns extending over twelve pages. Thus, under the word " abstract," we are referred to page 20, where we find—

" The sun's my father, and the earth my mother,
I am but a man, and you are but another."

This, it appears, is an abstract of the Redman's creed. If it be so, the Redman is far more philosophical than is generally supposed. He has put into another shape the old axiom, " Sol et homo hominem faciunt." We have made several more ventures by the help of the index, but have found nothing else worth quoting. Still, the index is most useful, and we suggest it to other poets as a means of lightening the labours of their reviewers.

Mr. Barlow¹⁹ will certainly very soon lose the position which he has already gained if he publishes any more such books as " The Marriage Before Death." If there is one thing pretty well agreed upon by all schools of thought, it is that a certain amount of restraint, if not of silence, should be observed with regard to the mere animal passions of human life. No one will accuse Mr. Grant Allen of being a transcendentalist, or with being infected with any false prudery, and we should therefore advise Mr. Barlow to study " Physiological

¹⁷ " Legends of the Morrow." By Thomas Gordon Hake, Author of " Parables and Tales," " New Symbols," &c. &c. London: Chatto and Windus. 1879.

¹⁸ " South-Western Pennsylvania." In Song and Story. With Notes and Illustrations. By Frank Cowan. Author of " Curious History of Insects," &c. &c. Greensburg, Pa. Printed by the Author. 1878.

¹⁹ " The Marriage Before Death," and Other Poems. By George Barlow, Author of " Two Marriages." London: Remington & Co. 1878.

Æsthetics" before he gives us another volume of poetry. He has made a grave mistake, from which it will take him some time to recover.

Mr Washburn's poems²⁰ are very much above the average of American verse. A spirit of true patriotism rings through them. His lines upon his own book breathe a manly independent tone. In some of the pieces, too, we meet with a good deal of original thought.

The author of the "*Bride of Gettysburg*"²¹ informs us in his preface that his "book is only written for the perusal of true admirers of genuine poetry—those who can appreciate lofty imagination, grand conception, and combination of ideas—graceful, fluent, flowing numbers—choicest harmony of cadence and rhyme, freighted with high and noble aspirations, filled with feeling and pathos, adorned with simile and metaphor," &c. &c. We are afraid that we do not appreciate lofty imagination, for we most certainly do not care for such lines as—

"Come, come away, I heard thee say, and fast cross Death's silent sea,
In this region fair there is no care, we all of woes are free." (p. 42.)

which sound to us very much like a religious nigger melody.

We have received what is called a "proof" copy of "*Love's Avater*."²² Here is the commencement:—

"Thou holiest among the holy nine,
Lo, eight co-operative labours shine
In mirrors that revolvingly accept
All being whose created mist hath crept
Athwart thy face."

We can only suppose that the "proof" has not been corrected.

We are not, however, able to extend this supposition to Mr. Leighton's carefully printed volume.²³ Here are some of his verses, neither worse nor better than usual—

"The thoughtful student poring o'er the past,
Can read on rock-bound ribs of earth her story;
Broad glacier-marks, the fossil shell and leaf,
Are each an illustration of past time."

We prefer the prose of Lyell's "*Principles of Geology*" to such poetry as this.

"*To My Lady*"²⁴ is a volume of more than average poetry. The writer shows, as most men of any cultivation are sure to do, a feeling for Nature. But he has scarcely the power to give his feelings full utterance. Once or twice, however, he touches a higher note than usual. Here is the beginning of a sonnet entitled "*Love's Music*:"—

²⁰ "Poems." By W. T. Washburn. New York: J. Haney & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1879.

²¹ "*The Bride of Gettysburg*." An Episode of 1863. In Three Parts. By J. D. Hylton, Author of "*Voices from the Rocky Mountains*," &c. Palmyra, New Jersey. 1878.

²² "*Love's Avater*." A Prelude to a Tragedy. And Other Poems. By Walter Rew. London: Trübner & Co. 1879.

²³ "Change." *The Whisper of the Sphinx*. By William Leighton, Author of "*The Sons of Godwin*." London: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1879.

²⁴ "*To My Lady*." And Other Poems. By Pakenham Beatty. London: Provost & Co. 1879.

"I saw fair Love upon an April day,
 And Spring had touched his tender lips with red
 And woven garlands for his golden head,
 And Hope had taught him rich sweet words to say,
 That footsore men upon their weary way
 Drew near." (p. 122.)

This is certainly something more than pretty. There are one or two other pieces which deserve notice, especially those which touch upon music and political freedom.

"Quarterman's Grace, and other Poems"²⁵ will certainly not detract from the high reputation which Mrs. Pfeiffer has already attained. The pieces, however, which we like best are amongst the shortest. In these Mrs. Pfeiffer sustains her strength to the close. Such bits as a "Song of the Early and the Latter Spring," and "A Song of Winter," are both very charming, especially the latter. Some of the sonnets, too, are very beautiful. We wish that we had space to give some quotations.

Just twelve years ago a work upon criticism, with the clap-trap title of "The Gay Science," appeared. A more mischievous book upon the subject could not have been written. Its author was an adherent of a school of philosophy which had long ago received its death-blow, and a supporter of a literary system which stood self-condemned. The book, in spite of all the puffs of the press, fell dead upon the world. We have now before us a work²⁶ by a French critic, whose object and whose method is precisely the reverse of that of the author of "The Gay Science." The translation of M. Véron's work appears in "The Library of Contemporary Science," a series which we cannot too strongly recommend to all our readers. Many excellent works have already appeared in the series, but none will prove of such service to the literary man, and especially to the poet, as the present volume. M. Véron clearly discerns the wants of the day. He is not afraid of the revolution in thought which is going on in all directions. "Fata volentem trahunt, nolentem ducunt" is the idea which runs through the book on the one hand, whilst on the other the individuality of the artist inspires every page. The man is the artist. No academies, no systems of prizes, no State patronage, can make the artist. These are the curses of art. We cannot, of course, give M. Véron's most eloquent and most conclusive reasons against all these things. Those who have thought most upon the subject will best understand the strength of M. Véron's position. Upon some minor points artists may be inclined to differ from him, but they are essentially minor points, and do not touch the main argument. It is, however, to the chapter upon Poetry to which we would direct attention. Both critic and poet should study and lay to heart every line, the

²⁵ "Quarterman's Grace." And Other Poems. By Emily Pfeiffer. Author of "Gerard's Monument," "Glän Alarch," &c. &c. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1879.

²⁶ "Æsthetia." By Eugène Véron. Translated by W. H. Armstrong, B.A. (The Library of Contemporary Science.) London: Chapman & Hall. 1879.

critic even more than the poet, because he is generally the more ignorant of the two. To the critic M. Véron emphatically says, "you must look to the work, and the work only, for your motives of appreciation. There is only one true criterion—the sum of poetic ability which the author, by the production of the work, proves that he possesses. Nothing else has any real, scientific value" (p. 340). This, in short, brings us back by a new route to Hegel's aphorism, "the value of a work of art rises in the ratio as the thought is more deep and comprehensive, and in the ratio as that thought is more vividly expressed." As to the workmanship of the poet's art, M. Véron expresses the whole truth in these lines, "whilst our endeavours should be to suggest as many ideas as possible to the intellect, we should, at the same time, aim to demand from it a minimum of effort" (p. 345). Is it too late in the day that Mr. Browning and his school may sit at the feet of M. Véron? "Poetry," says Emerson, "teaches the enormous force of a few words, and, in proportion to the inspiration, checks loquacity. Great thoughts ensure musical expressions." M. Véron then proceeds to show how we may diminish the strain of continuous effort, how, in short, we may attain musical expression. But let it never be forgotten that this musical expression can only be attained by loftiness and generosity of thought, or, in Hegel's words, "in the ratio as the thought is more deep." M. Véron's next section is still more interesting, as it deals with the bearings of poetry upon Science, a question which has been almost ignored in England, or else treated from the mere theologian's point of view. As far as we can remember, Mr. Morley is the only critic who has, in his *Essay on Byron*, touched upon the matter in a satisfactory way. Like Mr. Morley, M. Véron warns us against the foolish notion that our greater knowledge of the secrets of Nature will less exalt our imagination than the childish notions of primitive ages. As M. Véron asks, "How can we believe that a comprehension of the law which binds the stars and our earth together, and makes them rush in their proper order through the infinities of space, which again are peopled with literally an innumerable multitude of similar worlds and systems, can prevent us from being more deeply stirred by the sight of the midnight sky, than the men who looked up at it and thought they were gazing at a vault sprinkled with golden nails?" And he proceeds to ask whether man can have become indifferent to man now that he studies mankind, now that he is investigating the laws of the body and the laws of the mind, laws of which the very greatest philosophers of old had not the very slightest conception? What, too, from a social point of view, he asks, are the true glories of our day, charity, toleration, respect for womanhood, childhood, and for human life, and even for animals? He points out that virtues which were rare amongst the ancients are becoming more and more binding upon us. He shows that such sentiments as hate, anger, revenge, and cunning, which were looked upon with almost approbation by the ancients, are now regarded as crimes, and he points out how all these changes in morals have affected, and must continue to affect, the character of modern poetry. We wish

that we had space to follow M. Véron through his two excellent chapters on the novel and the drama. We must, however, refer our readers to them. We cannot better conclude our notice of this most excellent and important work than by the author's own words—"The new form of faith is all the more fervent, because it dates its rise from the downfall of error. It is faith in science—a new sentiment, but one not the less deep and powerful because free from the intolerance of religious faith. . . . Modern poetry will be the daughter of Science."

Mr. Locker²⁷ is a bold man. He has given the world the contents of his commonplace book. Most of us after a certain age give up keeping a commonplace book. We have discovered the truth of the old proverb—it is better to read twice than to write once. If, however, we can tell a man by his library, we can most certainly better read him by his commonplace book. Here is the innermost circle of his friends. Here are those whom he has especially thought it worth his while to cultivate. Heine most truly said, that we can tell a man's wit by observing what he thinks is witty. The loud laugh and the quiet smile, too, betray two very different classes of minds. Mr. Locker, however, has dared do more than give us his commonplace book. He also ventures to give us side by side with classical wit some of his own. Few writers can stand such a test as this. We are bound, however, to say that Mr. Locker stands it well, so well that we wish he had given us more of his own good things, particularly his recollections of his contemporaries, his own observations on life and the world of men and women with whom he has mixed, than so many of the good things of others. We know where to find the latter. Still we are glad to have them in such an accessible form as Mr. Locker has put them. He collects, too, from all sources. Those who do not like German wit, can find plenty of American, and those who do not appreciate that rather gaunt humour, can find abundance of French wit, brilliant and sparkling. "Patchwork" is just the book to take up at any odd five minutes. Open it where you will, you will find something well worth reading and remembering.

Messrs. Butcher's and Lang's prose translation of the *Odyssey*²⁸ will, we hope, produce a revolution in translations. They have successfully shown what we have so often insisted upon, that a good prose translation is far better than any verse translation. In verse the translator needlessly fetters himself with fresh difficulties. It is quite true that his verse may be very beautiful, but its beauty—that is, beauty to the English reader, not to the student of the original—is gained at the expense of the author. To meet the exigencies both of the metre and the rhyme, he either condenses or amplifies. To do either is equally wrong. The condensation may be epigrammatic, and the amplification very beautiful, but this is not to the point. A translation should be

²⁷ "Patchwork." By Frederick Locker. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1879.

²⁸ "The *Odyssey* of Homer." Done into English Prose. By S. H. Butcher, M.A., Fellow of University College, Oxford, and A. Lang, M.A., late Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. London: Macmillan & Co. 1879.

a mirror representing, as far as one language can ever represent another, both the letter and the spirit of the original. This is precisely what Messrs. Butcher's and Lang's translation does for the *Odyssey*. Take the following little bit,—

“And without the courtyard hard by the door is a great garden, of four ploughgates, and a hedge runs round on either side. And there grow tall trees blossoming, pear-trees and pomegranates, and apple-trees with bright fruit, and sweet figs and olives in their bloom. The fruit of these trees never perisheth, neither faileth, winter nor summer, enduring all the year through. Evermore the west wind blowing brings some fruits to birth and ripens others. Pear upon pear waxes old, and apple upon apple, yea, and cluster ripens upon cluster of the grape, and fig upon fig. (B. vii. 110.)

This, indeed, if ever there was, is an echo of the original lines, lines which anticipated the sweetness of Theocritus. Buffon once said of some poetry, “it is nearly as good as good prose.” But no poetical version will ever come up to such translation as this. We wish that we had space to give other translations of other kinds. We will merely say that Keats should have lived to this day, and then he would truly have heard Homer speak out “loud and bold.”

The idea of Mr. Dobson's book²⁹ is certainly good. But what could have impelled Mr. Dobson to have undertaken such a task? He does not seem to possess one single qualification. He does not even write tolerable English, such English as we are accustomed to in the days of Mr. Matthew Arnold, Dr. Newman, Mr. Saintsbury, and Mr. Pater. What we mean is that he possesses no charm of style. And a book of this kind above all demands style. We never linger over a sentence except to wonder at its clumsiness or its platitude. Mr. Dobson does not seem to have any real sympathy with one single poet. He never enters into their inner spirit. Any bookseller's hack would have done the work as well. It is sheer waste of time to say a word about such a production.

We are glad to see a new edition of Lamb's “*Tales of Shakspeare*”³⁰ very prettily got up, with a sensible introduction by Mr. Ainger, and a charming frontispiece by Du Maurier.

M. Blouet's edition of “*Le Barbier de Séville*”³¹ is meant for students, but we can recommend it to all persons who want to read it again in a convenient form.

²⁹ “*The Classic Poets, their Lives and Their Times.*” With the *Epics* Epitomised. By W. T. Dobson. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1879.

³⁰ “*Tales from Shakspeare.*” By Charles and Mary Lamb. Edited by A. Ainger, M.A. London: Macmillan & Co. 1879.

³¹ “*Le Barbier de Séville.*” Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by L. P. Blouet, B.A. London: Macmillan & Co. 1879.

MISCELLANEA.

THE most important articles in the new volume of the "Encyclopædia Britannica"¹ are the "Charles James Fox" of Mr. W. F. Rae, the "Finance" and "Free Trade" of Professor Thorold Rogers, the "Fine Arts" of Professor Sidney Colvin, the "Frederick the Great" of Mr. Sime, and the four extensive articles that come under the heading "France." The first-named article is written with all the accurate historical discrimination and caustic impartiality which distinguishes the author of "The Opposition under George III." There are few who possess so complete, so intimate a knowledge of the political life of that portion of the eighteenth century as Mr. Rae; still fewer who would be able to write of it as he does, without allowing their judgments to be blinded and their critical faculties to be warped by an adhesion to those party feelings which exert, even at this lapse of time, an influence and a power of arousing passion, scarcely less potent than they possessed at the period of their birth. Mr. Sidney Colvin's paper is a valuable dissertation upon all that can come fitly under the heading "Fine Arts" as distinct from the question of æsthetics. "It is the province of æsthetics," says Professor Ruskin, quoted by Mr. Colvin, "to tell you (if you did not know it before) that the taste and colour of a peach are pleasant, and to ascertain (if it be ascertainable, and you have any curiosity to know) why they are so." Mr. Colvin after proposing the less sarcastic and more extended definition that the name æsthetics is intended to designate a scientific doctrine or account of beauty in Nature and art, and of the faculties for enjoying and originating beauty which exist in man, goes on to the consideration of his own proper task in three divisions. (1.) A definition of fine arts in general. (2.) A definition and classification of the fine arts severally. (3.) Some observations on their historical development. While we may not always agree with Mr. Colvin in his dogmas, we cannot but feel grateful for the conciseness with which he has presented his views, and for the great erudition he has compressed into so small a space. No one who is not as learned as Mr. Colvin himself can fail to derive advantage from the careful study of his paper, which has, moreover, the great merit of being a model article for an Encyclopædia, not, like too many of its fellows, a sort of esoteric disquisition seeming strangely uneasy and out of place in a work of popular reference.

Among the shorter articles Mr. Garnett's "Faustus," Mr. Andrew Lang's "Family," Mr. Carruther's "Falconer" and "Farquhar," Professor Palmer's "Firdousi," and Mr. Minto's "Fielding," call for especial praise. The last-named article is a valuable piece of criticism upon a topic evidently congenial to the writer. The combined qualities which made the author's manuals of English literature so

¹ "The Encyclopædia Britannica." Vol. XI. Fal-Fyz. Adam & Charles Black. 1879.

attractive are displayed to the best advantage in the consideration of "Immortal Fielding." Mr. Minto does not, in making his articles eminently agreeable, forget to make them useful too, so we are given a very valuable list of Fielding's plays, with dates. He might, however, have mentioned Fielding's indebtedness to Plautus for the plot of his "Intriguing Chambermaid." Mr. Saintsbury's article on French literature is the work of a man so well acquainted with his subject as to be inclined to over-dogmatism. We should certainly be disposed to quarrel with many of his criticisms on modern French literature. He seems to have lost the proper perspective in viewing his groups of modern writers, and is therefore inclined to give far more praise than is their due to authors who are little better than shadows' shadows. In his estimate of the eighteenth century story-tellers we cannot agree with him in applying the term "lively" in any sense to the novels of Crébillon *filz*. To none of the works of "that abject thing," as Macaulay styles the author of "La Nuit et le Moment," could such a term be fairly applied. Their indecency is so completely counterbalanced by their incomparable dulness that the oburgations they have received seem almost unfair. So tedious are they that we have always interpreted Gray's famous wish to lie on a sofa and read Crébillon *filz* as the expression of a desire for sleep; simply somnolent in their effects are the works of him who was styled Crébillon the gay, but who had been better nicknamed Crébillon the dull. But however much we may disagree with Mr. Saintsbury his wide and varied knowledge is incontestable. He would scarcely have made the ridiculous mistake which occurs in the article on Beaumarchais's "Figaro" in the same volume, which converts "Le Mariage de Figaro" into two works by taking its other title "La Folle Journée" as a separate play and makes no mention of "La Mère Coupable" the real conclusion of the great "Figaro" trilogy. The article on "Fencing" is poor, and makes no mention of the salutes; and the article on the "Flagellants" is meagre and its references scanty.

The extraordinary influence that captive Greece won over her Roman lords finds its historical parallel in modern times in the artistic triumph of defeated Italy over her French conquerors, the artistic triumph which may be fairly said to have created the French Renaissance² in spite of the subtle and ingenious arguments raised by M. Edmond Bonaffé in his "Causeries sur l'Art et la Curiosité." But even the most loyal Frenchmen, even the most ardent of English philo-Franks can scarcely with any show of reasonable argument contend that the French Renaissance has the intense interest attaching to it that belongs to the Italian Renaissance. For this reason Mrs. Mark Pattison's two volumes may not, perhaps, command so many readers as were won by Mr. Symonds' huge undertaking. But we much prefer Mrs. Pattison's method of treating her subject. Her book is written in a calmer style than that adopted by the author of the "Greek Poets,"

² "The Renaissance of Art in France." By Mrs. Mark Pattison. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1879.

and, though it is always picturesque, it does not offend with the cloying sweetness and the kaleidoscopic effects which do so much to mar Mr. Symonds' work. But the chief disadvantage against which Mrs. Pattison's book will have to contend is, that it appeals not merely to students alone but to students of a somewhat limited order. The history of the Renaissance in France is, roughly speaking, little better than a history of furniture, and a Renaissance whose chief results lie in the department of decorative upholstery cannot, of course, hope to vie with the splendid names and the varied qualities of the Italian new birth. Mrs. Pattison's work will be of great value to those—and we are of the number—to whom all that the inventive genius of humanity can produce from the mechanical arts, all that skilled handicraft can do to beautify daily life and make lovely the habitations of man afford delight. On the literary side of the question Mrs. Pattison scarcely dwells enough, and the impression that remains after laying down her volumes is that we have been wandering in a pleasant paradise of skilled workmen, of illuminators, of architects, of carvers in wood and fashioners of ivory, of goldsmiths and silversmiths, of potters and enamels, but that with the highest ways of art we have had but little to do.

Mrs. Pattison has not come to her task unprepared. The amount of reading, of patient study, and of personal investigation that was necessary before such a book as this could be even attempted was enormous, and Mrs. Pattison has evidently undergone it all without flinching. But she bears her labour so lightly that the reader, while admiring the graceful style and the graphic descriptive powers of the book, is apt to overlook the immense toil which lies hidden beneath the bright and vividly coloured pages.

There are certain subjects, however, which Mrs. Pattison would have done far better to have left untouched. An inquiry into the moral character of the *mignons* of Henri III. can serve no good purpose in a book of the kind, and if Mrs. Pattison can quote the authority of Ronsard against them, she might also remember that Ronsard has written epitaphs upon Quelus, attributing to him all knightly virtues—

“De tout ce que Nature en ce monde peut faire
De vaillant, de parfait, de courtois et de beau
L'ombre repose icy.”—Épithaphe de Quelus (1584).

Those who rejoiced over “The Gamekeeper at Home” need not fear disappointment in reading its author's new volume.³ The same exquisite sense of natural beauty, the same keen powers of observation, the same vivid presentation of all that may be seen or felt in wood or pasture, are here found as fresh and delightful as before; nay, more so. It would seem as if our anonymous naturalist, far from exhausting his skill, had, in his “Gamekeeper,” given us little more than a taste of his quality, for the new book is actually better than its predecessor. The author evidently deeply loves his theme, and, like all

³ “Wild Life in a Southern Country.” By the Author of “The Gamekeeper at Home.” London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1879.

who pay healthy homage to anything worthy of worship, he wishes that others should joy in his joy and share in his content. The intense humanity of the book, its reverent recognition of beauty wherever met with, its true poetic inspiration, and, above all, its sincerity and earnestness, qualities without which few words are worth the listening to, can hardly be praised too highly. Every page of the book is steeped in the glamour that belongs to the loving service of Nature, and the strange harmony that Pan alone can teach his votaries lingers about it from first to last. To all those dwellers in cities, those movers in the crowded ways of men, who feel sometimes burn within them the passionate desire for Flora and the country green, this book should be precious. It brings with it the waters and the woods, and the triumph of the seasons, and the shifting masque of the sky with an exactness that rivals Tennyson, and the same sweet sadness that gives so great a charm to the poems of William Morris.

There is something so essentially ephemeral about the average of journalistic and magazine writings, that there is a strong objection to their being collected in book form. Mr. Comyns Carr's *Critical Essays* will not be met by any such objection. Though they were all written from time to time in various journals and magazines, as the artistic exigencies of the day called them forth, in all of them is visible the careful treatment given to work designed for something better than the reading of an hour. Every essay in the volume is, of necessity, distinct from its fellows, yet each is so skilfully fashioned as to fit with the others into an artistic whole. The readers of Mr. Carr's book may learn from it many valuable æsthetic truths, and receive an impetus to more serious consideration of the art-problems which are every day brought with the spread of education before the attention of an increasing audience. One special feature in connection with Mr. Carr's book is, that it may be considered from the point of view of Mr. Whistler's fantastic challenge to critics. Mr. Carr is of the head and front amongst those offenders who have stung Mr. Whistler into speech. According to the painter of arrangements and symphonies, Mr. Carr, because he is not himself a painter, must not be allowed to criticise painting at all. On Mr. Carr, therefore, may be turned all those arguments which fall to the ground at once when levelled against Mr. Ruskin, who, whether for good or bad, claims to be an artist in the technical sense of the term, and has exhibited works of art, which are, we believe, the admiration of a circle. If any one who has been amused by Mr. Whistler's diatribe will, after carefully reading Mr. Carr's *Essays on Art*, say that Mr. Carr ought not to have written them because he is not himself a painter, we can only say that for that person's opinion we have no manner of respect whatever. One of the great charms of Mr. Carr's criticism lies in his exceeding fairness. Mr. Ruskin's Ghirlandajo Phillipics are quietly set aside with the words "it is always a pity to depreciate beautiful work, however brilliant the rhetoric employed in the process," words that reveal the true artistic feeling of the author, who then proceeds to give to Domenico a truer

⁴ "Essays on Art." By J. Comyns Carr. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1879.

and higher place than that so dogmatically awarded him by the Oxford Graduate. Mr. Carr's criticism is neither too dogmatic nor too tentative; it is the thoughtful expression of the opinion of a scholar—one who has studied too deeply to believe himself infallible—one who endeavours to impart that superior knowledge he possesses to all who care to learn, and who has no wish to keep his treasure to himself. In clear and happy language he puts before us the noble works of art he loves so well, and the cherished names of Mantegna and Bellini come from him with a fuller meaning to the thoughtful student.

The German books of the quarter are very varied in interest. To students of the stories of the Carolingian Cycle, Dr. Koschwitz's edition of various versions of the journey of Charlemaigne to Jerusalem and Constantinople⁵ will especially recommend itself.

The story is of special interest to the lovers of the old French epics as serving to show how the heroic types of the earlier legends degenerated into the broadly comic figures of a later day. The aspects of the Hellenic gods in Aristophanic comedy are not more startlingly grotesque, in comparison with the grandeur of the Homeric deities, than are the characters of the King and his peers in the journey story as contrasted with the splendid figures who move majestically through the measured tirades of the "Chanson de Roland." The silly—and in the case of Oliver, the shameless—boasts of the French knights and their Falstaff-like monarch, seem to belong more fitly to a chronicle of Gargantua than to a tale of those who fell at Roncesvalles; and it is only by repeated assurance of the sacred right of ridicule that we can reconcile ourselves to this ridiculous story of Charles the Great and his gallant peers.

A valuable contribution to the lore of the Arthusian Cycle is made by Herr Kölbing's⁶ edition of the Tristram Saga ok Isondar.

Herr Voegelin's volume⁷ on the French and Spanish sources of Herder's *Cid* is another interesting example of the labours of modern German scholarship. Herder is almost as famous for having advised Goethe not to write "Faust," as for having written the "*Cid*;" but the great idol of Richter could hardly be blamed for doubting the possibility of recreating the antique legend, if he judged from the point of view according to which he elaborated his own work.

Among the recent additions to the admirable series of pamphlets published by Carl Habel, in Berlin, two will be of especial interest to English readers at the present time—Professor Gustav Sohn's⁸ Paper on the question, "What is Socialism?"⁸ and Herr J. B. Meyer's Essay,

⁵ "Sechs Bearbeitungen des altfranzösischen Gedichts von Karls des Grossen reise nach Jerusalem und Constantinople." Herausgeben von Dr. Eduard Koschwitz. Heilbronn: Gebr. Henninger.

⁶ "Die Nordische und die Englische version der Tristram sage. Herausgegeben von Eugen Kölbing. Erster theil. Tristram's Saga ok Isondar." Heilbronn: Gebr. Henninger. 1878.

⁷ Herder's *Cid*. Die Französische und die Spanische Quelle." Zusammengestellt von A. S. Voegelin. Heilbronn: Gebr. Henninger.

⁸ "Deutsche Zeit-und-Streit Fragen. Was ist Socialism?" Von Gustav Sohn. Fichte, Lasalle und der Socialism. Von J. B. Meyer. Berlin: Carl Habel. 1878.

in which he traces the influence of Fichte upon the great German Socialist, Ferdinand Lasalle.

The second volume of Herr Witte's exhaustive work on Dante will afford great delight to the lovers of Dante scholarship. The reproduction of Massaccio's portrait of Dante, and the map of Florence at the end of the thirteenth century, add much to the value of the volume.

Among the educational works before us high praise must be given to Professor Nichol's "English Composition"⁹ in the series of literature primers edited by Mr. Green. So much in so small a compass we have seldom seen, and there are, we fancy, but few, who, in reading through this little volume of 128 pages, would not find that they had obtained some benefit from it. It ought to take a place as a standard work.

Mr. J. H. Gladstone has published a second and enlarged edition of his work on Spelling Reform,¹¹ which we reviewed in these pages some time back. The book deserves careful study from all who are interested in the orthographical disputes of the day.

Mr. Mayor issues before the other parts the IVth Part of his valuable Juvenal for Schools,¹² containing Satires XII. to XVI., with exhaustive annotations.

Mr. Rush's Latin Delectus¹³ is not a very interesting book. Is it beyond the capacity of the schoolmen to produce a work of the kind which should be more attractive and less cheerlessly uninviting than the existing specimens?

Mr. D. B. Munro presents the world with a new edition of the First Book of the Iliad,¹⁴ with an essay on Homeric Grammar and Notes.

If we are to judge by the number of Greek grammars of all kinds that issue from the presses of Messrs. Macmillan the study of Greek must be decidedly on the increase in this country, and all would-be Trojans will have a hard fight of it. A sixth edition of Wordsworth's Greek Primer¹⁵ testifies to the popularity of the work, yet there are many better Greek grammars for beginners.

A new edition of "Chambers's Mathematical Tables"¹⁶ will be welcomed by all who are glad to have difficult calculations done for them.

The lovers of "goody-goody" books will find in "Half-Hours with my Girls"¹⁷ the kind of mild mental food that they relish. Books of this class command, we believe, a very large circulation. The fact

⁹ "Dante-Forschungen. Altes und Neues." Von Karl Witte. Zweiter Band. Heilbronn: Gerb. Henninger. 1879.

¹⁰ "Literature Primers. English Composition." By Professor Nichol, LL.D. Macmillan. 1879.

"Spelling Reform." J. H. Gladstone, F.R.S. Macmillan & Co. 1879.

"Juvenal Satires," XII.—XVI. J. E. B. Mayor. Macmillan. 1879.

"Synthetic Latin Delectus." E. Rush. Macmillan. 1879.

"Homer, Iliad Book I." D. B. Munro. Macmillan. 1879.

"Clarendon Press Series." A Greek Primer. C. Wordsworth. Macmillan. 1878.

"Chambers's Mathematical Tables." W. and R. Chambers. 1878.

¹⁷ "Half-Hours with my Girls." By Lady Baker (Amy Marryat.) Hatchard. 1879.

speaks strongly for the want of increased education among some sections of the reading public.

We have received and read with interest the Report of the Conference on the Restoration of Ancient Buildings, held at the Royal Institution last year. The vigorous and earnest speech of Mr. William Morris ought to be read and re-read by all who care more for our old buildings as they are than for the would-be restorations of educated ignorance.

We have also received the Report of the Petition of William Muir and others for Rectification of the List of Contributories to the City, of Glasgow Bank, edited by Alex. Taylor Innes, and published by the Edinburgh Publishing Company.

"Debrett's Peerage and Baronetage"¹⁸ in two handsome library volumes, maintain their usual character for completeness and correctness.

¹⁸ "Debrett's Peerage and Baronetage." Dean & Son. 1879.

INDEX.

* * * *All Books must be looked for under the Author's name.*

- ANOUR, E., "Col. Fougas' Mistake," 280
 ADAMS, Rev. H. C., "Wykehamica, A History of Winchester College," 577
 ADAMS, Davenport, "The Mariners of England," 287
 "Afghanistan," 111-167
 AGRICULTURIST, Northern, and Ex.-M.P., "Justice to Native Industry," 552
 ALDRIDGE, Lizzie, "The World She Awoke in," 582
 ALLEN, Grant, B.A., "The Colour Sense; its Origin and Development," 544
 ALZOG, Dr. J., "Manual of Universal Church History," 213
 ANDREWS, Mary T., "Animals and their Social Powers," 296
 APPLETON, G. W., "Frozen Hearts," 279
 ARGYLL, Duke of, "The Eastern Question," 546
 ARNOLD, Arthur, "Social Politics," 232
 ———— Matthew, "Mixed Essays," 560
 "Asia Minor and Euphrates Valley Railway," 551
 "Auld Lang Syne," 278
 AUSTIN, C. E., "Undeveloped Resources in Turkey in Asia," 230
 AYLWARD, A., "The Transvaal of Today," 237
 AYRTON, M. C., "Child Life in Japan," 296
- B., J. T., "Brian Boru," 585
 BAIN, Professor A., "Education as a Science," 559
 BAKER, Lady, "Half-hours with My Girls," 599
 BARKER, B., "Eliot the Younger," 279
 BARLOW, G., "The Two Marriages," 281
 ———— "The Marriage before Death," 588
 BARZELOTTI, G., "The Ethics of Positivism," 223
 BASTIAN, A., "Die Culturländer des Alten America," 556
 BAUMGARTEN, J., "La France Contemporaine, ou, Les Français peints par Eux-mêmes," 235
 BAUR, Dr. F. C., "The Church History of the first Three Centuries," 219
 BEATY, Pakenham, "To My Lady," 589
- BEERBOHM, J., "Wanderings in Patagonia," 556
 BEESLY, Mrs., "Stories from the History of Rome," 264
 "Beginning, The," 566
 BELLEW, H. W., "Afghanistan and the Afghans," 550
 BENNET, G. L., "First Latin Writer," 295
 ———— J. H., M.D., "On Pulmonary Consumption," 569
 BESANT, W., and J. RICE, "The Monks of Thelema," 276
 BEY, H. BRUGSCH, "A History of Egypt under the Pharaohs," 574
 BIART, L., "The Two Friends," 287
 "Bismarck's, Prince, Letters to his Wife, Sister, and others," 274
 BLACK, William, "Goldsmith," 580
 BLANDFORD, H. F., "Report on the Meteorology of India," 245
 ———— "Indian Meteorological Memoirs," &c., 246
 BLOUNT, L. P., B.A., "Le Barber de Seville," Edited by, 593
 BLUNT, Rev. John, M.A., "The Annotated Bible," 222
 BLYTH, A. W., "A Manual of Practical Chemistry," 567
 O'BRIEN, C. G., "Light and Shade," 278
 BRITTON, J. and R. HOLLAND, "Dictionary of English Plant Names," 563
 BROMM, Dr. H. G., "Klassen des Thier Reichs," 563
 BUCKHEIM, C. A., "German Poetry for Repetition," 298
 BUCKNILL, S., "Habitual Drunkenness" 569
 BUNCE, J. THACKERAY, "Fairy Tales, their Origin and Meaning," 291
 BURKE, S. H., "Historical Portraits of the Tudor Dynasty," 573
 BURNABY, Captain F., "On Horseback through Asia Minor," 231
 BURTON, R. F., "The Land of Midian Revisited," 555
 BUTCHER, S. H., M.A., and A. LANG, M.A., "The Odyssey of Homer," 592
- CAIROLI Family, The, 77-110

- Candeze, Dr. E., "The Curious Adventures of a Field Cricket," 287
- Cantacuzene, Princess Olga, "In the Spring of My Life," 278
- Caro, E., "Le Pessimisme aux XIXe. Siècle," 542
- Carr, J. Comyns, "Essays on Art," 597
- "Cartouche," 583
- Cernuschi, H., "Monetary Diplomacy in 1878," 558
- "Chambers's Mathematical Tables," 599
- Chandler, W. A., "The Exchanged Identity," 283
- "Cheveley Nobs, Saul Weir," Parts IV.-VII., 276; 581
- Church, Rev. A., and Rev. J. W. Brodribb, "Tacitus, Annals. Book II.," 295
- Clare, J. W., "Manufacture of Waistcoat to Prevent People being Drowned," 297
- Clark, E. W., "Life and Adventures in Japan," 555
- Clarke, Charles and Mary C., "Recollections of Winters," 274
- C. B., "A Class Book of Geography," 243
- Hyde, V.P.S.G., "Sovereign States and Quasi-Sovereign States; their Debts to Foreign Countries," 244
- Clergyman, a Protestant, "Hereditv," 560
- "Chapters on Christian Catholicity," 216
- "Notes on the Defence of the Book of Daniel," 538
- Colenzo, J. W., D.D., "The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua," 534
- Collins, Mabel, "In This World," 583
- Collins, Wilkie, "The Haunted Hotel," 280
- "Cookery, Official Handbook for the National Training School of," 296
- Congreve, Richard, "Commemoration of Auguste Comte," 221
- Constable, H. S., "Fashions of the Day in Medicine and Science," 571
- Conway, Moncure D., M.A., "Demonology and Devil-Lore," 530
- Copier J., "Erasmus's Praise of Folly," 292
- Costa, J. M. de, "Harvey and His Discovery," 571
- Courtney, W. L., M.A., "The Metaphysics of John Stuart Mill," 54
- Cowan, F., "South Western Pennsylvania," 588
- "Creation, Extra Physics and Mystery of," 535
- Creighton, Louise, "Life of Sir Walter Raleigh," 264
- Cunningham, General Sir A., "My Command in South Africa," 549
- DALTON, H. R., B.A., "The Mountain Mystery," 282
- Davies, W., "A Fine Old English Gentleman, exemplified in the Life and Character of Lord Collingwood," 266
- Davis, J., "A Plan for Raising Iron-Clads," 297
- Dawson, J. W., LL.D., "The Origin of the World, according to Revelation and Science," 227
- "Debrett's Peerage and Baronetage," 600
- Delbos, Professor L., "Chapters on the Science of Language," 293
- Desprez, P. S., B.D., "Daniel and John: or the Apocalypse of the Old and that of the New Testament," 219
- "Dialect, English, Society, Dictionary of English Plant Names," 563, *see* Britten, J.
- Digby, W., "The Famine Campaign in Southern India, 1876-1878," 263
- Dobson, W. T., "The Classic Poets, their Lives and their Times," 593
- Doherty, Hugh, M.D., "Organic Method," 541
- Drysdale, J., M.D., "The German Theories of Infectious Diseases," 258
- Duff, Grant, M.P., "Miscellanies," 551
- Duncker, Max, "Geschichte des Alter thums," 575
- E. A. L. O., "Pomegranates from the Punjab," 296
- Education, Reports of, in Victoria and in Ontario, 561, *see* Ontario, and Ferres
- "Elliot, The George, Birthday Book," 287
- Elvington, II., "Is it True?" 277
- "Encyclopædia Britannica," Vol. XI., 594
- English Dialect Society, Publications of, *see* Britten
- "Essays, Three, on Rights, Utility, and Positive Morality," 229
- Eton Boy, "About Some Fellows," 287
- Eucken, Professor R., "Geschichte der Philosophischen Terminologie im Umrisse dargestellt," 545
- Ewald, G. H. A. von, "Commentary on the Prophets of the Old Testament," 537
- Ewer, Dr. F. C., "Catholicity in its Relation to Protestantism and Romanism," 216
- FARLEY, J. L., "Egypt, Cyprus, and Asiatic Turkey," 550
- Farrar, Canon, "Language and Languages," 292

- Fauconnier, E., "La Question Sociale," 239
- Fenn, W. W., "Half Hours, or Blind-man's Holiday," 287
- Ferres, J., "Report of Education in Victoria," 561
- Ferrier, D., M.D., F.R.S., "The Localisation of Cerebral Disease," 253
- Finlayson, James, M.D., "Clinical Manual," 256
- Finn, James, M.R.A.S., "Stirring Times, or Records from Jerusalem Consular Chronicles of 1853 to 1856," 263
- Fisher, F. H., "Afghanistan and the Central Asian Question," 550
- Foster, W., "Political Presentiments," 234
- Fouillée, A., "L'Idée Moderne du Droit en Allemagne, en Angleterre, et en France," 242
- Fowle, Rev. T. W., M.A., "The Divine Legation of Christ," 535
- Fradur, Thor., "Sketches from Shady Places," 554
- "Friends or Foes," 559
- Frohschammer, J., "Monaden and Weltphantasie," 544
- "GAMEKEEPER, The, at Home," 288
- Gamgee, A., "Hermann's Physiology," 252
- Garland, Rev. G. V., M.A., "Genesis, with Notes," 222
- Gay, Henri, "Observations sur les Instincts de l'homme et l'Intelligence des Animaux," 543
- Gebler, Karl von, "Galileo Galilei and the Roman Curia," 578
- Geddes, W. D., "The Problem of the Homeric Poems," 290
- Gill, W. F., "The Life of Edgar Allan Poe," 273
- Gizycki, Dr. G. von, "Die Ethik David Hume's in ihrer geschichtlichen Stellung," 228
- Gladstone, Right Hon. W. E., "A Primer of Homer," 289
- "Gleanings of Past Years," 548
- J. H., F.R.S., "Spelling Reform," 599
- Glenham, H., "George Hern," 279
- Gore, G., LL.D., "The Art of Scientific Discovery," 245
- Gottschall, R. von, "Withered Leaves," 584
- Green, Professor, and Professors Mill, Thorpe, Richea, and Marshall, "Coal, its History and Uses," 249
- Green, M. H., "My Mother's Diamonds," 287
- Grey, Percy, "The Devil's Advocate," 224
- Griffiths, Major A., "The English Army," 553
- Gudgeon, T. W., "Reminiscences of the War in New Zealand," 537
- Guhl, E., and W. Koner, "The Life of the Greeks and Romans, described from Antique Monuments," 264
- "Given," 585
- "HADES, Epic of," 584
- Haeckel, Professor, "The Evolution of Man," 545
- Hagen, Professor, H., "Der Roman von König Apollonius von Tyrus," 297
- Hake, T. Gordon, "Legends of the Morrow," 588
- Halifax, M. C., "Among the Welsh Hills," 281
- Hamann, A., "German Classics, Lessing's Laocoon," 294
- Hamerton, P. G., "Life of Turner," 580
- Hamilton, A. H. A., "Quarter Sessions from Queen Elizabeth to Queen Anne," 260
- Walter, "The Poets Laureate of England," 578
- Hardy, Thomas, "The Return of the Native," 280
- Hansworth, Dr. A., "A History of the New Testament Times," 218
- Haweis, Rev. H. R., M.A., "Arrows in the Air," 221
- Hayter, H. H., "Victorian Year-Book for 1877-8," 557
- "Health Primers," 569
- Hearn, W. E., LL.D., "The Aryan Household," 559
- Heath, F. G., "Our Woodland Trees," 251
- Heinze, Th., "Ueber die Fremdwörter im Deutschen," 297
- Herbert, T. M., M.A., "The Realistic Assumptions of Modern Science Examined," 539
- Hergenbahn, Th., "Das Antragsrecht im Deutschen Strafrecht," 297
- Hittell, John S., "A History of the City of San Francisco," 576
- Hodgson, Rev. J. T., M.A., "Memoir of the Rev. Francis Hodgson, B.D., Scholar, Poet and Divine," 271
- Homer, *see* Butcher, S. H., M.A.
- Hooker, J. D., C.B., and John Ball, F.R.S., "Journal of a Tour in Morocco," 554
- Hortsmann, C., "Sammlung Altenglischer Legenden," 297
- Hughes, E. F., "The Millennium," 262
- Hulme, F. E., F.L.S., "Familiar Wild Flowers," 252

- Huxley, Professor, "Hume," 579
 Hylton, J. D., "The Bride of Gettysburg," 589
- INDIA and our Colonial Empire, 189-212
 "India, Report on the Administration of the Meteorological Department of the Government of," 246, *see also* Blandford, H. F.
 "India, The Forces of the Native States of," 551
 "Italian Blue-books, Parliamentary Returns, and Statistics," &c., 561
- JAMES, Prosser, M.D., "Sore Throat," 253
 Janet, Paul, "Final Causes," 540
 Jensen, Dr. Jul., "Thun und Handeln," 297
 "Johnson, Dr., His Biography and Critica," 1-39
 ——— Joseph, "Clever Boys of Our Times, and how they became Serious Men," 275
 Jones, J. T., "The Croomaboo Mail Carrier," 583
- K. O., "Friends or Foes," 559
 Keetley, C. B., "The Student's Guide to the Medical Profession," 258
 Kennard, Rev. R. B., "Eternal Hope," 221
 ——— R. H., M.A., "Arundines Sturi," 294
 Kidd, Joseph, M.D., "The Laws of Therapeutics," 257
 Kinahan, G. H., M.R.I.A., "Manual of the Geology of Ireland," 246
 Kingsley, Rev. C., "True Words for Brave Men," 217
 Kingston, W. H. G., "With Axe and Rifle," 232
 Knight, Professor W., "The English Lake District," 286
 "Knox, Kathleen, "Queen Dore," 295
 Kölling, Dr. Eugen, "Englische Studien," 297
 ——— "Die Nordische und die Englische version der Tristram Sage," 598
 Koschwitz, Dr. E., "Sechs Bearbeitungen des altfranzösischen Gedichts von Karls des Grossen reise nach Jerusalem," 598
 Kym, A. L., "Das Problem des Bösen," 543
- "LAGUNAS, Near the," 582
 Lamb, Charles & Mary, "Tales from Shakespeare," Edited by A. Anger, M.A., 598
 Lancaster, Mrs., "Talks about Plants," 252
- Lang, A., M.A., *see* Butcher, S. H., M.A.
 ——— R. Hamilton, "Cyprus," 229
 Laroque, Madame, "Great and Small," 295
 Lathan, R. G., M.D., "Russian and Turk," 231
 Lawn, Henri von, "The French Revolutionary Epoch," 261
 Lear, H. L. Sydney, "A Selection from Pascal's Thoughts," 229
 Lee, Rev. F. G., D.C.L., "Historical Sketches of the Reformation," 259
 Leighton, W., "Change," 589
 Lewis, Edward Dillon, "A Paper on the Codification of the Criminal Law of England," 239
 Liebreich, R., "School Life: its Influence on Sight and Figure," 258
 Lindsay, A. M., "A Gold Standard without a Gold Coinage in England and India," 558
 Liversedge, Professor, "Journal and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New South Wales, 1877," 565
 Locker, Frederick, "Patchwork," 592
 Lockwood, Edward, "Natural History, Sport and Travel," 237
 Loftus, Mrs., "Forty-six Social Twitters," 241
 "Longfellow's Works," 288
 Lowndes, R., "René Descartes, His Life and Meditations," 227
- M'CARTHY, Justin, "A History of Our Own Times," 572
 MacDonald, J., M.D., "The Ulster Civil War of 1641," 574
 Machiavelli, Niccolò, and his Times, 167-188
 Mackenzie, Morell, "Diphtheria," 570
 MacLaughlin, Louise, "China Painting," 295
 Macquoid, Thomas and Katherine, "Pictures and Legends from Normandy and Brittany," 236
 Mainwaring, H., "A Tragedy Indeed," 278
 Mallison, Col. G. B., "History of Afghanistan," &c., 575
 "Manchester Literary Club, Papers of," 297
 Marshall, W., "England's Language," 293
 Martini, C. de, "Il Nuovo Patto della Unione Monetaria Latina," 557
 Mayer, A. M., "Experiments in the Phenomena of Sound," &c., 567
 Mayor, J. E. B., "Juvenal," 294-599
 Merry, W. W., "Homer: Odyssey, XIII.-XXIV," 294
 Meteyard, Eliza, "The Children's Isle," 295

- Meyer, J. B., "Fichte, Lasalle und der Socialism," 598
- Michie, Sir A., Q.C., "Readings in Melbourne," 557
- Minto, William, "Daniel Defoe," 579
- Mitford, Mary Russell, "Our Village," 287
- Morell, J. D., LL.D., "Philosophical Fragments, written during the Intervals of Business," 222
- Morgan, Appleton, "International Copyright," 241
- Morris, Mowbray, "The First Afghan War," 262
- Mosseley, H. N., M.A., F.R.S., "Notes by a Naturalist on the *Challenger*," 562
- Müller, Max, M.A., "Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion," &c., 532
- Munro, D. B., "Homer, Iliad, B. I." 599
- NESTE, Alice, "The Mysterious Rubies," 583
- Newman, John Henry, B.D., "Selections Adapted to the Seasons of the Ecclesiastical Year," 537
- Nichol, Professor, LL.D., "Literature Primers, English Composition," 599
- Nicholson, H. A., M.D., and R. Etheridge, F.G.S., "A Monograph of the Silurian Fossils of the Girvan District, in Ayrshire," 565
- Nicolson, W. Millaw, M.A., "Classical Revision of the Greek New Testament," 538
- Northcote, J. S., "Epitaphs on the Catacombs," 291
- OLIPHANT, T. L. K., "Old and Middle English," 293
- Mrs. and F. Tarver, M.A., "Molière," 579
- "Oliver, Rachel," 278
- Ontario Education Department, "Compendium of School Law and Regulations," 244
- "Report of Education in, for 1877," 561
- O'Reilly, Mrs. R., "Phœbe's Fortunes," 583
- Oxenham, H. N., M.A., "An Eirenicon of the Eighteenth Century," 536
- "Catholic Eschatology and Universalism," 536
- PALEY, F. A., "Homeri quæ nunc exstant, an reliquis Cycli carminibus antiquiora jure habita sint," 290
- "Papacy, The: its Early Relations with Roman Catholic States," 39-57
- "Paradoxical Philosophy," 542
- Parloe, J., "Our Railways," 234
- "Parson, Recreations of a Country," 286
- Pattison, Mrs. M., "The Renaissance of Art in France," 595
- Payne, John, "Lautrec," 285
- Pfeiffer, Emily, "Quarterman's Grace," 590
- Phillips, S. K., "On the Seaboard, and other Poems," 283
- Phipps, R. W., "Free-trade and Protection, considered with Relation to Canadian Interests," 240
- Prejevalsky, Colonel N., "From Kulja Across the Tian Shan to Lob-Nor," 556
- Probyn, May, "Once! Twice! Thrice! and Away!" 278
- Proctor, Richard A., "Pleasant Ways in Science," 245
- RAMBAUD, Prof. A., "The History of Russia from the Earliest Times," 575
- Ranking, Montgomerie, "Bjorn and Bora," 283
- Ravenshaw, J. H., "Gaur: its Ruins and Inscriptions," 551
- Reuter, Fritz, "An Old Story of My Farming Days," 584
- Rew, Walter, "Love's Avater," 589
- Robertson, A., M.A., "A Course of Lectures on the Government, Constitution, and Laws of Scotland," 554
- Robinson, P., "Cabal. The Ameer, his Country, and his People," 232
- Rodwell, G. F., "Etna, a History of the Mountain and of its Eruption," 237
- Ross, R. S., "Removal of the Indian Troops to Malta," 230
- Rush, E., "Synthetic Latin Delectus," 599
- Russell, W. C., "The Wreck of the Grosvenor," 287
- "Russians, The, in Turkey," 57-76
- SCHILLER, "Egmont's Leben und Tod," * Edited by C. A. Buckheim, Ph.D., 577
- Schweinfurth, Dr. G., "The Heart of Africa," 550
- Selkirk, J. B., "Ethics and Æsthetics of Modern Poetry," 286
- Senex, "The British Empire and the Free Imports System," 240
- Severne, Harleigh, "Chums," 295
- Shakespeare, W., *see* Lamb, Charles and Mary
- Simon, Collyns, LL.D., "The Principles of Human Knowledge. Being Berkeley's Celebrated Treatise on the Nature of Material Substance," 229

- Simmonds, P. L., "The Commercial Products of the Sea," 251
- Skelton, I., "Essays in Romance and Studies in Life," 281
- Smith, Edward, "William Cobbett, a Biography," 268
- J. W., "A Handy Book on the Law of Husband and Wife," 244
- Sohn, G., "Was ist Socialism?" 598
- Southey, Robert, "Life of Nelson," 578
- Spencer, Herbert, "Education, Intellectual, Moral, and Physical," 233
- "Spencer's, Herbert, First Principles, Free Notes on," 229
- Spry, W. J., A.M., "The Cruise of the Challenger," 234
- Squire, Balmanno, M.B., "Atlas of the Diseases of the Skin," 255
- Stedman, A. M. M., "Oxford: its Social and Intellectual Life," 234
- Stevenson, R. L., "Edinburgh," 559
- Stoughton, J., D.D., "Religion in England under Queen Anne and the Georges," 537
- Stubbs, C. W., M.A., "Village Politics," 238
- Sullivan, A. M., "New Ireland," 561
- Sunderland, I. T., "What is the Bible?" 217
- Symonds, John Addington, "Shelley," 580
- TAIT, W. C. A., M.A., "Analysis of English History, based on 'Green's Short History,'" 275
- Talbot, Clara, "Elinor," 278
- Teale, T. P., M.A., "Dangers to Health in our Houses," 568
- Thomas, Annie, "Mrs. Cardigan," 581
- Bertha, "Cressida," 277
- H. O., "Diseases of the Joints," 254
- "Thomas's, St., Hospital Reports," 257
- Thompson, J. Turnbull, "Social Problems: an Inquiry into the Law of Influences," 241
- Thurston, F. W., B.A., "Medea: a Tragedy," by Grillpazer, 298
- R. H., A.M., C.E., "A History of the Growth of the Steam Engine," 567
- Todhunter, John, "Alcestitis," 587
- Tolstoy, Count Le, "The Cossacks," 280
- Towne, Rev. E. C., B.A., "New Biological Discoveries," 562
- Tristram, H. B., M.A., "Genesis and the Brick-kiln," 529
- Trotter, Captain, "Life of Warren Hastings," 578
- "Truth, Shadows of the Coming," 535
- Twain, Mark, "Literary Scrap Book," 297
- URTON, Major-General, "The Armies of Europe and Asia," 243
- "VANITY Fair Album, January to June, 1878," 292
- Vase, Gillan, "A Great Mystery Solved," 280
- Veley, Margaret, "For Percival," 281
- Vere, Aubrey de, "Proteus and Amadeus," 227
- Verne, Jules, "The Survivors of the Chancellor," 288
- Véron, Eugène, "Æsthetia," 590
- Voegelin, A. S., "Herder's Cid," 598
- WALDSTEIN, C. Ph.D., "The Balance of Emotion and Intellect," 227
- Walker, A., "Lady's Holm," 279
- Waller, Charles B., M.A., "The Apocalypse Viewed under the Light of the Doctrines of the Unfolding Ages and the Restitution of all Things," 221
- Walpole, Spencer, "A History of England, from the Conclusion of the Great War in 1815," 262
- Warner, C. D., "Six to One," 288
- Washburn, W. T., "Poems," 589
- Waterton, C., "Wanderings in South America," 553
- Webster, Augusta, "A Housewife's Opinions," 292
- "Weir, Saul," 276, 581
- Welcker, A., "A Voyage with Death," 282
- Wigand, A., Professor, "Der Darwinismus ein Zeichen der Zeit," 544
- Wild, J. J., Ph.D., "At Anchor," 553
- "Wild Life in a Southern Country," 597
- "Will is the Cause of Woe," 279
- Williams, Rowland, D.D., "Stray Thoughts," 534
- Willis, R., M.D., "William Harvey: a History of the Discovery of the Circulation of the Blood," 265
- Wilson, A., Ph.D., "Leisure Time Studies, chiefly Biological," 250
- "Within Sound of the Sea," 582
- Witte, Karl, "Dante - Forschungen," 599
- Woakes, E., M.D., "On Deafness, Giddiness, and Noises in the Head," 570
- Wordsworth, C., "A Greek Primer," 599
- Y., A. M., "The Prince's Triumph," 282
- Yonge, Charlotte M., "The Story of the Christians and Moors of Spain, 236
- "History of France," 559.

